

WAYWARD
YOUTH

AUGUST AICHHORN

FOREWORD BY

SIGMUND FREUD

THE VIKING PRESS • NEW YORK

FOREWORD

By Sigmund Freud

Of all the fields in which psychoanalysis has been applied none has aroused so much interest, inspired so much hope, and accordingly attracted so many capable workers as the theory and practice of child training. This is easy to understand. The child has become the main object of psychoanalytic research and in this respect has replaced the neurotic with whom the work began. Analysis has revealed that the child lives on almost unchanged in the sick patient as well as in the dreamer and the artist; it has thrown a flood of light on the instinctual forces and impulses which give the childish being its characteristic features; and it has traced the paths of development which proceed to maturity. It is no wonder that expectation was aroused that psychoanalytic work would prove valuable in education, the purpose of which is to guide the child on his way to maturity, to encourage him, and to protect him from taking the wrong path.

My personal share in this application of psychoanalysis has been slight. In my youth, I accepted it as a byword that the three impossible professions are teaching, healing, and governing, and I have been sufficiently busy with the second. This does not mean that I do not appreciate the great social value of the work which attracts my co-workers in the pedagogical field.

August Aichhorn's book deals with one part of the great problem of the application of psychoanalysis to education, namely, that of influencing the dissocial adolescent by means of education. The author had worked for many years in an official position as director of state institutions for the care of delinquents before he became acquainted with psychoanalysis. His treatment of his charges had its source in a warm sympathy for the fate of these unfortunates and was rightly guided by his intuitive understanding of their psychic needs. Psychoanalysis could teach him little that was new to him in a practical way, but it offered him a clear theoretical insight into the justification of his treatment and enabled him to explain his method to others in this field.

We cannot assume that every educator has this intuitive gift. Aichhorn's experience and achievement lead us to two conclusions. One is that the educator should be psychoanalytically trained; otherwise the child, the object of his effort, remains an inaccessible enigma to him. Such training is best achieved when the educator subjects himself to an analysis in order to experience it within himself. Theoretical teaching of analysis does not penetrate deeply enough and brings no conviction.

The second conclusion sounds rather more conservative in its purport, that educational work is *sui generis*, not to be confused with nor exchanged for psychoanalytic means of influence. Psychoanalysis of the child may be drawn upon as a contributory help, but it is not an appropriate substitute for education. This is true not only because of

practical reasons, but also because of theoretical considerations. The relation between education and psychoanalytic work will probably be the subject for a detailed investigation in the near future. I shall indicate only a few points here. One must not be led astray by the statement, quite justified in another sense, that psychoanalysis of the adult neurotic may be compared to re-education. The child, even the wayward and delinquent child, should not be compared to the adult neurotic, and re-education is something quite different from the education of the immature. The possibility of exerting influence through psychoanalysis depends on quite definite conditions, which may be described as the "analytic situation"; it requires the formation of certain psychic structures and a special attitude toward the analyst. When these factors are lacking, as in the case of children and young delinquents and, as a rule, in criminals dominated by their instincts, the psychoanalytic method must be adapted to meet the need. The theoretical chapters of this book offer the reader a preliminary orientation in these various considerations.

I add one more conclusion, which has no special significance for the theory of pedagogy but is important for the position of the educator. If a teacher has learned analysis by experiencing it himself and is capable of applying his knowledge as a supplementary aid in his work with borderline and mixed cases, he should obviously be allowed the practice of analysis and should not be hindered in it for narrow-minded reasons.

of behaviour, we must not overlook the fact that remedial education accomplished many good results before we had any psychoanalytic insight. Educational work is an art, in which intuition is of primary importance. This holds true in greater measure for remedial training than for general education. The more intuitively the worker grasps the difficulties of his charge, the more successfully he works. It must be granted that technical skill derived from a definite knowledge of the normal predictable course of mental processes enhances the efficacy of his work. When the psychic mechanisms revealed by psychoanalysis are familiar to the educator, what has been intuitive understanding becomes a conscious recognition of the forces involved.

The educator often overvalues the significance of psychology for remedial training. For well-rounded work, he must take into consideration many other factors, psychiatric, sociological, economic, and cultural.

TWO

THE ANALYSIS OF A SYMPTOM

THE general survey in our first chapter has given us some idea of the task of child guidance and has introduced us to psychoanalysis. At this point, we could continue the theoretical discussion of our work, leaving the application until a later period. Our discussion would then divide itself into two parts: the first would establish general principles and serve as a foundation, the second would show the application of these principles to specific cases. This procedure would have several advantages; in the first place, a systematic introduction would familiarize us with the psychoanalytic way of thinking so that we would not find our conclusions shocking or far-fetched as is often the case in the first approach. In the second place, the presentation of cases would be facilitated, since in showing the relation between cause and treatment of dissocial behaviour we could refer to the theory already learned instead of having to interrupt our story for explanations. This method seems a logical approach to the subject. Despite these advantages, I wish to suggest another method. I am in the midst of practical work with children, and theoretical discussions without application seem to me out of place. Because I see greater advantages in bringing you face to face with

real situations, I prefer to risk the dangers already mentioned: that you will be incredulous, that the interpolations of theory will interrupt the story, and that you may criticize me for being unscientific. I shall present problems as I have found them, neither made to order nor simplified. We shall learn what each case demands in the way of special knowledge, psychoanalytic or otherwise.

Let us begin with a simple case in the clinic rather than in the institution. A mother brought her thirteen-year-old son to the clinic, complaining about his misbehaviour and insisting that he be sent to a reformatory. I first interviewed the mother, who told a well-rounded story with the help of a few direct questions. On Wednesday, the boy had taken some soap, soda, and the newspaper into the laundry of the apartment house where the family lived. When she returned to the apartment at noon, she found the door locked. The boy had disappeared, leaving the key with a neighbour. The mother said, "I thought he had run away because he has done so several times before without any reason. We are good to him at home. . . . There was nothing missing from my purse which was on the table. There was quite a little money in it. My husband's savings had not been touched either. They are kept in the inside pocket of an old coat that hangs in the closet. The boy knew this. I did not discover until later that he had taken some money out of the drawer of the kitchen table and all there was in his sister's savings bank. When he did not come home that night, I went to the police and reported him as missing. On Friday afternoon, when I was coming home with some

work, I met him near the house. He was stubborn and sulky but he had washed and had on clean clothes. He wouldn't talk and I couldn't get out of him where he had been or what he had done with the money. I don't know yet. I didn't scold him or whip him, but I can't do anything more with him. He belongs in a reform school."

She discussed the home conditions quite frankly. She had been happily married for fifteen years to a foreman in a machine shop. She did home embroidery for a firm in the city. When I asked if there were ever marital disputes, she said, "Oh yes, little scraps such as everyone has." The relationship between her and the boy seemed to be good. "I am sure he loves me more than he loves his father. My husband is much too easy on him. He lets the boy do almost anything he wants and practically never punishes him. I get awfully annoyed about this, but it does no good. If I say anything, my husband leaves the house and does not come back for hours. We can't give much time to the children because both of us work all day. My husband loves to fish and usually goes fishing on Sunday. He often takes the boy along. My daughter and I stay at home and do the mending and darning."

The family lived in three rooms. The daughter slept with the parents; the boy in a tiny bedroom. The mother had had no trouble with the daughter, who was eleven, got along well in school, and was industrious at home. When the two children quarrelled, the girl gave in to her brother more than she should. The woman concluded her story by saying that there had been no quarrel of any kind before

the boy ran away this time; he had no reason to be afraid of punishment, and she knew of nothing else that could have frightened him. She could not explain his running away. It was out of the question that he had been enticed by other boys; his only friend was a boy of a nice family, and he was hardly ever on the streets.

The following facts supplemented the woman's story. Both parents were in good health; there was no alcoholism or insanity on either side of the family, nor any indication of criminal or delinquent tendencies. The boy's development had been normal; he did not have convulsions as a child and there was nothing now to make one suspect any psychic illness.

I then interviewed the boy. I asked the mother to wait, assuring her that I would tell her later what seemed best to do. The boy made a good first impression. There was no trace of the typical delinquent in his appearance; on the contrary, he looked like a well-brought-up child of good middle-class family. Although overgrown, he seemed strong, and there was a sunny smile on his round, childish face. His dark hair was neatly parted; his face and hands looked as if they had been scrubbed. His immaculate white sailor suit enhanced the impression of an overgrown child.

After the usual greeting and a few opening remarks, we sat down at a table in my office. When we discuss the relationship between mentor and child in a later chapter, we shall take up the importance of the first interview. A part of our conversation I shall repeat verbatim; the remainder can be summarized. All interviews in the clinic are

private. The boy cast a different light on the relationship between his parents; there was not much harmony between them; they did not understand each other very well. When the mother was angry, his father would go away and stay for hours at a time. A week ago Saturday after a quarrel, his father took his fishing tackle and went to the country. Instead of returning at the usual time, he stayed away until late Sunday night. His mother feared something had happened to him and was much worried.

The boy's attitude toward his parents was ambivalent; it wavered between affection and rejection. When his mother was too strict, he turned to his father; if his father refused to take him fishing, he complained to his mother. He loved his mother more, but he thought his father was right to go away when there were unpleasant quarrels at home. His sister was not very nice to him; he often got angry with her. His mother seemed to favour his sister; on the Tuesday evening before he ran away, his mother had given his sister money to have her shoes resoled; she did not give him anything although he needed new shoes more than his sister. And his mother did not see why he should be annoyed about this. His sister got better grades in school than he. He did not like school; he would much rather quit and learn to be a mechanic. He had few friends other than one boy of his own age whom he liked very much. Except when this friend called for him to go walking with him, he did not enjoy going out on the street. Sometimes they went to movies together. He liked travel pictures best and he enjoyed travel books. The only reason he wished to become a

mechanic was that his parents would not let him go to sea.

I shall repeat our conversation about his running away, in so far as it clarifies the picture of his delinquency.

"When did you run away?"

"On Wednesday."

"When was it exactly, in the morning or in the afternoon?"

"I'm not sure how late it was, but toward noon, before lunch."

"Did you start from home or were you out on the street?"

"I was at home and left from there."

"Was anyone else at home?"

"No, I was alone."

"Where were the others?"

"Mother was in the laundry, father was at the factory, and my sister was at school."

"Do you remember if anything was wrong beforehand, were you frightened or angry?"

"No."

"Perhaps something happened Tuesday evening."

"No."

"What did you do Tuesday evening?"

"I went to the store. Mother had given me some money. I brought back some change and she put it in the table drawer."

"Now think a minute, wasn't your father or your mother angry with you on Tuesday evening or Wednesday morning?"

"No."

"Did you have any trouble with your father?"

"No."

"Or with your sister?"

"No; oh yes, I was mad at her because she could have her shoes resoled before I got new ones."

"How was that?"

"Mother gave her some money and she put it in her savings bank."

"Why?"

"I don't know. Mother took the money out of the table drawer."

"Did you think about running away on Tuesday night?"

"No."

"When was it then?"

"Not until Wednesday and then I left right away."

"What did you do beforehand?"

"I took some soda and soap and the newspaper to mother in the laundry. Then I went back to the apartment."

"Did you look at the paper?"

"Yes."

"What did you read about?"

"That a man was lost in the mountains."

"When you took the things to your mother, was anything wrong?"

"Mother was cross on account of the stamps."

"What stamps?"

"My friend had had some stamps stolen and they thought that I had taken them."

"Who are 'they'?"

"Oh, everyone, but mother, too."

"Were you mad at your mother?"

"Of course. I thought to myself, 'She makes me tired.'"

"When you went home from the laundry, what did you do?"

"I spread a piece of bread with margarine and ate it."

"Were you in the kitchen or in the living room then?"

"I was looking out of the window in the living room."

"Did you notice anything on the street?"

"I was looking into the court. There was a dog down there and I threw him a piece of bread."

"Show me how you stood by the window."

The boy then leaned over the table on his elbows. I let him remain in this position to make it easier for him to remember.

"What happened after you had thrown the bread to the dog?"

"Then I ran away."

"Wait a minute, not so fast. You were leaning on the window sill, had finished your bread and margarine, had thrown some to the dog. Now think a bit and try to remember why all of a sudden you wanted to run away."

"I don't know."

"Did the idea come to you while you were eating?"

"After I had finished, I thought, 'I'll go to Tulln.'"

"Why to Tulln?"

"Because I wanted to go to the woods."

"Are there woods only in Tulln?"

"No, but I wanted to get some cherries for my mother."

"But why just in Tulln?"

"Because father owns some cherry trees there."

"How do you know that?"

"Because I was with him when he bought them. I have often been in Tulln with my father when he went fishing."

"I see. You thought you would go to Tulln to get cherries for your mother, and what then?"

"There were some cherry stones lying on the window sill. Then I went into the kitchen and made myself four bread-and-margarine sandwiches."

"What else did you do?"

"I took some of mother's money and a bag."

"Where did you get the money?"

"Out of the kitchen table drawer."

"Are you sure?"

"Yes."

"Now think a minute."

"I took all there was in the drawer."

"Where did you get the rest?"

"Out of my sister's savings bank."

"Where was the bank?"

"In the chest in the living room."

"Was it locked?"

"Yes, but the key was in mother's purse."

"Where was the purse?"

"On the table in the living room."

"Was there money in it?"

"Yes."

"How much?"

"I don't know."

"Did you take all the money in your sister's bank, or did you leave some?"

"I did not take it all."

"Why not?"

"I didn't need any more for the trip."

"Was there money in any other place in the apartment?"

"Yes, in the closet in an old coat of father's. He keeps his money in an old billfold in the pocket."

"Was this closet locked?"

"Yes, but the key was in the lock."

"Have you a bank, too?"

"Yes."

"Why didn't you take your money?"

"Because I wanted to save it."

"How did you happen to take your sister's money?"

No answer.

"Don't you want to tell me?"

No answer.

"You took the money out of your sister's bank, and what then?"

"I put the sandwiches in my pocket and locked the apartment."

"Did you take the key along?"

"No, I gave it to a neighbour, and then I left."

"Weren't you afraid you would meet your mother on the stairs?"

"No, she had said she would have to hurry in order to finish by lunch time."

"What would she have done?"

"I don't know. I was supposed to put the lunch on to warm."

"Did you do that?"

"No."

"Where did you go when you left home?"

"To the station."

"Did you walk or take the street car?"

"I walked, and then I had to wait for two hours."

"What did you do in the station?"

"I sat down and ate a sandwich."

"Did your father always carry some lunch when you and he went fishing together?"

"Yes; and I always had to carry it."

"When you were at the station, were you afraid that you might be caught?"

"No, nobody from home ever goes there."

"Did you know when you reached Tulln?"

"Yes, I know the Tulln station very well."

"What did you do when you got to Tulln?"

"Nothing."

"Did you stay in the station?"

"No, I went right to the woods."

"But then you did do something."

"Yes, I thought you meant, did I get into any mischief?"

"What did you do in the woods?"

"I found the cherry trees."

"Did you pick any cherries?"

"No, they weren't ripe yet, and then I was afraid to go home."

"What did you do then?"

"I walked around in the woods."

"Why?"

"Because I was hunting strawberries. There were other cherry trees there, too. I took some cherries and ate them."

"Did you take some from these trees for your mother?"

"No."

"How long did you stay in the woods?"

"Until it was quite dark. It began to rain, too."

"Where did you go that night?"

"I slept in a barn."

He now described more in detail how he spent the night, and how careful he had to be in order to avoid being discovered by the farmer. He told how lonely he was because he had to sleep all by himself in the hay; said at first he was frightened lest he not wake up in time in the morning and be caught by the farmer; then he could not sleep at all and so he left the barn as soon as it was light. Although it continued to rain all day, he remained in the woods so as not to be detected. He did not think much about home. His only concern was whether he could sleep in the same barn that night. He waited until it was dark, crept back to the barn and crawled up into the hay without being seen. This time he slept very well and did not wake up until it was broad daylight. He had to wait until the farmer left the house and then he ran back to the woods in a hurry. He

had not spent any of the remaining money but saved it for the return trip; strawberries, cherries, and his three sandwiches had been his only food. He ate the last sandwich on Friday morning when it was already quite hard. It was hunger that drove him home. On the trip home, he felt no particular remorse. He did not feel afraid until he reached the door. His sister, who was the only one at home, said that his mother would soon be back from work, and that his parents were very angry about his running away. He washed, put on clean clothes, and went to meet his mother. When he met her on the street, she did not scold him but simply said he was such a bad boy that he would have to be put in a reform school.

Another short talk with the mother confirmed the boy's story. After hearing the reasons which the boy gave, she was inclined to view the stealing and the running away as not at all serious. But she could not understand why he had not told her this himself. To answer this question, we must examine the affair more closely. Is the matter so simple as the mother thought? Even a superficial consideration enables us to recognize two distinct phases in his behaviour, the product of different psychic situations. The boy himself told us where the one ended and the other began: in the woods when he saw that the cherries were not ripe. "The cherries weren't ripe and then I was afraid to go home." Let us leave the second phase for the time being and return to the beginning. We can eliminate several possible causes of the delinquency at once. There is no indication of illness nor any inherent tendencies toward vagrancy. Neither is it

possible to explain the running away as a result of fear of punishment, or as an anxiety reaction. One thing is certain: the boy explained his action by his wish to get cherries for his mother.

Let us first discuss the case without any psychoanalytic consideration. No child is absolutely trustworthy, so we must weigh the boy's statements carefully. We do not yet know whether he told the truth. The statements of delinquents should always be checked. However, when we catch a child in a lie, we should not shame him. Expressions such as "You lie," "You must tell the truth," should always be avoided. It is much more efficacious to act as if the child had made a mistake. We can say, for example, "Are you sure you meant what you said?" "Now think a minute," or "Take your time; tell me again," etc.

How was it in this boy's case? Did he really wish to bring cherries to his mother from Tulln, or did he tell me this only as an excuse, or what was his motive? Since we cannot determine this with certainty, we must be satisfied with establishing its probability on the basis of our general impression of the boy. Did he lie? It is possible. He had refused to give his mother any explanation and he knew she had brought him to me to be sent to a reformatory. His fate therefore depended on the impression he made on me. He might have thought, "If I am clever, I can get out of this trouble." If he was guided by this idea, then he understood his mother very well. Her attitude had changed after she learned from me that a loving thought had prompted the boy's running away. Does the rest of his conduct make

us feel that this was the case? Yes, because he said first that he wanted to go to Tulln to get to the woods and only later mentioned the cherry trees. Do you recall this part of the interview? After I had made several attempts to find out when he had decided to go to Tulln, our conversation was as follows: "Did the idea [to go to Tulln] come to you while you were eating?" "After I had finished, I thought, 'I'll go to Tulln.'" "Why to Tulln?" "*Because I wanted to go to the woods.*" Not until I asked, "Are there woods only in Tulln?" did it occur to him . . . "No, but I wanted to get some cherries for my mother." "But why just in Tulln?" "*Because Father owns some cherry trees there.*"

Let us now consider without prejudice whether he might have told the truth. This seems probable when we compare his statements with those of his mother, who was certainly not in collusion with him. The two are in complete agreement about all the facts. The boy's telling me that he stole some cherries from trees which did not belong to his father reveals a streak of honesty. He told this spontaneously although he could have thought that this would work to his disadvantage. To this can be added the facts that he took with him a bag for the cherries, that he appropriated no more of the easily accessible money than he needed for the railway fare, that he spent nothing on himself but saved the remainder for the return trip, and that he was seized by fright when he discovered that he could not carry out his plan because the cherries were not ripe. When we consider the impression that he made in the interview, it seems im-

possible to believe that he was lying. And yet the assumption that he was telling the truth is equally unsatisfactory. There seems to be no reason why he should have thought affectionately of his mother. On the contrary, he had been annoyed with her the evening before because his sister was to get shoes before he did, and just before running away, he had been angry about the stamps.

But perhaps he was a "good child." After his anger had cooled off and his hunger was satisfied, he thought about his poor mother working in the laundry and he felt sorry for her. Getting the cherries was an act of conciliation. This assumption would seem admissible were it not refuted by another fact: he stole from his mother and sister. If bringing cherries to his mother had been his only idea, he could have done this more simply by buying some with his savings. Nor would it have been necessary to come home empty-handed; just as he stole cherries for himself, so he might have filled the bag with stolen cherries for his mother. Did he lie after all? We are not yet obliged to believe this. Perhaps his sweet tooth was the cause even though he was unaware of it. By that I mean: he had eaten his bread, he wanted something more, he saw some cherry stones on the window sill and conceived the idea of getting some cherries for his mother. His own desire for cherries disguised itself in this form. His theft would be socially acceptable because he spent none of the money for himself. He would naturally get some of the cherries. But had his appetite been strong enough to make him steal, it would hardly have suffered the delayed satisfaction occasioned by the long wait in the

station and the ride to Tulln. He would have yielded to it earlier and bought something to eat. It would have been easy for him to take more money to satisfy his desires. He subsisted on berries and his three sandwiches for three days, he spent no money on food, and he did not steal money elsewhere. We know cases in which stealing is the result of uninhibited appetite, but this does not seem to be one of them. We can hardly say that the boy lied, but we cannot maintain that he told the truth. We are tempted to compromise, to say that although he told untruths, he believed them to be the truth. Is this possible and can we proceed on such an uncertain assumption? The uncertainty increases when I raise the question which I have so far purposely overlooked: why the boy spent the money taken from his sister's bank and none of his own nor of his mother's or father's although it was equally accessible.

We seem to have reached an impasse. Perhaps you are thinking of other ways of explaining the boy's conduct; perhaps you are impatiently asking why all this fuss simply because a boy stole some money and ran away from home. We have set ourselves the task of investigating this dissociated behaviour; we cannot abandon it just because we are not satisfied with the results. It seems we must turn to psychoanalysis for help. From the psychoanalytic point of view, it becomes impossible to consider the stealing and the running away as accidental, nor can the boy's affection for his mother or his sweet tooth be accepted as the cause. Where shall we find the motive?

Up until now, we have concerned ourselves with only one

of the boy's statements. Since this leads nowhere, let us consider another. When he took the soda and soap to his mother in the laundry, she made a remark about the stamps which his friend had lost. He was very angry at being suspected and thought to himself, "She makes me tired," which could be interpreted to mean, "She doesn't like me; I am going to get out of here." Where would this wish originate? He had been annoyed with his mother the evening before because of the shoes and now she had vexed him again. He had to do something to change the uncomfortable situation in which he found himself. An impulse to run away is understandable. But this does not explain the stealing, nor why he took money just from his sister and mother, nor why he chose to go to Tulln and said that he had planned to get cherries for his mother. We must go a step farther and be willing to admit that he might have been unconscious of his real purpose. If he does not know what determined his action, then these reasons are not in his consciousness. We cannot elucidate them by questioning him, not because he does not wish to tell us but because he himself does not know them. They must be sought in the boy's unconscious.

We have already spoken of the dynamic concept in psychoanalysis, that is, that psychic phenomena are the product of psychic forces. The boy's trip to Tulln and all that went with it can be regarded as the result of such a process. We must therefore discover the psychic drive behind this behaviour. It would seem that there were two drives at work, both in the unconscious, and that one is operating to prevent the other from becoming conscious. The final solu-

tion of the boy's dissocial act depends on the uncovering of this contest between psychic forces. But we should know more about the psychic processes concerned. We shall therefore leave the discussion of the specific problem for the moment and turn to a more general study of psychic phenomena.

We should begin with a brief discussion of the unconscious. We must not think of the unconscious simply as an aid in explaining psychic phenomena, but rather as actually existent, just as consciousness is. We then understand that it has its special significance and special functions. When we think of the conscious and the unconscious, we do not mean two definitely separated compartments of the mind, which can be so designated. However, psychic processes, as such, do separate themselves into two phases, which are differentiated according to whether one "knows" or is "conscious" of them or not. The unconscious, in which all kinds of things are harboured, has various functions to perform. For example, our wishes come from this source, and our emotional attitudes toward people and things around us. What we call attraction to another person is present in the unconscious long before we are aware of it. If we observe the reaction of the new-born child to his organic needs and to the stimuli which come from outside himself, we understand why Freud recognized the unconscious processes as primary. There is little of consciousness to be seen in the infant. As the child grows, he becomes aware of his bodily sensations, conveyed to him through his sense organs; thus consciousness evolves out of the unconscious.

The tendency of the child to imitate is also a function of the unconscious. Feelings of love for his parents develop in the child without his knowledge. On account of this, he admires and assumes certain of their characteristics. We say he identifies himself with them. Imitation is doing what others do in identification with them. When a little girl treats her doll as she has seen her mother treat a younger brother or sister, or plays at housekeeping with her toy dishes, she is identifying herself with her mother. The little boy who puts on his father's hat and parades through the room with his father's walking stick, or refuses to go to bed because his father has not yet retired, is identifying himself with his father. If we observe children closely, we find ourselves continually confronted with these identifications. Children identify themselves not only with persons but also with animals and occasionally with inanimate objects, such as toys.

Why are we now concerned with this tendency in the child? Because this characteristic, although it does not explain our boy's behaviour, gives us a hint as to the way he solved the conflict with his mother. We know that his father left home after quarrels with his wife and that he stayed away for some time. By identifying himself with his father and doing as he did, he escaped his own unpleasant situation. He went to Tulln. He was simply repeating what his father had done the previous Sunday. In addition, he took revenge on his mother by causing her distress. He must have thought that his mother would worry about his disappearance just as someone must have worried about the man

who was lost in the mountains. His revenge was made greater by stealing money from his mother and sister. In this way, he settled the score with his sister for the favouritism shown her on the day before; if the money was gone, she could not get shoes before he did.

Maybe you agree with these conclusions on the basis of a father identification, but perhaps you do not understand why he did not admit this; why, instead of saying that he had been angry with his mother, he told me that he wanted to be kind to her, to bring her a present of cherries. You are justified in feeling that identification does not explain the stealing and furthermore that all this sounds like quite a complicated thought process for a simple boy. But we must advance step by step in explaining his motives.

It will be easier if we do not insist on discovering a single motive behind the boy's actions but rather admit the possibility that several impulses united to determine them. Let us imagine that a wish demanding gratification rises in the unconscious. The following is an example. A child stands beside a table on which there is a box of candy. If he has never been told that it is wrong to take candy without asking permission, he will help himself to a piece and enjoy it without conflict. In this case, the wish meets no opposition. Another child has been forbidden to eat candy, but he has forgotten this. A vague feeling of uneasiness will make him hesitate, but he finally takes the candy and eats it without a bad conscience. In this case, the wish meets with weak opposition. A third child understands clearly that he should not take the candy, but he wants it so much that he takes

it anyhow and then suffers guilty feelings. In this case, the wish overcame the restraint. Another possible reaction is that an inhibiting force, the result of the child's training, will immediately drive the wish back into the unconscious or even prevent it from ever becoming conscious. In general, we can say that whenever a wish conflicts with a moral, religious, or social principle, the latter exerts pressure either to make the wish remain unconscious or to repress it into the unconscious after it has been conscious. Two forces play a part in the mechanism of repression: the unconscious, which aims toward gratification, and the conscious, which tries to prevent the gratification; in other words, a repressed and a repressing force. The result of this conflict is not predictable. The repressed impulse may be strong enough to overthrow the opposition of the repressing impulse, or the reverse may be the case. Let us imagine that neither is strong enough completely to conquer the other. This situation must manifest itself in some way. A banal example will illustrate. In our professional work, we are often subjected to annoyances. It would be a relief if we could rid ourselves of the accumulated affect by scolding someone, but our training in good manners restrains us. Two tendencies are now at odds in us. If the first conquers, we indulge in an outburst of temper; if the second proves stronger, we keep silent. But maybe neither of these two things happens. Instead we are seized by a violent fit of coughing. What does this mean? It represents a compromise between the two impulses. Scolding is a motor mechanism for affect discharge through the muscles of

speech. Coughing employs the same muscles but in a way which escapes the disapproval of our better selves. Such an expression, which unites two tendencies, psychoanalysis calls a symptom. We see that both tendencies contribute to the formation of the symptom, or, as Freud expresses it, the symptom is supported from both sides, from the repressed and from the repressing. Such symptom formations often appear as manifestations of neurotic illness. Similarly certain acts of the healthy individual are attributable to this mechanism. Freud has made a study of some of these everyday phenomena which are known in psychoanalysis as blunders, slips of speech, and the like.

The foregoing example of symptom formation as a compromise between conflicting forces brings us back to our patient. May we attribute his behaviour to the same mechanism? Do we find here two opposing tendencies which find expression in a symptom because neither is strong enough to overthrow the other? If this is the case, we should be able to determine the repressed and the repressing forces and the symptom which they created. There is certainly no doubt that the boy was at odds with his mother before he ran away. Let us now assume that his desire to run away, to do what his father had done, contained the one impulse. This impulse might have remained conscious or it might have been repressed into the unconscious by some inhibiting force within the boy which opposed the running away. In the first instance, he would have gone to Tulln and he would have known why he went. A powerful opposing impulse might have repressed this wish and have resulted in his

staying at home. Its content might have been, "A decent boy does not run away" or "I'll get a whipping for running away." But the fact is that he ran away.

Let us try another approach for the purpose of discovering conflicting impulses. We found that the boy's anger with his mother culminated in the revengeful wish to punish her. This impulse could hardly remain conscious; it probably would not have been permitted to become conscious before being repressed; the command to love one's mother is strongly entrenched in every child. If these two impulses actually existed in the boy, what would have happened? Had revenge conquered scruple, he would have stolen and run away, but he would have known the reason. Had moral training triumphed, there would have been no delinquency, as we have already indicated. If neither conquered, we should have had a situation favourable for producing a symptom. A symptom could be formed out of a revengeful and a moral impulse provided that both could find partial satisfaction in a single act. The boy's journey to Tulln represents such a solution. We can imagine that the conflict which took place while he stood by the window eating his bread and margarine came to an end when he saw the cherry stones on the window sill and resolved to go to Tulln. We know he wanted revenge. His identification with his father makes it possible for him to imitate him and to choose his father's method of causing his mother worry and distress. The moral impulse, to do something nice for his mother, is not capable of thwarting the gratification of

the revenge, but it serves to change the conscious form of the revenge by adding a motive of kindness. The idea of bringing cherries is united with the other purpose; the symptom is complete. His delinquent act is not possible until it has been disguised in this way. This symptom differs from the usual neurotic symptom in that it does not have the quality of discomfort and unpleasantness which characterize the neurotic symptom. It is this pain which makes the neurotic aware of his illness and ready for treatment. The fact that the delinquent does not suffer discomfort from his symptoms constitutes one of the chief difficulties in the analytic treatment of delinquents.

At the expense of considerable effort, we have discovered that a delinquent act is founded on the same mechanism which we regularly find in the neurotic symptom. Although we must not make the mistake of thinking that every delinquency can be explained in the same way, nevertheless we can consider that we have already learned a great deal about diagnosis. This discussion has also contributed to our knowledge of therapeutic treatment. We now know that we cannot content ourselves with the first superficial statements about a case such as "A boy has stolen and run away." We must learn the exact circumstances. Nor is it sufficient for discovering the causes of the delinquency to question the boy, the parents, and others in the environment, since they do not know the real significance of the dissocial behaviour. Without psychoanalytic training the worker cannot unearth these hidden factors. In the case of our boy,

nothing could have been accomplished with kind words or with punishment; either course would have aggravated his hate impulses. This dissocial behaviour was of a compulsive nature and not to be changed except by altering the forces which determined it.

FOUR
SOME CAUSES OF
DELINQUENCY
(CONTINUED)

ALTHOUGH we must guard against generalization, our study of several cases seems to justify the formulation of a general principle. Delinquency represents one of the departures from the normal in psychic processes, and for this reason a solution of the problem of delinquency depends on understanding the psychic content. Since we have learned to think psychoanalytically, we know that dissocial behaviour is the result of disturbed psychic patterns, of abnormal accumulation of affect. The manner in which the psychic energy is utilized determines the direction in which the individual develops; whether he will be psychically normal, whether he will be subjected to nervous illness, or whether he will become dissocial.

Since our explanations and conclusions up until now seem obvious, you may underestimate the necessity for a thorough study of psychoanalysis. You may even believe that you can simply adopt a few psychoanalytic principles and carry on your work as formerly. Such an idea would lead you into dilettantism, which is more dangerous than complete ignorance. Not every delinquent is an interesting

psychoanalytic or neurotic problem, but there are so many possible determinants for every delinquent act that our investigation must be guided by sound theoretical knowledge. I do not wish to alarm you, but simply to warn you that unless we avoid all haste and superficiality, we are doomed to failure.

The next case is that of an eighteen-year-old boy brought to me by the mother. My first advice was that the child should be examined by a psychiatrist. The doctors were unable to find any sign of nervous disorder and attributed the laziness and aggressive behaviour of which the mother complained to a conflict within the family. The mother was a widow; the father, who had been foreman in a large factory, had died many years before. After his death, the mother secured an office position which barely sufficed to support herself and the children. The situation had been better during the past year since the oldest daughter had begun to work. She was a year younger than our patient, had learned the trade of seamstress, and was employed in a dressmaking shop. There were three more children in the family: girls, aged fifteen, thirteen, and ten years.

When the mother returned with her son after the doctors' examination, I asked her to wait while I interviewed the boy alone. The boy made a feminine impression; he seemed shy and ill at ease, and was at first uncommunicative. It was hard to believe that this boy was capable of the aggressive acts ascribed to him, and I realized at once that they must be momentary outbursts of affect rather than the expres-

sion of a brutal nature. I learned the following important facts during the long interview with the boy. He had completed the seventh grade of the public school with a creditable record. His plan to continue his work in high school was interrupted by the death of his father. He wanted to apprentice himself to a painter, but since he could find no opening, he had taken the job of errand-boy in a drug store about December of the same year. Because of his mother's eagerness to have him learn a trade, he gave up this job after a few weeks and apprenticed himself to a carpenter. He liked this job and remained over a year until he discovered that his employer was not a master carpenter and therefore had no right to train apprentices. He was so much annoyed by this that for some time he refused to enter another carpenter shop. Finally, however, he secured another apprenticeship through his mother. He lost this job nine months later because the firm went bankrupt. By this time he had had enough of carpentry. His mother tried everything from kind words to beating to make him change his mind, but to no avail. He had no further interest in learning a trade, and after weeks of job-hunting became an errand-boy again, this time in a paper store. He was discharged after six weeks because he refused to carry out an order which was offensive to him. A relative now took him in charge because his mother would have nothing more to do with him. He left home to become an apprentice in a planing mill, but returned after eight weeks. Previously there had been only short intervals between jobs, but this

time he remained unemployed for half a year. He was brought to me after he had failed to hold his last job, as errand-boy in a dry-goods house.

The boy declared that he did not want to be a burden to his mother since he was strong and healthy, but he refused to become a common labourer as his mother wished. He would be content to learn carpentry if he could be given credit for his first year's apprenticeship, but nobody was willing to straighten out this affair. During the time he was unemployed, he had enjoyed helping his mother with the housework. He especially liked washing dishes and house-cleaning. He read a lot in his spare time—anything that came to his hand, without discrimination. He became excited when we discussed his relationship to the different members of the family. He seemed especially to hate his oldest sister. I learned that his fits of anger were chiefly directed against her. He felt insulted because his sisters belittled him and laughed at him. The oldest sister was the leader in this, and his mother, instead of standing up for him, took the side of the girls. He explained to me with considerable affect that the boy in a family ought to have a say as well as the girls. He liked his mother best, and the sisters in the order of their age, the youngest first. He could not bear his oldest sister because she was always disagreeable and wanted to boss everything. The sisters were quite different in appearance. The oldest was taller than he, had a narrow face, blue eyes, and blond hair. She resembled the mother, but the other sisters looked more like their father. The mother and sisters were very religious,

but he had liberal socialistic views, which he had never discussed with his family. They associated only with strict Catholics. They took him to social gatherings with them without knowing how repugnant this was to him. He did not dare tell his mother of the conflict about the difference in their ideas. He liked to visit one of his mother's friends because he met a girl there whom he admired very much although the rest of the people were uncongenial. He was embarrassed when I asked him whether he had ever liked any girls before, but then admitted that at thirteen he had been in love with one of his oldest sister's schoolmates who spent a great deal of time with them. He remembered her as similar in appearance to his sister except that her hair was a deeper blond, and her eyes grey-blue. When I asked him whether he was in love at the moment, he blushed, but then spoke with enthusiasm of the girl already mentioned. Had he ever kissed her? "A boy doesn't do that," he replied, flushing and embarrassed. His description of her made her in every way the older sister's opposite, although he seemed unaware of this fact. She had black hair and dark-brown eyes. When I asked whether he knew anyone in his childhood with such eyes and hair, he mentioned his youngest sister. Questioned about his childhood, he gave several recollections. The first was about "saying pieces" on holidays, an important custom in the family. One time when he was very little, he and his oldest sister had competed in reciting birthday greetings. The father had promised a picture book to the one who recited best. She got the prize, and he was so angry that he tore up the book. The narrative se-

quence of this incident was reversed in his memory; he began by describing how his father had whipped him for his naughtiness. He also told me that he and this sister had loved to play father and mother as children, and that the youngest sister was always their child in this game.

This ended our interview and I called the mother in. She was irritated that she had been kept waiting, and immediately told me that she could not understand why I had to talk so long to the boy because I knew already what the trouble was; she had told me that at our first meeting before I sent her to the clinic. It was obvious that she felt her authority as mother threatened. She was a lean woman of middle height with sharp features and hard eyes. She gave the impression of being an energetic person whom nothing could daunt. Life had treated her badly from childhood. Although married life had given her material security, she had not had a satisfactory relationship with her husband. After his death it had been a struggle to maintain the five children. Her oldest daughter was an exceptional girl who turned over all her earnings to the mother. With her help they could have got along much better if it had not been for the trouble with the boy. The mother felt that her husband never understood the deeper needs of her nature. He was a cheerful person who took life lightly; he was indiscriminating in all his pleasures, including women. There were no open quarrels between them, but the wife withdrew more and more from her husband. "I always had to stand apart from life. My religious upbringing was very strict. When I later discovered how much these principles were

contradicted by actual life, I suffered for years until I finally reached a solution within myself." She spoke of her son in a deprecating way as though he no longer meant anything to her. "He is not a man, just a stupid, stubborn boy who thinks he knows it all. He tries to lord it over his sisters, and naturally they won't stand for it. He carries on so and talks so foolishly that the girls laugh at him; this makes him furious and he attacks them like a wild animal, especially the oldest. If I don't get him out of the house, something terrible is bound to happen. He obeys me; he doesn't dare defy me because he knows that I would whip him even though he is eighteen years old. He acts like a child. After he has been up to something, he is very obedient and clears up everything around the house nicely. He is a very orderly boy; his closet is much neater than any of his sisters', and he gets mad if they disturb anything. On the other hand, he is careless about his person. I have to make sure that his neck and ears are clean. But he will stand before the mirror for an hour arranging his tie and combing his hair. Of course his sisters are annoyed by this. He thinks only of himself. In the morning he won't get up and doesn't clean his shoes. He has no initiative; housework and reading books are no work for a grown boy; he ought to have a steady job. I won't support him any longer. I haven't the money and he has to learn that we won't slave for him. He is not even honest; when I send him to the store, he cheats me in small amounts, which he spends on candy like a school child. I refuse to bear it any longer; he has to take work as a labourer and earn his own bread and butter."

We feel that the mother's complaints are to some extent justified and that she is wise in seeking help in this intolerable situation. What is to be done? Perhaps you think that having heard both sides, we should now bring mother and son together and try to find a middle road out of the difficulty, encourage one or the other, urge them to be more patient and so try to reach a compromise. *Such a type of procedure would be as ineffectual as a moral lecture about delinquency. It is not our job to make peace, nor to judge the boy, but rather to solve the problem.* We know that we must first discover the cause of the dissocial behaviour by understanding the psychic situation which produced it. For the moment it is only the emotional reactions of this dissocial boy which interest us, and therefore we must examine the facts for their subjective rather than objective validity. Everything we learn about the case must contribute to this. This implies that we take the side of the boy. Since we believe that all psychic manifestations are somehow predetermined, we must say to ourselves, "He is in the right, there must be reasons for this behaviour." What would we gain by being shocked, or by joining the ranks of those who are distressed by his behaviour? Moral or ethical condemnation will not help us.

The most disagreeable of the boy's traits, his brutality at home and especially that toward the oldest sister, should be our first interest. We eliminate all moral judgments and see the brutality for what it is, the manifestation of a long latent situation. Dynamically this could be expressed by

saying that the discharge of psychic energy no longer remains within social bonds. This trait might be constitutionally determined. If we believed this, it would concern us no further; his laziness would be the only problem left for us to deal with. But this can hardly be a case of constitutional brutality since nothing about the boy corresponds to the type—neither the impression he made on me nor the description supplied by the mother. What the boy said made us feel that his aggressions were momentary outbreaks of affect, and as such they deserve our interest. We find aggression directed chiefly against the oldest sister and we have further evidence that he hates her. One of his childhood memories might indicate a source of this hate. As a very small boy, he probably experienced very painful slights. You will remember the story about the birthday book. Experience in the treatment of neurotics by psycho-analysis has taught us that such a memory usually serves as the façade for many other similar memories which are recalled in the course of treatment. We see that this father was tactless in his treatment of the boy, that he disregarded his feelings and apparently did not understand him. It seems probable, too, that there was actual favouritism shown the little girl by the father. We might therefore say that the boy's dislike of his several sisters was founded on the slights endured as a child, and that he particularly hated the oldest sister because she was her father's favourite. The constellation in this family is one we frequently encounter. The father prefers the daughters to the

son, the mother has no special need for affection, and the son is therefore cheated. The same can be true of girls if the situation is reversed.

At this point a few general statements are pertinent. Anyone who has contact with children, whether as parent or teacher, will find himself continually faced with a phenomenon which no effort on his part can quite eliminate. The harmony of every nursery is continually disturbed by feelings of envy and jealousy within the group, though the parents try to avoid any show of favouritism. Observation should have taught us what psychoanalysis has to say on this subject, i. e., that every child regards his brothers and sisters as competitors in the struggle for the important first place in the love of the parents. This rivalry does not endanger the child's development if parents deal sensibly with each situation as it comes. Many mothers do the right thing by instinct; others make continual mistakes without realizing it. In these cases it often happens that the relationship between brothers and sisters lacks warmth even in later life. The more unfavourable the circumstances the greater the likelihood that they will lead to delinquency. The situation of this boy must have been thoroughly unfavourable. In addition to an unsympathetic father he had a clever but hard woman as a mother. Nevertheless we cannot accept his suffering from lack of love as the cause of his delinquency. Why not? Because the other incident which he related about his childhood makes this theory untenable.

We heard that the sister he now hated had at one time been his favourite playmate. This would have been impos-

sible had they been bitter rivals. We might suppose that the relationship had been ambivalent were it not that they played mother and father, with the youngest sister as their child. Of course we do not know how long this relationship between the children lasted, but we are safe in supposing that countless other memories similar in character lie behind the one he told us. Can this fact help us to find a cause for his delinquency? We might set up as a premise the supposition that his hate of his sister was determined by an unconscious erotic tie to her. Because of your lack of familiarity with psychoanalysis, it may sound fantastic to hear talk of an erotic tie where only violent hate manifests itself. If our supposition were founded only on the childhood memory it would have little justification. There are other facts, however, which support this. You may wonder that we should proceed on such a doubtful assumption, especially since psychoanalytic experience teaches us that the first statements of a patient are often altered or refuted by the deeper material which is disclosed later in the analysis. But do not forget that our work differs from that of the psychoanalyst. We are not in the position of being able to wait; because we must act quickly, we are forced to form a picture of a situation after a few interviews. We know that our conclusions are no more than partly right, and that only the result of the treatment will show how far our assumptions were correct. We can lessen the uncertainty by a careful study of the material at our command.

Before returning to the case under discussion, we should make clear what we mean by "erotic tie." We are justified

in supposing that the brother and sister shared an intense experience while playing the game of father and mother. We know that this childish game is not always harmless, that children put more into it than is commonly supposed, and that playing husband and wife frequently ends with examining each other's bodies and thus satisfying childish curiosity. We have often found in our practice that children act out in these games what they have observed their parents doing. Under crowded living conditions, it frequently happens that children have the opportunity to see sexual intercourse between their parents. Certainly such games are a source of excitement which can only be termed sexual, although this word is used in a broader sense than usual. The memories which survive these experiences serve to bind the partners strongly to each other, and the more intense the emotion the stronger the tie. Even though he is not caught in the act, the child is certain to learn that what he did and felt on these occasions was wrong. He understands the difference between these games which he invents for his own pleasure and those which are approved. If the drive toward the instinctual pleasure remains stronger than his fear of punishment, the games are continued; if the other impulse conquers, the experience is repressed. Children at this age are not capable of solving the conflict consciously by rejecting the forbidden pleasure. They try therefore to forget the game and everything associated with it, including the feelings for the partner involved, which represent the greatest danger to renewed temptation. Repression cuts these impulses off from this form of expres-

sion, but they continue to exist in the unconscious. After conscious control has been lost, these impulses are subjected to the influence of other forces in the unconscious and the result is what psychoanalysis calls a fixation. We can easily understand that the ties to the child partner are not broken but simply displaced, i. e., an unconscious erotic tie is formed. The danger of this attachment becoming conscious is lessened if the feeling is completely reversed, if the love relationship finds conscious expression as hate. We now have a general conception of what we mean by an unconscious erotic tie, although it is hardly possible to grasp the full significance of this psychoanalytic principle at once. In the case of our patient, we lack proof that the boy's hate for his sister was so determined. If we say that it could have developed out of their childish game, we draw an analogy with the neurotic. But our boy is a delinquent and not a neurotic. We must therefore find other material to strengthen our supposition. I believe it will be helpful to discuss another theory before returning to the facts of the case.

You are familiar with the term "puberty." The common belief is that it refers only to the physiological changes, the maturing of the genital organs in both sexes which takes place during this period. But many individuals are unable to fulfil the function of reproduction in spite of having normally developed sexual organs. They are incapable of feeling the necessary attraction for persons of the opposite sex, or else their psychic constitution is such that it demands other than normal sexual gratification. Freud has

shown us that an understanding of puberty is impossible unless the psychological component is considered. He has deepened our insight into that psychic development which normally ends with adolescence and has studied the results of disturbances at various points. One fact is of immediate importance to us: that at adolescence the youth should give up his first love objects within the family and replace them by others outside this circle. In psychoanalytic terms, the infantile libidinal ties must be loosened in order to free the libido for object relationships outside of the family. If the libidinal ties to the infantile objects are too strong, are fixated, it becomes difficult or impossible to loosen them in puberty.

Our boy's relationship to the opposite sex indicates that he has been only partially successful in accomplishing this task of puberty. Such a failure results from an infantile fixation on some member of the family. It is not normal for an eighteen-year-old boy to say "a boy docsn't do that" when asked if he has ever kissed a girl. We may consider that this strengthens our argument. The boy's statements about his love object deserve our interest. The first girl whom he loved at the age of thirteen was the same age as his oldest sister, her friend and classmate. The two differed little in manner and in appearance. His love object is here still, the sister, and yet not the sister herself. His present love object has nothing in common with the sister except her work; in appearance, she is her opposite in every detail. Does this tell us anything? We know that as the result

of repression of the forbidden childish game, everything associated with it is likewise repressed; also that because the love tie to the partner in the game is not really loosened, there is constant danger of its reappearance in reality. The great surge of libido which comes at puberty makes the boy for the first time able to carry out his sexual desires and increases the danger that the sister may become the object of these desires. This danger is lessened if conscious hate blocks the approach to her. It is now possible to understand why the repressed libido had to be changed to hate. The process was accomplished by one of the repressing tendencies which protects the ego. The conscious hate acts as a safety measure and must remain as long as the unconscious erotic tie exists, to prevent its breaking through from the unconscious. It remains a question whether any other tendency was operative to make him give up the sister as sexual object.

Freud has taught us that the surge of libido in puberty is accompanied by a strong wave of repression. This is more powerful in girls than in boys, but in both cases it encounters the early love objects and excludes them as sexual objects. Psychoanalysis says that the incest barrier is erected. The statements of the boy in this case indicate how effective was the repression. We can actually see how this barrier began to raise itself when at thirteen he exchanged his sister for the girl similar to her. His present love choice is even more illuminating. The incest barrier has been extended to the type represented by the sister, making the type sexually

unapproachable. Yet the youth has not departed from the family. His last love object resembles the youngest sister to whom he is bound by a weaker tie.

Let us formulate our findings in order not to lose perspective. We are discussing an eighteen-year-old boy who is accused of aggressive behaviour at home, especially toward his oldest sister. Our first idea had to be rejected, that the favouritism shown the eldest daughter and the neglect he experienced in childhood led to his dissocial behaviour. A memory which he tells of his childhood leads us to believe that this aggression was determined by an unconscious erotic tie to the sister. We were led to this assumption because of the analogous condition to be found in the neurotic, but we found significant facts to confirm it; first, the evidence that the patient's relation to the opposite sex was considerably inhibited, and second the fact that he chose a love object in every way his sister's opposite. I selected this case to present to you because it illustrates many important points in our method of treatment. It shows how deeply we probe for the determining cause of delinquency and how we follow every given clue without waiting for the child to work with us. Our procedure is to set up a picture of the case which will serve to reduce the inevitable element of uncertainty. If you recall that establishing the cause of delinquency was found equivalent to discovering the conditions which had led to latent delinquency, you will understand that we have already fulfilled a part of our purpose. An unconscious erotic tie is one of the psychic conditions that

build up a mechanism requiring only a provocation to set it in motion.

Let us now continue our inquiry and consider a remark which the mother made about her son. "He is not a man, just a stupid, stubborn boy." Does this tell us anything? We should compare it with, "He obeys me; he doesn't dare defy me because he knows that I would whip him even though he is eighteen years old. . . . After he has been up to something, he is very obedient and clears up everything around the house nicely." We are inclined to agree that he is not a man; he certainly does not act like one. But does he fit the description of a stupid, stubborn boy? His actions point in another direction. He does the work about the house usually done by the women. He makes no protest against this; in fact he enjoys it. His closet is neater than those of his sisters; he stands before the mirror for hours brushing his hair and arranging his tie; he is shy and fearful like a girl. In short, he shows many feminine traits which accord with his appearance. This may be an inherent factor, added to which is the experience of growing up without a father and surrounded only by women. He made no mention of other boys; he spoke only of his sisters and their friends. It often happens that men brought up in a strictly feminine environment develop feminine traits. The fact is unmistakable in this youth. We recognize it not only in his own statements and in what his mother tells us, but we also see it clearly in his whole personality. It is this feminine streak in her son which the mother resents and which causes

the boy conflict when he tries to assert his masculinity. This conflict, which vents itself in outbursts of affect, we may consider the second determinant of his behaviour. Are we right in this? Again we must turn to psychoanalysis for deeper insight. We have already learned about identifications, that they are the product of the early attachment of the child to his parents and that if this attachment becomes too strong it will lead to an abnormal development or to delinquency. In order to understand this, we should study the normal psychic development. It will simplify the presentation to discuss the development in the male child only and to assume that that of the girl is analogous.

The parents are generally the first persons to enter the sphere of the child's experience, and for this reason the child's first feelings are directed toward them. At first the libidinal strivings of the child are directed equally toward mother and father; the child loves both equally. In the course of time the feelings for his mother increase, and although he continues to love his father, situations arise which make the father objectionable. Even a three-year-old child can so resent his father's tenderness toward his mother that he would like to get rid of him so that he can have his mother to himself. His feelings for his father now vary; love is at times replaced by rejection. Psychoanalysis describes this as an ambivalent attitude toward the father. The name chosen by Freud to characterize this unmistakable stage of development has often been misinterpreted. He calls it the Oedipus stage, making reference to the classic myth. You will remember that Oedipus married

his mother after killing his father, although neither mother nor son knew of their kinship. Those people who do not wish to understand the psychoanalytic way of thinking raise a cry of indignation at the idea of comparing the relationship between Oedipus and his mother with that of the little boy to his mother. But you who want to understand deserve an explanation. The little boy can no more actually kill his father than he can think of having sexual relations with his mother; his sexual apparatus is too immature. The same "Oedipus situation" only signifies the same tendency translated into the emotions of this stage of development, for which the child cannot be held accountable. In psychoanalysis the word "sexual" has come to have a much broader and deeper meaning than was previously the case. As the child's development continues, this negative feeling for his father conflicts with the positive feelings, and is therefore repressed. The real Oedipus situation becomes the Oedipus complex, with all of its repercussions from the unconscious. If no further disturbances occur, the Oedipus complex is resolved approximately at the beginning of the sixth year. Its resolution marks the time of identification with the parents. The positive Oedipus complex is formed out of the tender relationship to the mother; the negative out of the similar relationship to the father. The first results in a positive attitude toward the mother and a negative attitude toward the father. The second is positive toward the father and negative toward the mother. The positive feelings from both these sources, which in every individual are variously coloured by the negative, unite to

form a father-and-mother identification. As the growth process continues, these identifications result in a gradual assimilation of the characteristics of the two parents. If the development is not normal—if, for example, the identification with the mother becomes too strong as a result of hereditary or of environmental factors, the boy will acquire female traits and his character will become feminine. The stronger the mother identification becomes, the more the father identification is impaired, and in corresponding measure, all masculine tendencies. The boy grows up deficient in manliness, and his adolescence is prolonged on this account.

This fact had catastrophic importance for the boy in our case. His father died just as he was finishing school at the age of fourteen. Since he was the oldest child and the only man in the family, he was faced with the task of taking his father's place. Had he been a normally developed boy, he would have been able to do this. But the father identification, which external circumstances forced on him, failed time and again. His mother told us, "He tries to lord it over his sisters, and naturally they won't stand for it. He carries on so and talks so foolishly that the girls laugh at him; this makes him furious and he attacks them like a wild animal." He himself declared with great affect that he was "somebody" and that not only the girls had the say in a household. His inability to act like a man caused him conflict, which he tried to master by excessive brutality. His sisters sensed that he was a cowering woman rather than a forceful man, and made fun of him until he was beside him-

self with anger. We now have a second explanation for his aggressions. This lack of success in the father identification is clearly the result of his identification with his mother.

But still another conflict disturbed him and helped to determine his behaviour. This was the clash of his own socialistic philosophy of life with the strict Catholic ideas of his family. He refused to see any good in their religion, rejected it completely for himself, and yet was too weak to oppose his mother. Instead, he never mentioned the subject, so that his mother was unaware of his real opinion. This resentment also found release in his aggressive behaviour. After each outbreak, he gave in and kept on submitting to the mother's authority. In only one thing was his opposition unwavering: he would not become a common labourer. This resistance was reinforced by his determination to show the girl he was fond of that he was worth something. To be a common labourer was to be nothing, and as long as he escaped this destiny, there still remained a chance for him to prove his worth. We have gone as far in disclosing the determinants of the aggressions of this boy as is necessary before beginning treatment. We now see that the laziness about which we were consulted is not real laziness. The boy's unfortunate experiences and the opposition of his family have put him in a desperate position. If a change could be brought about in his relationship to his mother and sisters, and if he could find suitable work, it seemed likely that a great improvement would result.

Let us now consider methods of treatment. Above all it

seemed important that the boy be spared further experience of failure in the father identification. An easy way to accomplish this was for me to take over the father role in this family for a time. If the boy acknowledged me as the father, he would no longer have to play the part, and one of his conflict situations would be eliminated. With my help he should be able to attain a better relationship with the members of his family. But I would accomplish more if I could bring them into the proper transference relationship to me. The knowledge that I was there, ready to act with father authority if need arose, should change their attitude toward their brother, and the relationship would be improved on both sides. In the same way, the harassed mother would be relieved of anxiety and therefore would be able to adopt a more reasonable attitude toward her son. This is a superficial description of what takes place in the external situation when the worker steps in to fill the father role in the family. Such external change is all we strive for in the beginning. I did not mention my purpose. The first interview offered possibilities for creating the proper transference. The boy responded at once when he felt that he was talking to someone who really understood his misery. The opportunity given her to unburden herself by talking was important in the case of the mother; she left with the feeling of having found someone who could and would help her. She was easily dissuaded from her plan to force the boy out of the house to seek work as a labourer. I was able to arrange that he be given credit for his first year of apprenticeship and go on with learning carpentry. He began

work two weeks after our first meeting, and did well. He gave no indication of laziness. We settled the conflict about religion by talking the matter over with his mother. In my presence, the mother promised to allow her son perfect freedom in this respect. After that he no longer joined the family in their social gatherings except when he had the opportunity to meet the girl mentioned earlier.

Doubtless you expect me to tell you the plan that I made for clearing up all his dissocial behaviour. But I confess that I am unable to do this, nor am I certain that it would be possible in any case. It has been my practice for years to utilize favourable situations, or, if none exist, to create them; intuition and deliberation serve me alternately, depending on the case. This may seem a very uncertain method, but it may be that ties exist between the unconscious of the analysed worker and the unconscious of his patient which ensure the accuracy of the work.

It may interest you to hear how the boy reacted during the early part of the treatment. When alone with me, he would scold about his sisters; when we were all together, he played the part of the superior older brother, would look at me with a meaningful nod to see whether I observed how silly the girls were. Peace was restored to the family at the end of a few weeks. The change in atmosphere reacted favourably on each member of the group, although no single member recognized what part he played in bringing this about. The mother's opinion, when asked how things were going, was "much better, he now behaves much more sensibly." The boy attributed the change to the fact that ~~his~~

oldest sister was less disagreeable and that his mother now took his part. I had given the mother some understanding of the boy's conflict, and her changed attitude made the boy feel that she was on his side. For four months I saw the boy two or three times a week, usually not at home. We discussed his aggressive behaviour with the result that he came to understand its meaning. At first the outbreaks continued, although they were not so violent as before. They calmed down gradually, and during the last two months of treatment completely disappeared. In this case, the cure was permanent.

THE TRANSFERENCE

WE have used the term "transference" several times, and in the last case we attributed the therapeutic results to the transference without further definition of the word. We shall now consider more closely the emotional relationship which is thus designated. During a psychoanalytic treatment, the patient allows the analyst to play a predominating role in his emotional life. This is of great importance in the analytic process. After the treatment is over, this situation is changed. The patient builds up feelings of affection for and resistance to his analyst which, in their ebb and flow, so exceed the normal degree of feeling that the phenomenon has long attracted the theoretical interest of the analyst. Freud studied this phenomenon thoroughly, explained it, and gave it the name "transference." We shall understand later why he chose exactly this term.

I cannot reproduce for you all of Freud's research about the transference, but must limit myself to essentials. When we speak of the transference in connexion with social re-education, we mean the emotional response of the pupil toward the educator or counsellor or therapist, as the case may be, without meaning that it takes place in exactly the same way as in an analysis. The "counter-transference"

is the emotional attitude of the teacher toward the pupil, the counsellor toward his charge, the therapist toward the patient. The feeling which the child develops for the mentor is conditioned by a much earlier relationship to someone else. We must take cognizance of this fact in order to understand these relationships. The tender relationships which go to make up the child's love life are no longer strange to us. Many of these have already been touched upon in the foregoing chapters. We have learned how the small boy takes the father and mother as love objects. We have followed the strivings which arise out of this relationship, the Oedipus situation; we have seen how this runs its course and terminates in an identification with the parents. We have also had opportunity to consider the relationships between brothers and sisters, how their original rivalry is transformed into affection through the pressure of their feeling for the parents. We know that the boy at puberty must give up his first love objects within the family and transfer his libido to individuals outside the family.

Our present purpose is to consider the effects of these first experiences from a certain angle. The child's attachment to the family, the continuance and the subsequent dissolution of these love relationships within the family, not only leave a deep effect on the child through the resulting identifications; they determine at the same time the actual form of his love relationships in the future. Freud compares these forms, without implying too great a rigidity, to copper plates for engraving. He has shown that in the emotional relationships of our later life we can do nothing

but make an imprint from one or another of these patterns which we have established in early childhood.

Why Freud chose the term "transference" for the emotional relationship between patient and analyst is easy to understand. The feelings which arose long ago in another situation are transferred to the analyst. To the counsellor of the child, the knowledge of the transference mechanism is indispensable. In order to influence the dissocial behaviour, he must bring his charge into the transference situation. The study of the transference in the dissocial child shows regularly a love life that has been disturbed in early childhood by a lack of affection or an undue amount of affection. A satisfactory social adjustment depends on certain conditions, among them an adequate constitutional endowment and early love relationships which have been confined within certain limits. Society determines these limits just as definitely as the later love life of an individual is determined by the early form of his libidinal development. The child develops normally and assumes his proper place in society if he can cultivate in the nursery such relationships as can favourably be carried over into the school and from there into the ever-broadening world around him. His attitude toward his parents must be such that it can be carried over to the teacher, and that toward his brothers and sisters must be transferred to his schoolmates. Every new contact, according to the degree of authority or maturity which the person represents, repeats a previous relationship with very little deviation. People whose early adjustments follow such a normal course have no difficulties

in their emotional relationships with others; they are able to form new ties, to deepen them, or to break them off without conflict when the situation demands it.

We can easily see why an attempt to change the present order of society always meets with resistance and where the radical reformer will have to use the greatest leverage. Our attitude to society and its members has a certain standard form. It gets its imprint from the structure of the family and the emotional relationships set up within the family. Therefore the parents, especially the father, assume overwhelming responsibility for the social orientation of the child. The persistent, ineradicable libidinal relationships carried over from childhood are facts with which social reformers must reckon. If the family represents the best preparation for the present social order, which seems to be the case, then the introduction of a new order means that the family must be uprooted and replaced by a different personal world for the child. It is beyond our scope to attempt a solution of this question, which concerns those who strive to build up a new order of society. We are remedial educators and must recognize these sociological relationships. We can ally ourselves with whatever social system we will, but we have the path of our present activity well marked out for us, to bring dissocial youth into line with present-day society.

If the child is harmed through too great disappointment or too great indulgence in his early love life, he builds up reaction patterns which are damaged, incomplete, or too delicate to support the wear and tear of life. He is incapable

of forming libidinal object relationships which are considered normal by society. His unpreparedness for life, his inability to regulate his conscious and unconscious libidinal strivings and to confine his libidinal expectations within normal bounds, create an insecurity in relation to his fellow men and constitute one of the first and most important conditions for the development of delinquency. Following this point of view, we look for the primary causes of dissocial behaviour in early childhood, where the abnormal libidinal ties are established. The word "delinquency" is an expression used to describe a relationship to people and things which is at variance with what society approves in the individual.

It is not immediately clear from the particular form of the delinquency just what libidinal disturbance in childhood has given rise to the dissocial expression. Until we have a psychoanalytically constructed scheme for the diagnosis of delinquency, we may content ourselves by separating these forms into two groups: (1) border-line neurotic cases with dissocial symptoms, and (2) dissocial cases in which that part of the ego giving rise to the dissocial behaviour shows no trace of neurosis. In the first type, the individual finds himself in an inner conflict because of the nature of his love relationships; a part of his own personality forbids the indulgence of libidinal desires and strivings. The dissocial behaviour results from this conflict. In the second type, the individual finds himself in open conflict with his environment, because the outer world has frustrated his childish libidinal desires.

The differences in the forms of dissocial behaviour are important for many reasons. At present, they are significant to us because of the various ways in which the transference is established in these two types. We know that with a normal child the transference takes place of itself through the kindly efforts of the responsible adult. The teacher in his attitude repeats the situations long familiar to the child, and thereby evokes a parental relationship. He does not maintain this relationship at the same level, but continually deepens it as long as he is the parental substitute.

When a neurotic child with symptoms of delinquency comes into the institution, the tendency to transfer his attitude toward his parents to the persons in authority is immediately noticeable. The worker will adopt the same attitude toward the dissocial child as to the normal child, and bring him into a positive transference, if he acts toward him in such a way as to prevent a repetition with the worker of the situation with the parents which led to the conflict. In psychoanalysis, on the other hand, it is of greatest importance to let this situation repeat itself. In a sense, the worker becomes the father or the mother but still not wholly so; he represents their claims, but in the right moment he must let the dissocial child know that he has insight into his difficulties and that he will not interpret the behaviour in the same way as do the parents. He will respond to the child's feeling of a need for punishment, but he will not completely satisfy it.

He will conduct himself entirely differently in the case of the child who is in open conflict with society. In this instance

he must take the child's part, be in agreement with his behaviour, and in the severest cases even give the child to understand that in his place he would behave just the same way. The guilt feelings found so clearly in the neurotic cases with dissocial behaviour are present in these cases also. These feelings do not arise, however, from the dissocial ego, but have another source.

Why does the educator conduct himself differently in dealing with this second type? These children, too, he must draw into a positive transference to him, but what is applicable and appropriate for a normal or a neurotic child would here achieve the opposite result. Otherwise the worker would bring onto himself all the hate and aggression which the child bears toward society, thus leading the child into a negative instead of a positive transference, and creating a situation in which the child is not amenable to training.

What I have said about psychoanalytic theory is only a bare outline. A much deeper study of the transference is necessary to anyone interested in re-educational work from the psychoanalytic point of view. The practical application of this theory is not easy, since we deal mostly with mixed types. The attitude of the counsellor cannot be as uniform as I have pictured it for you. We do not have enough description of individual forms of dissocial behaviour to enable us to offer detailed instructions about how to deal with them. At present our psychoanalytic knowledge is such that a correct procedure cannot be stated specifically for each and every dissocial individual.

The necessity for bringing the child into a good relation-

ship to his mentor is of prime importance. The worker cannot leave this to chance; he must deliberately achieve it and he must face the fact that no effective work is possible without it. It is important for him to grasp the psychic situation of the dissocial child in the very first contact he makes with him, because only thus can he know what attitude to adopt. There is a further difficulty in that the dissocial child takes pains to hide his real nature; he misrepresents himself and lies. This is to be taken for granted; it should not surprise or upset us. Dissocial children do not come to us of their own free will but are brought to us, very often with the threat, "You'll soon find out what's going to happen to you." Generally parents resort to our help only after every other means, including corporal punishment, has failed. To the child, we are only another form of punishment, an enemy against whom he must be on his guard, not a source of help to him. There is a great difference between this and the psychoanalytic situation, where the patient comes voluntarily for help. To the dissocial child, we are a menace because we represent society, with which he is in conflict. He must protect himself against this terrible danger and be careful what he says in order not to give himself away. It is hard to make some of these delinquent children talk; they remain unresponsive and stubborn. One thing they all have in common; they do not tell the truth. Some lie stupidly, pitifully; others, especially the older ones, show great skill and sophistication. The extremely submissive child, the "dandy," the very jovial, or the exaggeratedly sincere, are especially hard to reach.

This behaviour is so much to be expected that we are not surprised or disarmed by it. The inexperienced teacher or adviser is easily irritated, especially when the lies are transparent, but he must not let the child be aware of this. He must deal with the situation immediately without telling the child that he sees through his behaviour.

There is nothing remarkable in the behaviour of the dissocial; it differs only quantitatively from normal behaviour. We all hide our real selves and use a great deal of psychic energy to mislead our neighbours. We masquerade more or less, according to necessity. Most of us learn in the nursery the necessity of presenting ourselves in accordance with the environmental demands, and thus we consciously or unconsciously build up a shell around ourselves. Anyone who has had experience with young children must have noticed how they immediately begin to dissimulate when a grown-up comes into the room. Most children succeed in behaving in the manner which they think is expected of them. Thus they lessen the danger to themselves and at the same time they are casting the permanent moulds of their mannerisms and their behaviour. How many parents really bother themselves about the inner life of their children? Is this mask a necessity for life? I do not know, but it often seems that the person on whom childhood experiences have forced the cleverest mask is best able to cope with reality. It is not surprising that the dissocial individual masquerades to a greater extent, and more consciously, than the normal. He is only drawing logical deductions from his unfortunate experiences. Why should he be sincere with those people

who represent disagreeable authority? This is an unfair demand!

We must look further into the differences between the situation of social retraining and the analytic situation. The analyst expects to meet in his patient unconscious resistances which prevent him from being honest or make him silent; but the treatment is in vain when the patient lies persistently. Those who work with dissocial children expect to be lied to. To send the child away because he lies is only giving in to him. We must wait and hope to penetrate the mask which covers the real psychic situation. In the institution it does not matter if this is not achieved immediately; it means merely that the establishment of the transference is postponed. In the clinic, however, we must work more quickly. Talking with the patient does not always suffice; we must introduce other remedial measures. Generally we see the delinquent child only a few times; we are forced to take some steps after the first few interviews, to formulate some tentative conception of the difficulty and to establish a positive transference as quickly as possible. This means we must get at least a peep behind the mask. If the child is not put in an institution, he remains in the old situation under the same influences which caused the trouble. In such cases we wish to establish the transference as quickly as possible, to intensify the child's positive feelings for us that are aroused while the child is with us, and to bring them rapidly to such a pitch that they can no longer be easily disturbed by the old influences. To carry on such work successfully presupposes a long experience.

Let us interrupt our theoretical consideration here and see how the worker tries to grasp the situation, to establish the transference and to lift the mask. How others work, I do not know; I can only try to show you what I usually do. A youth comes into the consulting room. At first glance he seems to be the bully type. If we take a stern tone with him, he rejects us immediately and we can never get a transference established. If we are cordial and friendly, he becomes distrustful and rejects us or he takes this for weakness on our part and reacts with increased roughness. If we approach a boy who is intellectually superior with a severe air, he feels himself immediately on sure ground and master of the situation because he meets that attitude often in life. He looks with suspicion on people who are nice to him and is more than ever on his guard. The timid ones, who come in frightened, are easily reduced to tears by a stern demeanour and fall into a state which may be confused with sulkiness. How shall we conduct ourselves in order to establish a good contact with the child? I usually begin with a friendly look or attitude, sometimes I say, "How do you do," or I may only shake hands in silence. I say that there is nothing here to be afraid of, that this is neither a police station nor a court. Sometimes I tell a joke by way of introduction. This gives me an opportunity to size up the situation. We sit down opposite each other. Just how I proceed toward the establishment of the transference in an individual case depends on the impression I have of the youth as he first enters the room.

I consider this first moment of our coming together of

the utmost importance. It is more than a "feeling out" of the situation; it must have the appearance of certainty and sureness and must be put through as quickly as possible because in most cases it forms the foundation for our later relationship. The adolescent does the same thing when he comes into contact with me. He wants to know right away what kind of person he is dealing with. Children usually try to orient themselves quickly, but for the most part they are not clever about it. The adolescent, however, often develops an amazing ability at this. We can observe a momentary gleam in the eye, a hardly perceptible movement of the lips, an involuntary gesture, a "watchful waiting" attitude, although he may be in a state of conflict. The older he is, the harder it is to know whether he will prove stubborn, or openly scornful and resistant. It is especially difficult when he assumes an air of sincerity or unctuous submissiveness. If I accept this as genuine, he immediately feels superior although he may sense that I have the upper hand.

After this sizing up of each other is over, a struggle begins for the mastery of the situation. This may be brief or it may be prolonged, and I must confess that I do not always come out victorious. You must not think of this struggle, however, as a mutual show of conscious strength: There are many unconscious factors in it; we feel rather than know what actually takes place. My attitude from the very beginning lets the boy feel that I have a power over him. He is justified when he senses this as a danger: He does not feel this as an entirely new situation; he has

experienced it often before. I am thus no different from his mother, father, or teacher. If he is a border-line case of neurosis with dissocial features, or a mixed form where the dissocial features are predominant, I remain in the position of the parents but, as our association progresses, I act somewhat differently. If the child is in open conflict and expecting an attack, he is disappointed. I do not ask him what he has done, I do not press him to tell me what has happened, and, in contrast to the police or Juvenile Court, I do not try to pry out of him information which he is unwilling to give. In many cases where I feel the child wants to be questioned so that he can come into opposition to me, I say that he may hold back whatever information he wishes, that I understand that one does not want to tell everything to a person he has met for the first time. When I add that I would do likewise, he is usually willing to fall into conversation with me about something remote from his difficulties but in line with his interests. To describe my attitude from the moment when I let the boy feel some activity in me, I would say that I become progressively passive the more he expects an attack from me. This astonishes him, he feels uncertain, he does not know where he stands. He feels, rather than understands, that I am not an authority with whom he must fight, but an understanding ally. I avoid the word "friend" intentionally since he has no friends; he allies himself with others only because he needs them to achieve some end.

In a natural fashion, I begin to speak of things which interest most boys but are in no way connected with their

dissocial behaviour. Eight out of ten are interested in football. One must know the teams, the best players, the last match, the scores, etc. Less often one finds a contact through books, mostly through adventure and detective stories. It is often easy to talk about movies and in this way make the child lose his caution.

With little girls I talk about fairy tales and games. Often one does not need to go far afield. A remark about the clothes or jewellery they wear may start the ball rolling. I let the half-grown girls tell me about styles in clothes, in haircuts, or the price of toilet articles. I ask the youngest children who are afraid to talk what they like to eat; we discuss desserts and candies. Thus I reach topics which the child carries on in the conversation. Sometimes it is difficult, sometimes easy, but as a rule it is possible to arrive unobtrusively at what I wish to know. In the first interview I usually get the positive transference well enough under way to secure some explanations and to gain some influence.

It is also necessary to get some idea of the child's relationship to the members of the family and other people in the environment. Adolescent children usually answer such questions directly; with younger children this is more difficult. Either they do not answer questions at all or they answer in a way which is worthless for our purpose. We must learn their attitudes through various makeshifts, such as talking about games and stories.

I asked a ten-year-old girl if she liked to read. When she said "Yes," I asked what she liked best.

"Fairy tales."

"Without stopping to think, tell me the name of a fairy tale you like."

"Snow-White."

"What part in it?"

"Where the old witch sold Snow-White the poisoned apple."

"Were there pictures in your book?"

"Yes."

"One of the witch, too?"

"Yes."

"Describe the witch for me, not exactly as she is in the picture, but how you think of her."

She described the witch in detail, her size, her hair, her facial expression, mouth, teeth, and clothes. When I asked where she got these various characteristics, it turned out that they were a collection from people whom the child disliked. This does not always turn out so propitiously. Sometimes the figure described does not fit the disliked people in the environment.

Another little girl told me that she liked to play with dolls. I asked her to describe in detail a doll she would like to have. This again resulted in a composite figure, but this time it had the features of the people she loved.

A twelve-year-old girl once sat opposite me giving no sign through her facial expression, movement, or speech what kind of emotional situation she was in. I asked what colour she liked best.

"Red."

I continued, "When I think of a colour, I always think

of something which has that colour. On what do you see red?"

"On the front car of the grotto-train in the amusement park."

"Now tell me what colour you like least."

"Black."

"Where do you see black?"

➤ "Your shoes and tie."

"But surely something else black occurs to you, too?"

"The hole where the grotto-train goes in is black, too."

What all this may symbolize need not concern us at the moment. We need only consider how the anxiety connected with the ride in the grotto-train has been displaced onto me. She sat in front of me in the same anxious tension that she sat in the train in the amusement park. Perhaps she wanted to ask, "What's coming next?" How do we know this? My shoes and my cravat (which was really grey) had for the child the same colour as the grotto which she did not like. You can see how we get material from which we draw conclusions about the psychological situation of the child. I certainly would not have received a satisfactory answer to a direct question, for even if she had been ready to tell the truth she would not have known how to describe how she felt.

In such a tense situation we can accomplish nothing. I let her tell me about the trip through the grotto. Brightly lighted pictures appeared suddenly in the dark, devils roasting poor souls on hellish fires, dwarfs digging in the bowels of the earth for treasure, and such things. Something

uncanny was always appearing and nothing cheerful or happy ever happened. We went from this to the shooting galleries, from one stand to another, and to the merry-go-round. Then laughing, she told me about a funny fortune teller who could tell what was going to happen to you. When I asked what amusing experiences she could remember, she told of another trip to the amusement park at the time she was confined. With this her mood changed completely, making it possible for the transference to begin. She was now accessible to questions which came to the point. I do not need to mention the fact that the child had no conception of my intention.

Sometimes a deep distrust shows itself. Perhaps I have acted clumsily, perhaps I am dealing with a special type of personality. Then I must resort to some other method. I will report such a case where in a brief time I succeeded not only in overcoming the distrust but also in discovering how it arose.

A sixteen-year-old girl, who had been suspected of being a prostitute because of her behaviour and appearance, had suddenly shown a complete change. Her bold manner had disappeared and in her dress and behaviour she had become a conventional, respectable girl. The social worker wanted to know what had happened. Naturally I did not know, but asked to see the girl. We sat down together and she showed very evident distrust of me. I asked how things were at home but got no answer. Did she like to read? What did she think about? No answer. Would she tell me a dream? Continued silence. Thereupon I laughed and said, "You

think it's dangerous to talk to me. I can understand that, but certainly it can't be dangerous to tell me the story of a movie you've seen." She laughed and started to tell about a circus acrobat who had to dive from a high place through a burning ring. Two girls were in love with him. One of the girls, out of jealousy, cut the wire and made him fall into the fire-ring. The second girl saved him but sacrificed her life to do so. As you can guess from this summary, the story did not tally exactly with what she had seen, but showed her own version of it. I asked her what pleased her best in it and got the answer I expected, namely, that the girl sacrificed herself for her lover. I then asked if she could remember how the hero looked. When she answered in the affirmative, I asked her to describe what he must look like to please her. She described him as a strong, young, slender, dark-haired, clean-shaven man with bright eyes. Now I said, "Tell me, what does Franz look like?" She understood immediately that I meant her boy friend, was a little embarrassed, and then described him to look just like the movie hero. She went on without further effort on my part to say that he was studying chemistry but her mother refused to let her go with him. It was clear that the change in the girl was to be ascribed to her affection for the man. By attacking her distrust, I soon succeeded in overcoming her resistance.

I shall now present a case to show you how the transference can help one to find the deeper-lying causes of dissocial behaviour.

A city school reported that for several months a thirteen-

year-old boy had been absent on Tuesdays and Fridays. The history stated that instead of going to school he went to the horse market, not out of any special interest or because of the tips he may have got for small chores, but only to be in the neighbourhood of the horse-dealers. I do not regard every unusual bit of behaviour as springing from some obscure motive, but try first to find a simple explanation. Since I have always found that, after the transference is established, the child will go to school regularly if I show him that it pleases me, I tried it in this case. We must realize that in many cases no one troubles himself about a child's going to school and that he therefore has no incentive to endure the unpleasantness of school life. In such truancy cases, I have the boy come to me first every week, then every two weeks, and later less often. When he knows that I am interested in all the pleasant and unpleasant happenings in the previous school week, he enters into the school life, and the truancy subsides. With this boy who went to the horse market, the transference was established in the first interview. He came for the next two weeks and reported that he had been in school. The third week the mother came to say that he was going to school regularly, but twice a week he did not come home until late in the evening and she thought from the way he smelled that he must have been in the horse market again.

We see in this case how the transference blocked the outlet for a symptom. The force behind the symptom, however, was still effective and produced a new symptom. The boy could not stay away from school because of his feeling

for me. Now we see that this was not a case of ordinary truancy. Something attracted him to the horses and it was only a coincidence that the time for school and the horses was the same. Through the transference, I could see that we were dealing with a deeper mechanism. One needs psychoanalytic methods in the treatment of such a case. I do not want you to conclude from what I have said that I have any hard and fast rules which enable me to establish the transference in all cases. I only want to protect you from making the crudest mistakes in your practice by giving you some hints from my own experience.

When the child comes to us in the institution, we do not feel obliged to hurry the establishment of the transference. Unless it is a case of neurosis with dissocial features, we are friendly, but show no extraordinary interest in him or his fate and do not force ourselves upon him. We ignore his distrust, his secret or open opposition, his condescension, scorn, or whatever he may show against us. The preparation for the transference he gets from his companions. He usually makes quick contacts with the other boys not because he shows his real self to them or because he needs friendship, but because he must have an audience to whom he can relate an exaggerated account of his adventures, for whom he even improvises new escapades when reality offers nothing impressive enough. According to his custom, he begins to collect information about the details of the organization and the people with whom he comes in contact. Is the counsellor a "good fellow," can he be annoyed or teased, and how? He hears a great deal from the boys who are

about ready to leave the institution. He learns the characteristics of the people on the staff, what the real life of the institution is like. Through this contact with the other boys, he saves himself from the disillusionment which often follows first impressions, and comes in touch with an authority from which he does not need to turn distrustfully away, or which he tolerates, with clenched teeth, until such time as he attains his freedom and attempts a revenge.

If the *milieu* has done its part, the transference begins to develop as the counsellor gradually lets himself be drawn out of his passive role and responds to the newcomer in a neutral but friendly manner. Sometimes he pays more attention to the boy, sometimes less. This fluctuation of interest is not a matter of indifference to the youth. If he is distrustful because the counsellor seems to pay undue attention to him today, tomorrow he will be reassured if no notice is taken of him. He betrays a definite excitement the next day, however, if he thinks the counsellor has observed his unpolished shoes with displeasure. The shoes will be more highly polished or dirtier according to the positive or negative feeling aroused in him, or they will remain the same if no transference is underway. In this case we must wait. What I have said about the shoes is true for a host of other small details which the educator must be quick to recognize and to evaluate. He must sense the ambivalence or changes from affection to distrust in the relationship of his charge to him. There are no general directions for this. We must observe at first-hand how the experienced counsellor directs these waves of feeling and strives deliberately to raise the

crests to a higher point. It is easy to recognize when the positive relationship reaches a climax. Often the feelings of affection break out with such vehemence and strength that the child waits in great tension for his counsellor to appear, does something to attract his attention, runs after him, or finds something to do which brings him into his counsellor's vicinity. The unskilled worker will not recognize the importance of this moment, will be on the defensive and not realize that the affection of the boy can thus be changed into hate. On the contrary, when the hate reaction sets in, he will flatter himself that he has always seen through the hypocrite. If we try to show him how he misinterprets the situation, he turns a deaf ear. He does not understand that he is interpreting as cause what is really effect.

I would like to show you how hard it often is to establish a transference with individuals of the highly narcissistic type—that is, those who are in love with themselves. I cite the case of a seventeen-year-old boy who had gambled and speculated on the stock exchange and had made a lot of money. He had begun at fifteen as a cashier for a street money-changer, who entrusted him with orders on the exchange and made it possible for him to speculate on his own. He accumulated a small fortune for a boy, and made himself independent. He travelled to other countries and imported things which he sold as a bootlegger. This business paid well. He led a free and easy life in night clubs, gambled, and associated with the demi-monde. When his money gave out, he began pawning his mother's clothes. His mother, who had been left a widow after an unhappy mar-

riage, had repeatedly tried to reform the boy. Since she could do nothing with him, she appealed for help to a social agency which brought him to us.

He was one of those boys who give no apparent trouble in an institution. Such youths are polite and obliging, handy and useful in simple office work. They know how to get along with others and soon achieve the role of gang leader. When one works more intensively with them, one learns to see their difficulties. Inwardly demoralized but outwardly as smooth as glass, they offer no point of attack. Their behaviour is a mask, but a very good one. They show no interest in the personnel, and ward off every attempt to establish a real relationship to them. Thus the transference, which must of necessity be very strongly positive if one is to accomplish anything with them educationally, is almost impossible to establish. In the institution they give the impression of being cured very speedily but when at large again they revert to their old behaviour. We must use the greatest caution with them.

Our man of the world knew how to withdraw from every effort to influence him. He was with us several months without any transference having been established in the psychoanalytic sense. We could see, however, that he had been influenced by the environment. I thought it a good idea to get him away from it for a time so that he could compare the discomforts of another environment with those which he enjoyed with us, feeling that this realization might make him accessible to therapy. For this purpose, however, he must not be sent away; he must go of his own accord. I had

to avoid letting him know of my intention. The best way to achieve my purpose was to influence his feeling about the institution. Occasionally, running away from the institution takes place as the result of a sudden emotional state or because of a dream, and then it is hard to prevent. In most cases, however, it requires long preparation and should not escape the sharp eye of the counsellor. Aside from our position against punishment in general in a reform school, we regard it as a complete lack of understanding to punish returned runaways. The running away takes place only when the "outside" is a more attractive place than the "inside." If we can induce the boy to talk to us while he is in this conflict, we can often make the "inside" seem more attractive without mentioning his intention of running away. We can accomplish the opposite effect if we recall the outer world to his memory as more attractive than the life in the institution.

A short talk was sufficient to put our gambler in the right mood. A half hour after he left me, I got the report that he had run away. The first part of my treatment had worked. The counsellor did not know that I had provoked this. I confide such things to the personnel only when I need their co-operation, since it is extremely difficult when one lives among the boys to conceal such things. If such a plan does not succeed, it gives rise to unending differences of opinion. With our young gambler, this successful provocation to run away was a prologue to the establishment of the transference. I expected his return on the second day.

When he had not turned up after a week, I feared that I had made a mistake.

At nine o'clock in the evening ten days later, someone knocked on my door. It was the runaway. He was so exhausted physically and under such psychological tension that I felt I could accomplish much more with him than I had planned. I did not reproach him for going away, as he evidently expected. I only looked at him seriously and said, "How long has it been since you had something to eat?" "Yesterday evening." I took him into the dining room of my apartment where my family was at supper and had a place set for him. This boy, who was usually the complete master of a situation, was so upset that he could not eat. Although I was quite aware of this, I said, "Why don't you eat?" "I can't. Couldn't I eat outside?" "Yes, go into the kitchen." His plate was refilled until he was satisfied. When he had finished eating, it was ten o'clock. I went out and said to him, "It's too late for you to go into your group tonight. You can sleep here." A bed was fixed for him in the hall. I patted him on the head and said good-night to him.

The next morning the transference was in effect. How strongly positive it was I learned from a mistake which I made later. Without realizing it I gave him grounds for jealousy, in that I let one of his comrades check up on his bookkeeping, in which he often made errors. The counsellor to whom he was entrusted succeeded, however, in making good the mistake in this especially difficult case. Soon after

this he was allowed to bring the supplies from the city. He never let himself be led astray after that. He left the institution to become a salesman and for years has had a satisfactory record as a clerk in a business establishment.

The establishment of the transference seldom necessitates such an artifice. Generally the ordinary course of events is enough. I reported this case merely to show you how impossible it is to lay down general rules.