

## PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

J. A. Hadfield

THOSE who belong to the organized schools of Psychotherapy derive considerable advantage and comfort from that fact. It affords them the opportunity for combined effort and enables them to pursue definite lines of research to the farthest extent. It takes no little courage, in view of the strength of these schools, to strike out a new line and think for oneself; but one of the characteristics of British psychopathology has always been the number of its independent workers.<sup>1</sup> This has had a profound influence on British thought and in keeping the subject of psychopathology free from prejudice. This freedom from creed has been typically represented in the Institute of Medical Psychology (originally the Tavistock Clinic founded by Dr Crichton Miller) where several of the chapters of this book have been presented as papers for discussion. We therefore welcome this book for the originality of its views and its independence of outlook and commend it to those whose minds are not already made up upon the fundamentals of human conduct, misconduct and neurotic disorders.

A distinctive feature of Dr Suttie's work is its *objective* basis, as distinct from the subjective methods employed by most of us in analysis. "The facts", he says, "are objective and can be checked by several observers, unlike the evidence derived from the analysis of patients." The starting point of his conception of human life and development is the "need-for-companionship", a fact that can be objectively observed in the behaviour manifestations of early childhood and in animals.

Upon this need Dr Suttie founds his conception of love, and his insistence upon this factor, as against the Freudian theory of sex, is fundamental to his system. The

<sup>1</sup> "Some Impressions of British Psychiatry", *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 1025.

neglect of the love element as distinct from sex has always appeared to us to be one of the blind spots of Freudian psychology, and we therefore entirely agree with Dr Suttie's view. Indeed, it is the one we have urged and taught for years. Love is protective as well as sexual, and the sense of security is more important to the child than feelings of pleasure (sensual). This love relationship and not sex is the basis upon which social life is formed; and it is in the disturbances of this love life that we find the origin of the psychoneuroses. Mental development begins in a social relationship, so Dr Suttie's psychology is fundamentally *social*.

The companionship (love) upon which the sense of security depends is *reciprocal*. Giving is as important as getting, though the gift may be no more than an expression of appreciation. Nurture and what Dr Suttie calls "psychological weaning" have, therefore, a double significance in the determination of character traits which cannot be too strongly emphasized. It follows that the part played by the mother is of paramount importance in the development of the social relationships of the child. In emphasizing the active rôle of the mother Dr Suttie is again sharply at variance with Freud, whose system is patriarchal.

Dr Suttie extends this principle of security by responsive companionship to explain *play*, as necessary to give reassurance by mental contact with one's fellows when the maternal services are no longer required, and in doing so presents us with an entirely original theory of play. It is a theory that should be further explained and investigated in the use of play as therapy in the treatment of psychoneurotic disorders in childhood. Most of the disorders in early childhood, in our opinion, originate in a lack of security and love, rather than in incestuous desires; and we welcome the theory of play here offered which suggests that the success of play therapy in the treatment of such childhood disorders may be in part due to the reassurance which comes from social contacts in free play where the child is allowed to do as he likes, and express himself as he likes, without risking the good will and sense of security from the adult.

From love we pass to hate. Hate and aggressiveness are regarded by Dr Suttie as merely the result of thwarted love. His view differs from Freud's in that it assumes only the one primal factor, love, and makes anger and hate the frustration-reactions of love. These views will, no doubt, cause some discussion—nor, if I know Dr Suttie aright, will he be slow to take up the argument! Anger, according to Dr Suttie, differs in the lower organisms from man. In organisms not born in a state of nutritional dependence, anger is merely an aggressive intensification of effort to overcome frustration or danger; whereas, in man it is an intensified demand upon the help of others.

Dr Suttie's views on religion will appeal to many as the most interesting in the book, for here again we find the contrast between his matriarchal point of view and the patriarchal view of Freud. Nor is religion dismissed as a mere illusion, but is regarded as a therapeutic measure designed to deal with the problem of guilt and dependence. The Christian religion has aimed, and often successfully aimed, at the solution of this sense of guilt by its offer of forgiveness, its insistence on the love of God, and upon the love and friendship of man to man as the essence of social life.

These are but a few scattered thoughts on reading this interesting book, but they are sufficient to indicate that it contains a great deal of most suggestive material, and where the reader does not agree with the author he will, nevertheless, have his own thoughts stimulated and his own views clarified by contact with a personality whose opportunity for study upon so wide a correlation of psychology, sociology and anthropology we can only envy.

## THE ORIGINS OF LOVE AND HATE

### INTRODUCTION

IN our anxiety to avoid the intrusion of sentiment into our scientific formulations, have we not gone to the length of excluding it altogether from our field of observation? Is love a fiction, an illusion of a weak mind shrinking from reality, and if so how and why should our minds (regarded as really incapable of loving) ever have created the "idea" of love? Science is concerned with the whole range of experience, but its aim is to formulate this *without* the bias of hope or fear. It must therefore exclude *wish and purpose* (so far as is humanly possible) from the scientific "interest" but not necessarily from the scientific "field". We even draw a distinction in this respect between "pure" and "applied" science, and regard the outlook of the latter as being restricted by reason of its "practical" objectives. Even pure science, however, cannot function without a driving "interest" of which indeed it is an expression, but it is characterized by its aim to abstract this interest from any *particular* wish or purpose, so as to extend and organize knowledge in a way that shall be valid for all. While holding that our formulations can never be final, philosophic science holds also that they should be objective, i.e. uninfluenced by the limitations of the senses and the distortions due to feeling and tradition. If science had any philosophy of life it would be expressed thus: "We should