

REMARKS CONCERNING THE DEVELOPMENT OF APPLIED PSYCHOPATHOLOGY.

By ERWIN STRANSKY, M. D.,

Professor of Psychiatry and Neurology, University of Vienna, Austria.

Applied psychopathology, in a larger sense, has been in existence for a long time. In some regards it has been practiced since ancient times, even if subconsciously. But surely it was Freud—and that may be granted by a non-partisan of his doctrine—who, with his school, has always shown the possibility of understanding psychological states and occurrences by psychopathological methods in many relations. The same may also be said by homologism about the related schools of Jung and Adler. But there are also others who have done research work, as for instance, Liepmann, Hughlings Jackson, and Ribot, and in America, last but not least Meyer, Kahn (formerly in Munich), and Schilder, who formerly worked in Vienna. All these, if in different senses, have pointed out, although not always directly, how much normal psychology has to learn from psychopathology. Among living clinicians in German-speaking countries, we may mention especially Bleuler and Kretschmer, to whom we owe much in this sphere.

All this being granted, it remains to say that—as far as I am able to see—applied psychology first found a formulation as a special program of work in 1918. In the *Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Psychiatrie*, Vol. 74, I developed a sort of outlook on this subject in general terms. I pointed out that it was necessary to comprehend and combine the different points of view resulting from the findings of psychopathological researches. It was in this connection that I coined the term “applied psychiatry” (*angewandte Psychiatrie*), in a more precise sense “applied psychopathology” as I prefer to say and to write since then. This term was immediately accepted by Morgenthaler of Berne who advanced the idea later by editing a journal, in collaboration with Jaspers (then replaced by Forel), H. W. Maier, Repond and myself. Among other remarkable papers, this contained the famous treatise of Rorschach on the “Interpretation of Forms” (*Formdeutversuch*).

In the year 1920 a new step was inaugurated by me in this direction. I founded, here in Vienna, the Association for Applied Psychopathology and Psychology, with special aid of Dattner and Roffenstein. This was dedicated to the idea of clarifying the methods by which the results of psychopathological research could be applied to research in other directions; we held scientific lectures and discussions¹ on the one hand, and on the other, we intended to create a sort of seminars and research collaborations between psychopathologists and psychologists, as well as between psychopathologists and research workers in other fields. It was J. Roffenstein who, in contact with me, first tried to realize the ideal of collaboration in seminars. But his early death, caused by a tragic street car disaster, delayed the further development of this undertaking. Soon after, I gave the presidency of the association into the hands of M. Pappenheim, under whose leadership we turned to other tasks. The most important event of this period was the meeting of the first international congress of applied psychopathology and psychology in 1930 at Vienna. This was a most interesting scientific gathering and its impression will remain in the memory of everyone who participated, especially those actively engaged.² It was then that the value of our ideas which had been matured by criticism became apparent to a larger scientific public. In consequence, a permanent committee of Austrian, German Empire and Swiss research workers was formed, including psychopathologists, psychologists and others. As one of the results of the meeting, the committee was to arrange as soon as possible for the next congress. Although we were close to the realization of this aim, European circumstances have prevented it.

Since Pappenheim, whose merits have been mentioned, moved away from Vienna, the leadership of the association has returned

¹ So, for instance, we arranged the first great public discussion in Vienna between psychoanalysts and the school of clinicians, inaugurated by a discourse by R. Allers (edited by myself and Dattner, published by S. Karger, Berlin, 1922). We have also had other discussions, partially published in the *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Neurologie und Psychiatrie* and in the *Wiener Medizinische Wochenschrift*. These all concerned problems of general and applied psychology, religion, sociology, law, ethnological and race-psychological problems, etc.

² The report of this congress was published by S. Karger, Berlin, 1931, edited by H. Hartmann, M. Pappenheim and myself.

to my hands (1934). From this moment I repeated my former efforts to realize a discussion in seminars and to establish collaboration in research. In this, I was supported especially by Mrs. Auguste Flach, one of the most diligent members of the seminars, a pupil of Professor Bühler and also a resident member of the psychiatric clinic of Professor Pötzl. I was also aided by Dr. K. Th. Dussik, a young physician of this clinic who is very studious and talented. The *via regia* for the continuation of the embryonal plans of the late Roffenstein seems to be to knit a new and strong bond between psychopathologists and psychologists. It was a source of happiness for us that, particularly at this time, two important schools of research in Vienna, headed by two important leaders, in consequence of their special motives of research tended to find a stable contact between their schools, and therefore were disposed to give their hands upon the occasion offered by us and to use our association as a common platform to serve for the realization of this collaboration. One of these leaders is Otto Pötzl, the clinical successor of our great and famous master Wagner-Jauregg. Pötzl, with his interest especially in research in brain pathology, has always favored psychological methods. The other leader is Karl Bühler, the head of the Vienna school of psychology, who was always convinced of the necessity of contact with brain pathology and psychopathology, since his special interest, the psychology of language, gives a special disposition to such a contact. We thus succeeded in creating a stable seminar for the discussion and research collaboration between these two schools, under the auspices and through the administration of our association, which at the same time does not neglect its other activities. This collaboration has been existing and active for two years with remarkable success, and is managed with a ridiculously small amount of money. This makes a sort of surrogate for a public seminar, organized on a larger scale, whose realization in our poor Central Europe has been, of course, a Utopia. Such a seminar, in German-speaking countries as perhaps in foreign lands,³ appears to be unique. The subjects for discussion are determined upon at the beginning of each academic year by Professor Pötzl and Professor Bühler with the assistance of myself. Out of the soil of

³ I have been informed that a similar organization has been formed in America within the last few years, on a larger scale, with a public subsidy, but I am not in possession of positive facts; I mention it, in any case.

these collaborations and discussions have already grown a remarkable number of positive results.⁴ These were useful for us psychopathologists, but also thanks to the great number of demonstrations of clinical cases and anatomical preparations—for the psychologists as well: they found a vivid contact with the clinical material, which was quite a new thing for the greater part of them and of special importance for them.⁵

But of course we intend to extend this collaboration by the addition of research workers in strange fields; the most important of these till now, who made a comprehensive and splendidly illustrated report in our seminar, was Professor Oswald Menghin, the famous authority on prehistoric times, who is at present Rector Magnificus of the University of Vienna. He spoke about the art of paleolithic man, in connection with which Dr. Gottfried Engerth, assistant at our clinic, reported on productions of design and sculpture by patients with mental disease. One of the results gained by comparing these two reports was to show that the somewhat uncritical manner of comparing psychotic patients with archaic men as is very often done to-day is far from passing muster. There are many similarities but not quite complete homologies, Perhaps I may be allowed to mention in this connection a report made to the seminar by myself concerning the efficiency curve (*Leistungsfälle*) in special tests on normal, psychopathic and psychotic subjects.⁶ Recently we have benefited by very important reports of Bühler and his pupils and of Pötzl and Hoff ("Zeitraffer-Phänomen") then published in the *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Neurologie und Psychiatrie*. We have also heard important papers by Pötzl and the zoologist Konrad Lorenz and by Hoff and the

⁴ These concern especially the subjects of aphasic, schizophrenic and other pathological disturbances of speech in comparison with the psychological researches on speech, especially those of Professor Bühler and his pupils. The discussions were augmented by personal reports and frequent remarks of the two leaders, Bühler and Pötzl and by those of the more important workers of these two schools (Kauders, Hoff, Stengel, Dussik, as well as Brunswick, Fränkel, Wolf, Sonneck, etc.; the first-mentioned—Kauders—is recently professor of psychiatry and neurology at the University of Graz).

⁵ See the current reports of the seminars in the *Wiener Medizinische Wochenschrift*, 1935. Two reports concerning the year 1934 have been already published.

⁶ Then published in the *Schweizerische Archiv für Neurologie und Psychiatrie*, 1935.

physiologist Fleischmann (concerning different problems of comparing instinct-psychology of men and animals.)

It is not my intention to repeat here what I have said on other occasions on the same subject.⁷ I may be allowed to repeat my conviction that such collaboration with psychopathology is very useful for *nearly all* practical sciences dealing with human activities. It is, of course, not deniable that psychopathology receives stimulation from all sides; but it is certain that it is able to repay this stimulation with compound interest. So, for instance, we have seen that psychopathological researches have greatly aided eugenics, which not only is an object of interest for physicians and hygienists, but also has become a part of political science. We see that these researches are growing beyond their original limits and are aiding all of the practical social sciences in the largest sense. In Germany, it is to be seen now, the merits of psychopathology have been appreciated. Consequently an important influence has been given to physicians and especially to psychopathologists in legislation which has been enacted, such as previously obtained in no other land in the world. The great value of this fact does not seem to be diminished by the criticism which it is necessary to apply to this or that detail of such legislation. In common and scientific fairness, it is the duty of the physician or psychiatrist to recognize this fact and to state that it marks an undeniable progress in the political and cultural history of mankind—even though one, as the writer of these lines, is separated by facts of an anthropological nature (and not only by these) from certain basic ideas now governing Germany's mentality. But fairness and objectivity are, and remain forever a special *point d'honneur* for the research worker and for the physician; these compel him to recognize legitimate merits in men and ideas, even though they inflict, in other matters, pain on himself in some relations. Intensive collaboration with psychopathology could, moreover, be very useful to other branches of study which give less direct occasion than it does for practical knowledge of the mind. Psychopathology could, in fact, be useful to all those sciences which are concerned with human beings and human relations, because no human relations exist even in the economic

⁷ See, for instance, the lines published by myself on the theme "Angewandte Psychopathologie" in the *Psychiatrische-neurologische Wochenschrift*, 1932, No. 16/17.

sphere which do not have a psychological basis, and partially psychopathological aspects. Psychology, however, without psychopathological knowledge is only a torso without its other members.⁸ The forensic sciences have been aware of this fact for some time, and have applied it. Morgenthauer has had the courage to point out directly that, in public affairs and even in political life, psychopathological knowledge and its application is exceedingly useful. Let us, for instance, not neglect to consider, among many other things, the psychology of the masses.

The collaboration existing for some time between psychopathology and the forensic sciences, especially criminology, has demonstrated a fact of prime importance. Whenever the workers in two fields of research meet to form a sort of *entente cordiale*, this generally culminates in a comparison between the end results in each field. The two fields are often by their natures different in regard to their origins as well as the objects of their research, and the cooperation proves much less advantageous when this *entente* is abused for an uncritical meddling concerning their methodologies. The motto must be "separate marching, but a united front." Each field of research must choose its characteristic (*arteigene*) methods and not those which are foreign to it (*artfremd*). The mutual stimulation while being kept as active as possible must be limited by an agreement for mutual benefit, especially as concerns the ends in view and choice of the questions discussed. The comparison and exchange of results then obtained enrich both fields of work. This is a matter which should be understood by doctors of philosophy as well as by doctors of medicine and psychiatrists when they intend to make contact with each other. We understood this, as an important lesson of our seminar in regard to the relations between psychology, psychopathology and the study of prehistoric times. As I pointed out, it is far from being an advantage for those

⁸ It would, of course, be a great mistake to conclude that *all* human relations between human minds are to be understood *schematically* by psychopathological points of view. This was the great nonsense brought about by the so-called pathography. It was in consequence of this that psychopathology with its buried gold had a bad reputation for a long time. Tiling, the ingenious precursor of Kretschmer, had been criticized, legitimately by Cl. Neisser, for he had—allegorically—regarded psychology to be a sort of appendix of psychopathology; such and similar misunderstandings must be avoided.

sciences dealing with human affairs when they neglect contact and collaboration with psychopathology. But it is equally bad if this very necessary collaboration *pour mieux se connaître* should make confusion, since, as a matter of *methodology*,⁹ the occasions when such mutual influence in *methodologics* is useful are, I would not say merely inconvenient, but relatively restricted. This presupposed one must state that psychopathology is a province of medicine which has the most extensive frontiers and relations with other medical fields. For instance, mental hygiene, which came to life in America, is, as Kauders has pointed out, nothing else but a sort of applied psychopathology. In addition, psychopathology is related to widely different branches of science, beginning with theoretical and practical psychology and including history, research in religion and the development of culture, jurisprudence and the study of public and private human relations in the widest sense. The noble rôle of applied psychopathology is that of a mediator between these different fields. Its results thus serve mankind in health as well as in disease.

In closing, may I express my gratitude to Daniel C. Dawes, M. D. Yale University, now attached to the Vienna Psychiatric Clinic, who kindly helped me with my English style, which, of course, is not quite fluent.

⁹ Compare the reports on the two meetings for synthesis in medicine at Marienbad, Dresden-Leipzig, 1933 and 1935, publ. Th. Steinkopff (arrangement by M. Sihle, edited by Th. Brugsch).