Chapter 3
Freud's Shibboleth: Psychoanalysis

[Freud]. . . himself, after all, had discovered the roots of scientific investigation in children's sexual curiosity.
Peter Gay[1]

Freud's story begins at the Institute of Ernest Brücke, professor of physiology at the University of Vienna.[2] In Brücke's laboratory, Freud spent 6 years, 1876–1882. There, in addition to being introduced to reductionistic physiology and publishing a few neurological papers, he first met Josef Breuer. He also studied with the phenomenologist, Franz Brentano, and translated some of his works. Freud received the MD in 1881. The years 1882–1893 became his period of clinical training. He published a single experimental study, the effects of cocaine on muscular strength in 1885. He prescribed the drug for his patients, took it frequently himself, and introduced it to his medical colleagues until one of them died of it through the deleterious effect of the cocaine on a preexisting medical condition. But in all this, Freud never mastered the methodology of the experimental laboratory.

Instead, Freud's conception of science became clinically oriented toward the treatment of patients, which proceeded under Theodore Meynert. He had a brief encounter with Charcot, where he audited his lectures and translated two of his works. Here, the history of psychoanalysis as the psychoanalysts tell it, quoting Freud himself, was that Freud always considered himself a student of Charcot and Charcot his master. Charcot, however, returned no such recognition. Freud, in fact, although he identified himself briefly as an ardent Francophile, was probably closer to Bernheim, whose work he also translated. It was the occasion of consulting with Bernheim that brought Freud to Paris in the first place, where he attended the International Congress in 1889 as an auditor.

Meanwhile, Freud continued in private practice with Breuer, who introduced him to the patient, Anna O., neé Bertha Pappenheim. Apparently, by talking out her problems, her symptoms were relieved, a process which she, herself, called "the talking cure." Freud took the case over from Breuer, mulled over the implications of her venting, noted a sexual component, and hatched the idea of repression—that there was a censor at work normally preventing traumatic memories from coming to the surface, probably related to the patient's sexual experiences. These memories could be intentionally liberated by various means, hypnosis being the

E. Taylor, *The Mystery of Personality*, Library of the History of Psychology Theories,
DOI 10.1007/978-0-387-98104-8_3, © Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2009

primary medical vehicle of the era, which at first Freud employed. Freud claimed remarkable success with Anna O., but, it turns out, that was not the complete story.[3]

In 1893 Breuer and Freud published the results of their researches with hysteric patients in the *Neurologische Centralblatt*, in an article entitled "Preliminary Communication on the Nature of Hysterical Phenomena."[4] F. W. H. Myers published a note on it right away in the psychical research literature and in 1894 William James summarized it in the inaugural issue of *Psychological Review*, the first introduction of Freud's work to the American psychological public, according to the later historians of psychoanalysis.[5] Breuer and Freud followed in 1895 with their collaborative work, *Studies in Hysteria*, which reproduced the 1893 "Preliminary Communication," had theoretical sections by Breuer and by Freud, respectively, and presented a collection of their cases, mainly Freud's.

Their main point was to highlight the cathartic cure of hysterical symptoms by the release of repressed memories, usually of sexual origin. While they did cite some of the French literature, their interpretation was decidedly slanted toward German sources. The document hinted at priority for the psychogenic hypothesis—that psychological causes can create physical symptoms—despite the fact that the year before, William James, citing Pierre Janet as the originator of this doctrine, had praised Breuer and Freud for corroborating Janet's "already old findings." The controversy would continue, first Freud and then his followers claiming priority, then Janet asserting himself. But after 1913, the Freudians, just starting to come into their own, finally prevailed, sweeping Janet's claims to the side.

Even before 1895, Freud began to have his own ideas about the origins of the neuroses and started pulling away from Breuer, eventually to develop a system, which sometime after 1896 he called psychoanalysis. What he meant by that can be variously defined. His father had died in 1896 and he went into a period of creative illness, in which he engaged in an intensive process of self-analysis, particularly the analysis of his own dreams, having earlier elaborated on the technique of free association as a replacement for hypnosis. Psychoanalysis, in this sense was the unique product of his own psyche, underived, which he developed into a language and system unique to himself. He did this, he believed, according to the dictates of objective science and believed thereafter that psychoanalysis was also a science, equivalent to but entirely a separate science from neurology, psychology, and psychiatry. Thus began another great controversy, namely whether or not psychoanalysis was a legitimate science, since part of it seemed to be anchored in biology and Darwinism, yet the other part seemed wholly and idiosyncratically confined to Freud's own psyche and there never has been a way to tell which was which.[6]

During this time, Freud wrote but did not publish his "Project for a Scientific Psychology" (1895).[7] In it, he attempted to move from a neurologically based understanding of mental events to a theory of psychogenesis in which he conceptualized the effects of unconscious conflicts arising from the defenses of the ego. The unpublished document was preserved by his new collaborator, Wilhelm Fleiss, an eye, ear, nose, and throat man who introduced Freud to the ideas of the inherent bisexuality of all human beings and the notion that nasal tissue was erectile in nature. He also

became his sounding board, at least until Freud began to gather a small group of auditors around him after 1904.

Much has been made of "The Project," most of it erroneous or based on false assumptions, mostly because writers focus exclusively on Freud and have no clue about the previous contextual history of the psychogenic hypotheses. Suffice it to say that in "The Project," Freud had attempted to correlate mind states with brain states by subjecting psychogenesis to a critical interpretation according to the current state of neurophysiology at the time. It was a brilliant move, but it failed utterly, since not that much was actually known about the neurophysiology and neurochemistry of the brain and nervous system. He abandoned "The Project" precisely because neurophysiology had yet to catch up to what was rapidly becoming known clinically about the influence of the mind upon the body, which far outstripped scientific corroboration in the laboratory or by autopsy, yet showed decisive psychological effects. He was forced to reassert the scientific basis of psychoanalysis, yet return to the method of symbolism, which he had been employing to uncover the unconscious meaning of the person's internal images presented in dreams as well as free associations.

It was not until 1899, or rather 1900, that psychoanalysis first became public, with publication in German of Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams*.[8] In it, Freud first reviewed the prevailing scientific literature on dreams, before turning to an elucidation of his method for interpreting them, with examples. He finished off with a general psychology of the dream process.

Dreams, he declared, were the royal road to the unconscious. The dream, Freud said, is made up of unfinished or unresolved thoughts generated during the day, which fuse in the dream world with memories derived from early childhood. These dream images are thrown together through association and contiguity, which the dreamer feels compelled to fit into the dream upon awakening as if actually related; hence, the story line with fantastic elements juxtaposed onto one another.

The book's thesis is that a wish and its fulfillment lay behind every dream but in disguised form. Every dream is a compromise between the wish and the resistance to its expression. He differentiated secondary from primary process thinking in this regard—what the overt dream was as told by the dreamer, as opposed to its real underlying meaning, which was buried in the dreamer's unconscious and could be called forth by the new method of free association. In this regard, Freud declared dreams and psychoneurotic symptoms as similar, both having their origin in earliest infancy.

This can be demonstrated by an examination of the Oedipal phase of the child's development, which basically determined by age 5 or 6 the nature of the child's adjustment to his parents, his or her sexual orientation, and the extent to which he would grow up to become either a maladjusted neurotic plagued by distorted sexual fantasies and their concomitant behaviors or a functioning, relatively adjusted member of society, able to have stable, healthy human relationships.

The theory was based on the play *Oedipus Rex* by Sophocles, where the hero, unbeknownst to himself, grows up to slay his father and marry his own mother. Freud believed that at a certain early moment in the life of the child, the boy devel-

ops the urge to sleep with his mother and destroy the father, so he can take his place in the marital bed. In the normally adjusted family, the father rises to the occasion and reasserts his place as the head of the family, with whom the boy, fearing castration, simultaneously acquiesces to and identifies with. In that new position, he has found his rightful place as heir to the father, but destined to find a mate who will probably resemble his mother, if he cannot actually have his mother as the object of his infantile yearning.

Distortions of this process, however, are unending. If the father refuses or cannot assert himself, for instance, the son triumphs and identifies instead with the mother, thus emasculating the father. This distorts the boy's future quest for a mate, and hence a stable family, as well as proper same-sex identification with his own future children, since symbolically, at that tender age, he takes on his own mother as an absolute object of sexual identification and never achieves same-sex identification through the father with other males that would allow him properly to enter the world of masculinity. At the same time, the father may even triumph, but the child never gets over the primitive wish to kill him. To the extent that he unsuccessfully represses, then sublimates this wish, their relationship becomes combative, which then generalizes to other males, and so on. The key to understanding the Oedipus myth, Freud suggested, was that all relationships stem from adjustment with the parents, especially during this crucial early period, and that maladjustments in this relationship may prefigure in dreams and neurotic symptoms in behavior and one's relationships for the rest of the person's life.

"Irma's Injection" was Freud's central specimen dream. Irma had been one of Freud's patients, a woman who was also quite involved with Freud and his family. Doctor and patient had reached a temporary impasse because while her hysterical symptoms had disappeared, her somatic ones persisted. Freud felt this was because she would not accept his interpretation, partly because of her own resistances and partly due to the weakening of Freud's authority because of his overinvolvement with the patient's emotional life. They agreed to suspend analysis for the summer.

Later Freud encountered a close colleague who had just spent time with the woman and her family and the colleague indicated she was better but not quite well, to which Freud found he had an annoying reaction. That night he wrote up the case and upon going to sleep had a dream. Irma came into a large hall where guests were being greeted and Freud pulled her aside and reproached her for not following his advice on how to rid herself of the somatic symptoms. She complained instead of excruciating pains in her throat and abdomen. It occurred to Freud that possibly he had missed something organic. Various physicians suddenly appeared in the dream and examined her again, suggesting a real infection, possibly from a dirty needle, Freud thought, that one of them had used to give her an injection. There were more details to the dream, on which Freud then free associated in his text to demonstrate that the dream was an unfinished thought in waking life mixed up with his own personal concerns from his past.

But the outcome in waking life was quite different. Her somatic symptoms, which had persisted after Freud had cured the hysteria, were due not to her refusal to accept Freud's explanation of the psychogenic and sexual origin of her symptoms, as he

had thought, but to gauze that Fleiss had accidentally left in her nasal cavity from a recent minor operation. The gauze, it turned out, had caused an actual infection.

The dream of Irma's injection was a centerpiece of the book. Freud used it as a means to show the reader the associations linked to each phase of the dream symbols, revealing the structure of the mind as stratified into levels—what was conscious, what was preconscious, and what was unconscious. He linked many parts to incomplete thought chains of the previous, but immediate period related to a recent illness of his own wife, to the injection associated with von Fleischl-Marxow's death from cocaine, and his guilt over that episode, and these events in turn revealed the extent to which the dream was related to the fulfillment of outcomes he had wished for in his own life.

Ernest Jones noted in his biography of Freud a half century later that 600 copies of *The Interpretation of Dreams* were printed and it took 8 years to sell them. Some 123 copies sold in the first 6 weeks and then 228 in the next 2 years. After 18 months Freud lamented that no reviews had yet appeared in any scientific periodical, although there had been a few in popular magazines here and there.[9] It is also true, however, that, later, the work went into numerous editions between 1913 and 1938, had been translated into eight languages, and remains in print today.

Eventually, when the book was finally reviewed, it was variously hailed as both good and evil. When they learned about it, Puritans, Calvinists, Catholics, and fundamentalists everywhere were shocked at the idea that children would have such thoughts about their parents, let alone thoughts about sexuality at all at that young age. Most of them probably did not even read the book. Bleuler at the Burghölzli in Zurich read it as soon as it was published and Jung was exposed to it not long after. Both began to incorporate Freud's theories into their treatment of the insane there at the asylum right away. Freud's followers declared that it had answered the riddle of the sphinx—what is man?—and unlocked the door to the secrets of our humanity.

The Interpretation of Dreams also marked the end of Freud's communications with Fleiss. He was soon replaced in 1902 by a young coterie of admirers who gathered around Freud to discuss psychoanalysis, called the Wednesday Psychological Society, a circle of younger men around a central father figure. It would later develop into the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society. Alfred Adler, Wilhelm Stekel, Max Kahane, and Rudolf Reiter were among the first. By 1906 there were 17 members, including Paul Federn, Isadore Sadger, Max Graf, Victor Tausk, David Bach, Eduard Hitschmann, Hugo Heller, and Fritz Wittels. Hans Sachs joined in 1910. Otto Rank was also a member. Jung had joined in 1907, Jones after the Clark Conference in 1909. As well, Karl Abraham, Max Eitingon, Sandor Ferenczi, A. A. Brill, Ludwig Binswanger, Oskar Pfister, and Otto Gross appeared at different times; it is interesting to note that these men all came to Freud through the Burghölzli. At the same time, according to the prevailing legend, Wilhelm Stekel was the first to "defect," then Adler, then Jung, and others.

We may conjecture at this point on the tremendous impact this work must have had on those who became so devoted to Freud's theories that many would commit their careers to the defense of psychoanalysis and write books that may have been polemic here and there but always essentially in tune with Freud's original

presuppositions about the unconscious. Enthralled, entranced, fascinated, absorbed into the spell of Freud's own unconscious are the terms that come to mind, yet all the while maintaining that psychoanalysis was a science. Meanwhile, to those outside the bubble, it all looked like a cult.

Despite the lack of reviews, Freud kept on writing. In 1900 he began treating the case of Dora, which he published as a "Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria."[10] Examining the subsequent impact of Freud's ideas on culture at large, Eli Zaretsky maintains that with Dora, Freud moved from a discussion of men versus women to a condition of ambivalence about gender opposites as they presented themselves in the unconscious.[11] The effect this had on Freud's theory was that gender was no longer confined merely to sexuality as an object choice but now had to do more with the larger sphere of masculinity and femininity in personality development. It was then not a great stretch in the way his work was subsequently interpreted to extend these considerations to the choice of one's lifestyle in the world to the so-called homosexual way of life. Dora was a case in point.

Dora was an 18-year-old Jewish student and ardent feminist who had sworn off marriage at the time and had been suffering from a recurrent depression, a condition from age 8, for which she had received at one point electrotherapeutic treatments, but to no avail. Her father, a former patient of Freud's who had been treated for both tuberculosis and syphilis, brought her to be treated for hysteric symptoms, including a persistent cough. As a young girl, the father had encouraged the daughter to engage in a relationship with a much older man, so the father could involve himself with the man's wife, whom the daughter was actually more attracted to herself. Although the analysis was prematurely terminated after a short time, Freud was able to divine that the origin of the girl's persistent cough was a fixed idea she had on the experience of oral sex her father was having with the older man's wife, a nongenital and generalized sexual excitement that the girl was acting out through her own mouth. The girl was also physically attracted to both the man and his wife, a condition of ambivalence, since she could not choose one over the other, which Freud labeled bisexuality.[12]

The solution to her hysterical symptoms, Freud concluded, was not that she could not choose between them; the conflict arose from not choosing. The case pointed to other examples of sexual ambivalence as a source of hysteric symptoms and also an explanation for the approach-avoidance behavior at the beginning of normal sexual encounters. It also ended Freud's adherence to a black-and-white doctrine of men versus women and the penchant to define these categories by a set of fixed traits. Masculinity and femininity became, rather, a range of possibilities within individual identity. A bundle of contradictions himself, Freud continued to emphasize male development in the Oedipus complex in his writings, however, only addressing slightly the Electra complex (the Oedipus myth, but in women) and did not write directly on the subject of female sexuality until the 1920s.

After *The Interpretation of Dreams* in 1900, Freud also followed in quick succession with *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* (1901), *Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious* (1905a), and *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* (1905b).[13] The first two applied Freud's theories to slips of the tongue, momentarily forgotten

names, and the kinds of phenomena seen in normal everyday waking life. Our outward behavior, over which we believe we have so much control, is actually dominated by vast unconscious forces; the normal and the pathological are on a continuum and not that far apart; humor serves the same function as sexual foreplay.

Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality was all about sex and the libido, what was at the core of our psychic energy. The first essay reviewed the perversions, the second childhood sexuality, and the third what happens at puberty. Freud separated first the object from the aim. Most men and women prefer each other, some prefer the same sex, and others prefer animals and objects. The perversions are biological experiments leading through evolution to the normal sex act. Therefore, they are universal dispositions of the sexual instinct in all human beings, which can be seen in childhood and later, in the face of normal adult sexual development, with its single aim of reproduction. The perversions show themselves in the form of developmental inhibition and sexual infantilism.

The child first awakens to the erotogenic zones: the mouth, the anus, and the reproductive organs. In the child, the period of ages 2–5 is one of efflorescence, going through oral, anal, and genital phases. The child's behavior is first characterized by autoeroticism, but then followed by a period of latency, in which direct sexual experience is held off as the sexual instinct is distributed throughout patterns of relationships with others and the establishment of personal habits related to repression and reaction formation which mold the later personality. Disruption at this phase, such as through seduction, can make the child further uneducable, sexually and emotionally, in adult life. Otherwise, in normal development, pleasure, excitement, and self-stimulation give way to the actual discharge of sexual products, which then culminate in a revival of adjustments made during the previous Oedipus phase coming forth at the beginning of adolescence, where there is the awakening of strong distinctions made between the genders. This, because of the incest taboo, in turn, leads to the search for a mate outside the family, courtship, marriage, reproduction, and a repetition of the Oedipus cycle with the new offspring.

Fixation can occur at any point along the way and be incorporated into personality makeup accordingly. Repression, the automatic blocking out of contents from conscious awareness, and sublimation, the diversion of sexual energy into more socially acceptable channels, are both processes at work in psychopathy, bringing about a regression to previous, earlier phases of personality development. At the same time, incomplete adaptation, particularly at the crucial developmental periods as the child passes through the oral, anal, genital, and then phallic phases, can produce fixation of parts of personality at that stage, while other parts of personality continue to develop. The adult then exhibits oral fixations, or possibly becomes anal retentive, or its opposite, or exhibits genital compulsions, where one's sexual organs can become the center of one's personality, as in the permanent display of breast implants or the flaunting of the size of one's reproductive apparatus.

Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality was a seminal text in Freud's corpus, second only to *The Interpretation of Dreams* as far as the importance he gave to it. Successful navigation of these developmental phases was always only approximate, however, so every adult struggles in some way with neurotic symptoms from the

past. One could call it the normal neurosis, as far as Freud's budding conception of personality was concerned. The only problem was that Freud spent the first part of his career as a psychoanalyst talking about the unconscious and psychopathology and only in the second part did he begin to broach a psychology of the ego and therefore of the normal personality. As Otto Fenichel later pointed out in 1946, psychoanalytic characterology remained in its infant stage until only much later, when enough had been written about the normal personality to even broach such an all-encompassing system of classification.[14] But the way in which Freud's theories have often been presented suggests that such a characterology was already in place from an early date, when it was not.

Freud did elaborate on some aspects of the psychosexual stages and character development in 1908 in a paper on anal eroticism.[15] He had already noted in his clinical practice that excrement, money, and obsessional neuroses were somehow linked. He came to understand that some types of patients experienced pleasure at retaining their feces and display this through traits of orderliness, stinginess, and obstinacy.[16] One of his more distinguished biographers, Peter Gay, notes that character in psychoanalytic theory meant a stable configuration of traits. But the problem is that this refers to a cluster of fixations, not something inherent and unchanging in the individual. Personality in this sense is the organization of inner conflicts, not their resolution. They are for Freud the building blocks of the ego, however.

Freud expanded this idea much farther in a paper a few years later on "Formulation of the Two Principles of Mental Functioning." It was all about primary and secondary process thinking. Primary process thinking is controlled by the pleasure principle, largely under the sway of the unconscious. Development proceeds by its modulation through the secondary process, the reality principle. The many combinations of these forces shape the kind of person we become in each individual case as the secondary process becomes stronger through maturation and socialization. The two principles continue to co-exist, often in conflict, however.

Meanwhile, the psychoanalytic movement was going through its own growing pains. One example is the claim that they were unfairly persecuted or opposed when in fact that was not always the case. Contradicting this view, Ellenberger notes that in 1907 the First International Congress of Psychiatry and Neurology was held in Amsterdam, September 2–7. Numerous dynamic theories were critiqued,[17] Freud's included, but it was not a major attack as the Freudians had claimed. Most were more interested in a discussion of their own theories, not psychoanalysis. There, Janet gave the main report at the session on theories of hysteria. Subconscious fixed ideas and a narrowing of the field of consciousness resulting from mental dissociation was his model. He thought hysteria belonged to a wider group of depressions. Aschaffenburg said Freud and Jung focused so much on sexuality that their patients naturally did the same, not the other way around. Jung gave Janet credit for the theoretical foundation of psychoanalysis. Dupré, Auguste Marie, and Sollier gave their own theories. Janet gave Breuer and Freud credit for their novel cases, but believed everyone knew there was an occasional sexual component, except these few cases were not the basis for an iron-clad theory of sexual origin. At one point, Janet was heard to call psychoanalysis a "mauvaise plaisanterie," or "practical joke."[18]

DuBois, van Renterghem, and others also presented. At the time, Ernest Jones characterized the discussion as one of violent polemics, which Ellenberger later disputed.

By 1908, psychotherapeutics was flourishing throughout Europe, the Netherlands, Britain, and the United States. The most noted psychotherapist internationally was not Bernheim, or Freud, but Paul DuBois of Bern, Switzerland. His rational theory of moral reasoning stressed self-knowledge and a spiritual component of personality and drew widespread attention. Meanwhile, an informal gathering at Salzburg, Austria, April 26, drew 42 participants and was later dubbed the first International Congress of Psychoanalysis. Six papers were presented, one by Freud. Freud and Bleuler also launched a new journal devoted to psychoanalysis, with Jung as editor. In the United States, the Emmanuel Movement, blending Protestant Christianity with psychotherapy, was in full swing. William Parker, a former student of William James, even launched a home study course on psychotherapy.

In 1909, the Sixth International Congress of Psychology was held in Geneva, chaired by Claparède, Piaget's teacher. The main theme was the subconscious. The keynote address was given by Janet.[19] A conference on psychotherapeutics was also held that same year at New Haven, Connecticut, sponsored by the American Therapeutic Society, primarily a group of physicians who normally dealt only with physical medicine. It was chaired by Frederick Henry Gerrish, a physician from Maine interested in the new work on the subconscious. The speakers, including James Jackson Putnam, Morton Prince, and Tom Williams, more accurately represented the state of psychotherapy at the time as international, eclectic, and interdisciplinary. Only Ernest Jones, even though he was not yet a member of Freud's circle, rang a note of elitist specialization, saying one can only do psychotherapy, by which he exclusively referred to Freud and meant psychoanalysis, after long training.

So, many professionals were not opposed to psychoanalysis; they simply did not know of or were ignoring it. But then in September 1909, the Twentieth Anniversary conference commemorating the founding of Clark University was held in Worcester, Massachusetts. Herbert Spencer Jennings was the featured speaker; Adolf Meyer spoke on the psychotherapeutic treatment of schizophrenia. A special session was also held where Freud and Jung spoke and were awarded honorary doctorates. Freud's lecture, however, was not the most important event of the congress. Interviews that appeared in the New York and Boston newspapers had been prearranged by Hall. In other words, the reporters did not flock to the conference to report on Freud. Only a handful of invited guests knew who he was, and his talks to a wide audience would have been of limited interest. They would not have been readily comprehended except by college-educated professionals, since he delivered them in German. He opened by saying how the event was so meaningful to him, since this was the "first official recognition" of his work, a point Ellenberger thought odd, since his ideas had been adopted by Eugen Bleuler at the Burghölzli 10 years earlier.

Psychoanalytic historians usually present the Clark Conference as the first international recognition of the movement. There was an amusing episode to report in this regard. After the conference was over, Ernest Jones reported that William James

came up to him and putting his arm around his shoulder said, "The future of psychology belongs to your work." Afterward, the psychoanalysts always believed that James was referring to psychoanalysis as the future of psychology, when James had actually said the same thing to F. W. H. Myers and the psychical researchers and also to Anagarika Dharmapala and the Buddhist meditators. Nevertheless, later psychologists, embellishing even further on Jones, got it turned around and reported that James had uttered those words not to Jones, but to Freud himself.[20]

So-Called Defectors, the First Turn Toward Ego Psychology and the Death Instinct

After the Clark Conference, an entirely new set of circumstances arose for Freud, especially around increased marginalization by the professions, while at the same time the exaggerated absorption of his ideas into popular culture occurred. On the one hand, everything Freud had written the Russians had translated between 1909 and 1914.[21] On the other, this was the era of a psychoanalytic hiatus in the United States as far as psychology and psychiatry were concerned, as only a handful of professionals followed Freud's ideas. Behaviorism had recently risen to dominate academic psychology, followed by mental testing, while in academic, scientific psychiatry, spectacular advances in brain neurophysiology and the beginning of major advances in psychopharmacology dominated. Personality was conceived as the study of a person's moral character. Clinical psychiatry was considered Meyerian, led by the students of Adolf Meyer who had passed through Johns Hopkins. At the same time, Benjamin Beit-Hallami maintains that the so-called religious psychotherapies, which Freud had decried in one of his newspaper interviews at the Clark Conference, were the primary cultural forms, along with the artists and writers that preserved psychoanalysis until the founding of the psychoanalytic institutes in the 1920s.

During this period Freud was continually bedeviled by political instability within his own circle that took valuable time away from his writing. Eventually, however, it would also begin to dictate what he was writing about.

Psychoanalysis and archeology Freud naturally related since both excavate successive layers below the surface, an idea upon which *Totem and Taboo* was meant to elaborate. At the same time, however, Freud intended it, he told Abraham, to cut off from psychoanalysis everything that was "Aryan-religious" in his attempt to outdo Jung, who had just left the fold.[22] *Totem and Taboo* (1912–1913)[23] was made up of four interrelated essays: The first was on the horror of incest, from primitive religions to modern culture; the second on the infantile return to totemism in the neuroses; the third on the relation of animism to magical thinking; and the fourth linked totemism to the incest taboo by identifying it with the father and therefore the Oedipus complex. Men are related to their gods as they are to their fathers. Freud considered the work an analytic reconstruction, not a mere guess. His analysis made it clear that civilized consciousness passes through three stages of thought: the animistic, the religious, and the scientific.

In 1914, Freud produced his controversial paper "On Narcissism."[24] It was controversial because it was partly an answer to both Adler and Jung, who had left Freud's circle by then, so it was reactive to begin with. Second, it marked a major shift in emphasis from a focus on the Id to the beginning of a psychology of the ego. Its very production caused Freud headaches and intestinal disturbance. Narcissism meant the infatuation of the person with himself, specifically with his own genital organs. Freud now maintained it was a necessary stage between autoeroticism and normal object love. Narcissism can be a neurotic perversion but it is also a characteristic of schizophrenics who have withdrawn from reality. It can also be found in children as well as primitive cultures. In this sense, it is not a perversion but, as Freud said, "the libidinal complement to the egotism of the self-preservation drive."[25] Parents show self-love when they see their own traits in their children. Lovers express it in how they present themselves to their partners or try to make them over into beings like themselves. Vanity would be a word to cover such types in the general population, possibly more prone in women than men, Freud had hinted. It can even become an ego ideal, when socialization demands attention away from self toward others, which proceeds by the attempt to find one's own traits in others. Its pathological manifestation is the delusion of being watched, while in the normal ego ideal it is associated with superego functioning, which is the guardian of the ego ideal. Its difficulty for orthodox psychoanalysts was that it implicated sexual instincts with the ego that classically had been normally confined to the unconscious.

Also in 1914, Freud must have sensed the end of an era and determined it was time to codify it by penning his version of events. He did so with his essay "On the History of the Psycho-analytic Movement" (1914b).[26] It was also a way to characterize Adler and Jung so there would be no mistake about their newly diminished role in the development of psychoanalysis.

In the early 1920s, Freud produced "Beyond the Pleasure Principle" (1920a) on eros and the death instinct, "Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego" (1921), and "The Ego and the Id" (1923).[27] Peter Gay describes these as Freud's structural essays—the writings on metapsychology. The stress was now on aggression and death.

"Beyond the Pleasure Principle" announced that in addition to *eros*, the entangling of sex and love in the creation of culture, there was *thanatos*, the death instinct. World War I had convinced Freud that evil was indeed a part of basic human nature in both men and women, for which his theory had also to account. The mind itself was a battlefield between *eros* and *thanatos*. While all mental events conspire toward the pleasure principle, the pleasure principle is also modulated by the reality principle. But then there is the incessant reenacting of situations that are disturbing to us, the compulsion to repeat a painful experience, the repetition of the same calamity in different situations over and over. These were but smaller manifestation of the larger ones, such as the urge to make war, a fascination with the dark side, even a cultivation of pain. It was, Freud came to assess, a drive toward annihilation, in contrast to the drive toward creation, which had guided his theories up to that time. He labeled it the death instinct.

"Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego" was Freud's psychoanalytic interpretation on the social psychology of the masses and the relation of the individual to the community. His thesis was that in every aspect of one's interior life, the other exists as object, ideal, helper, or adversary, and while the laws of the individual and the laws of the crowd appear at first as totally different systems, from a psychoanalytic viewpoint they are actually one and the same. True, groups have laws of their own. They are more intolerant, irrational, immoral, heartless, and inhibited than the individual. But they add nothing to our knowledge of psychology that cannot already be found in the individual except in an exaggerated state.[28] Their power and consequently cohesiveness were held together by diffused sexual emotions, the same passions that unite families. But particularly in more anonymous groups, they tend to be more neutral as mere emotional attachments. Nevertheless, erotic bonds are what bind people in a group in terms of loyalty to other members and fealty to whoever is the leader. As one feels more emotionally secure, one's guard drops to the collectively lowest common denominator, and personal inhibitions are relaxed. The power of the group dissipates as these bonds are weakened; panic being a sign of increased but unconscious group cohesion, not the lack of it.[29] Such sublimated erotic alliances account for strong group cohesion and also account for the repressed hatred for outsiders that develops with increased group identification. Where love is the self-consciously avowed motive, hatred is often the repressed feeling sequestered in the unconscious.

But psychologists interpreting psychoanalysis like to point to the doctrine of the id, ego, and superego as Freud's conception of the basic structure of personality. He did not articulate this model until the publication of *The Ego and the Id*, although parts of it lay strewn throughout his works before then.[30] In this work, Freud attempted to weave his model of consciousness; that is, waking consciousness (what he abbreviated as cns), the preconscious (pcs), and the unconscious proper (ucs), with first, the ego and the id, and then the superego. The ego, which grew out of the id, was the executive function, extending libido out into the world to cathect with objects. It operated according to the reality principle—that pain and compromise are sometimes necessary to express the longings of the id. The id, which represents the unconscious proper, is the vast interior inner world of the most basic and primitive instincts, whose material is all completely repressed. It operates unrestrictedly as the pleasure principle and presents its wishes to the ego as demands for immediate gratification, which the ego has to modulate.

The superego is an outgrowth of the ego, which has introjected social standards of right and wrong and developed a repertoire of emotions around shame, guilt, and remorse that serve the purposes of reestablishing harmonious adjustment with the environment. The development of the superego is the appearance of conscience, but also much more, as it expresses the entire repertoire of the person's beliefs and values. These three systems play off on one another depending on the person's level of libido, biological endowment, and past history.[31]

The Future of an Illusion (1927a)[32] was an attempt to protect psychoanalysis from the priests. Freud professed that he had been a devout atheist all his life and this was his chance to link his ideas about personal religion and neurosis under one

heading. Both obsessives and religious types performed rituals, both practice renunciation, and both are used to protect from and ward off the vicissitudes of the world. His conclusion was that religion was a universal obsessional neurosis as neurosis was a religion.[33] Hence, he believed, religion originates in the drives, which manifest themselves particularly in the appetites, vicissitudes, and helplessness of early childhood. In this context, we become what our parents were. We usually follow their gods and those of the clan and the tribe. But this does not change the circumstance that religion is based not on reality but on a wish for the way things ought to be. But they remain wishes, nonetheless, based on our earliest childhood illusions.

Civilization and Its Discontents,[34] which appeared in 1930, carried on from previous discussions; Freud maintained that we are inherently dissatisfied with culture. We resist it because it suppresses our most instinctual urges, at the same time that it acts as a panacea from the larger problems of destruction by natural forces, unfulfilled relationships, and our inevitable physical decline. In it, we feed the senses as substitute gratification and intoxicate ourselves into insensitivity. Religion he gave as a primary example. Work was another. Neither leads to happiness, however, or an answer to the big questions. For this, we hate civilization.

These works he saw as a reflection of dynamic tensions between the id, ego, and superego within the individual except now played out on a wider stage. Collectively they were attempts to move psychoanalysis more into the sphere of normal ego development and then to demonstrate the efficacy of psychoanalytic concepts for understanding culture at large. They were also a means to keep Freud occupied in the midst of continued political turmoil within his own ranks.

In 1923, the young Wilhelm Reich had published *The Impulsive Character*, later expanded into *Character Analysis.*[35] Reich linked the different forms of resistance to the stages of infantile sexuality. Ferenczi and Rank answered with their jointly authored *Development of Psychoanalysis* (1924), presenting the heretical idea that the relationship in therapy, not insight alone, was the locus of cure.[36] The same year, Rank also published *The Trauma of Birth*.[37] For it, he was ejected from the inner circle. His first heresy was that the bond between the mother and the child was preeminent, whereas Freud had laid greater emphasis on the father. Second, the root of neurosis was not the sex drive, but the trauma of birth, that is, the more existential attempt to overcome the trauma of existence between two dark voids, the one of birth and the one of death. In between, we are faced simultaneously with meaningless existence and the urge to create ourselves. Failure to face this dilemma, which is the unending human condition, throws the person into a neurosis because they have given up the process of creation in despair. The neurotic is essentially, Rank would later say, a failed artist.

Freud answered Rank in 1924 with a long letter that circulated in the psychoanalytic community describing their similarities and differences.[38] Rank himself was on a triumphant tour of the United States.[39] He attempted to defend himself against Freud's criticisms, recanted his own theory, was forgiven by Freud, but then recanted his recantation. He left for Paris in 1926, severing all ties to the secret committee that had formed around Freud when Jung had defected in 1912. By 1930, he said, he no longer called himself a psychoanalyst.

Rank would go on to develop these ideas and to place the locus of cure in the therapeutic relationship itself, not, as Freud maintained, on the therapist's interpretation of the patient's Oedipal adjustments, which were believed to lead to a lifting of repression through insight. For Freud, the therapist was the uninvolved scientist. For Rank, he was there to affirm the creative life of the patient through the therapeutic relationship. Rank's psychology focused more on the therapist and the phenomenology of what went on between patient and therapist. He identified, for instance, the Promethean complex. Prometheus was punished because he was the mortal who had stolen fire from the Gods, thus giving men their power, so that they believed that they were gods. The Prometheus complex was what beset parents in their role to shape the ego of the child and to make the offspring like themselves. It is also the indifferent attitude of the Freudian therapist, who remolds the patient in the direction of his interpretations. Overcoming this complex allows the inferior in the relationship to achieve independence and growth.

Growth in this sense, however, for Rank, in the end meant transcendence and individuation, not merely adjustment to external social norms. The patient needed to affirm their need for love and belongingness, which they attained in successful therapy, but at the same time, they needed to end therapy, break away, and be reborn into their own person. Life was this constant balance between belonging and breaking away, love and will, union with others in love and separation through growth and individuation, until the final rebirth back into the void at death.

The more sinister development in 1924, however, was that in April; Freud was diagnosed with nasal cancer. Eventually, he had to be fitted for a painful prosthesis in order to separate the nasal and mouth cavities, which had to be removed each night. He also continued to smoke 20 cigars a day up to the time he died 16 years later, in 1939. Nevertheless, after the diagnosis, he continued to work, to write, and to see patients. But the immediate group of his followers had dispersed. Rank was soon gone. Abraham died in 1925. Eitingon went to Palestine, and Sachs drifted to the periphery and eventually went to the United States. The committee itself was dissolved in 1924. A year later, it was briefly taken over by Anna Freud, Lou Andreas Salomé, Marie Bonaparte, and Loe Kann.[40] But this reconstituted committee dissolved by 1926. The committee, which was to have been Freud's successor, was then effectively replaced by the much larger and more diffuse international movement. This led to the creation of a network of institutes that operated outside the universities, but that become nonetheless more heavily medicalized. Psychoanalysts in the United States, against Freud's own more favorable position, had essentially rejected lay analysis, at the same time that America more and more appeared to become the new center of analytic activity. In 1925 the American Psychoanalytic Association first required a medical degree for every analyst, at a time when Freud had just published "The Question of Lay Analysis" (1926).[41] Vienna, Berlin, Budapest, and London continued to hold sway as long as Freud was alive. Nevertheless, the march toward increased professionalization, a new theoretical focus on the ego, and the mother–infant and mother–daughter relationships and female sexuality, became the new driving forces.

The Berlin Institute, run by Abraham, Eitingon, and Simmel, remained the center of European orthodoxy. Supported by government funds and recognized by the medical community, it focused on ego psychology. Graduates included Otto Fenichel, Käthe Friedländer, Edith Jacobson, George Gëro, Erich Fromm, Franz Alexander, Karen Horney, Sándor Rádo, Melanie Klein, Theodore Reik, Therese Benedek, Helene Deutsch, and Edward and James Strachey.[42]

Psychoanalysis also invaded the universities during the interwar years: Ferenczi taught at the University of Budapest and Max Eitingon at Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Franz Alexander taught part-time at the University of Chicago, while Stanley Cobb and Henry Murray, both power brokers in their own domain, introduced psychoanalysis at Harvard. This was also the era of "experimental psychoanalysis," when the question of whether or not psychoanalysis was really a science was put to the test.

Zaretsky notes that besides Vienna, Budapest, Berlin, London, Holland, Switzerland, and Russia, societies had been formed in Paris, Calcutta, Japan, the United States, Jerusalem, South Africa, and Scandinavia.[43] It was a mark of the spread of modernism. Generally, however, in places such as the Philippines and New Zealand, psychoanalysis was also to become associated with the spread of colonialism.[44] In 1924 the first collected works of Freud were initiated by Ortega y Gasset. Mexico, Brazil, Peru, and Argentina also by then had reading groups. Charlotte Bühler in Vienna, anti-Freudian though she was, taught Réne Spitz, Else Fraenkel, Marie Jahoda, Rudolf Ekstein, Bruno Bettelheim, and Edith Weisskopf. Piaget, a member of one of the Geneva psychoanalytic societies, aborted his analysis with Sabina Spielrein.

The 1930s was tumultuous, being simultaneously one of accolades and decline. In 1927 Freud's essay on "Fetishism,"[45] the transfer of one's sexual libido to particular objects, soon drew the attention of surrealists such as Salvador Dali, in what can only be called Dali's phase of extreme paranoid delusions, the phase for which his works are best known. In response to Freud's ideas about the sexual origin of the fetish, Dali began to incorporate realistic objects into his paintings that apparently had no artistic or aesthetic function with regard to the content of the painting itself. He even rendered a picture of Freud at their meeting and later said of that period, "Freud was my father," suggesting that Freud's ideas had loomed large in his interior life. For his part, Freud was charmed at their meeting in 1932 but failed to grasp what the surrealists were really up to with regard to a critique of Western cultural consciousness. Dali would go on to depict the surrealistic horrors of the Spanish uprising, before taking up a mystical interpretation of quantum theory. In that later phase he said, "Freud was my father. Now it is Heisenberg."[46]

The attempt to maintain purity of ideas within the psychoanalytic ranks prevailed as long as Freud was still alive. Vienna, Berlin, and New York remained the bastions of Freudian orthodoxy. In 1933 Wilhelm Reich, the really bad boy of psychoanalysis, published *The Mass Psychology of Fascism*,[47] a scathing political critique from a dynamic perspective. It was only slightly less radical than his books on the sexual revolution. Finally, in 1934 Reich was thrown out of the international psychoanalytic movement for his radicalism, while in 1937 Anna Freud's *Ego Psychology and*

the Mechanisms of Defence[48] appeared. She was her father's daughter, meaning that no son had stepped forward to carry on the legacy. From an early age, it was Anna who became Freud's most devoted follower and eventually heir apparent. Her father had pioneered in putting forth his ideas about the unconscious. Anna effectively put the stamp of approval on Freud's new emphasis after 1914, applying psychoanalysis to the normal personality.

Alongside Anna's emphasis on the ego, Melanie Klein proposed her version of object relations theory, which focused on attachment bonding with the mother.[49] Freud had argued for autonomy in articulating the Oedipus complex. Anna and Melanie opted to emphasize relationships. Another new interpretation also sprang on the scene in 1934, Jacques Lacan and his theory of linguistic mirroring.[50] A third was Ferenczi, who emphasized passive receptivity, not activity, as the force behind development. Imre Hermann, Alice and Michael Balint, and Heinz Kohut followed his line.[51]

Freud's other well-known works during this period included *Civilization and Its Discontents* (1930), "Female Sexuality" (1931), "Analysis Terminable and Interminable" (1937a), and *Moses and Monotheism* (1939).[52] His mother also died in 1931. In January 1933, Hitler came to power in Germany. On May 10, Freud's books were burned in Berlin. Sixty-five members were reduced to 15 at the institute. The number of students dropped from 222 in 1931 to 34 in 1934.[53] In 1936 the German Psychoanalytic Society joined the Goring Institute but finally dissolved in 1938. In 1937 Horney's *Neurotic Personality of Our Time*[54] was published, and in 1939, John Dollard's *Frustration and Aggression* and Abram Kardiner's *Individual and His Society* both appeared, further diffusing Freud's ideas.[55]

Feud's last major work was *Moses and Monotheism*. The work was composed of three essays, each longer than the other, in which Freud explored the mystery of Jewishness and the problem of self-hatred. To the question "Who was Moses?," Freud's answer, in the form of what he himself described as kind of "historical novel," was that Moses, Israelite leader and Hebrew lawgiver, was an Egyptian.[56] Christian and Jewish scholars of religion have by and large ignored Freud on the matter, but the issue is by no means settled as far as the historical question is concerned. This highlights the speculative nature of the document, which suggests a more important angle of interpretation; namely to what extent was Freud's Moses autobiographical? We know that Freud identified with Moses as someone who was a leader, was misunderstood, and was vilified as well as praised, all of which paled next to his central role in the birth of Israel. Freud saw himself as a Moses of the mind. After 1907, for instance, to Lou Andreas Salome, he characterized himself as Moses and Jung his Joshua who would enter the promised land of a transformed psychiatry, where he could never go.[57] At the same time, Freud placed himself in the lineage of Judaism while professing himself an atheist. One wonders the extent to which it is possible to separate one's Jewishness by simply ignoring the religious side of its history and still claiming the rest. We know from an analysis of Freud's artifact collection that the majority of figures were Egyptian and Greco-Roman, with a few Oriental pieces mixed in, suggesting a stronger identification with the mythic origins of European and Germanic culture than any self-conscious association with

the religion and culture of the Semites. Science, rather, was Freud's ultimate concern. David Bakan, however, has convincingly argued for a greater influence of the Jewish mystical tradition on Freud's thinking than Freud himself was possibly aware.[58]

Freud's Flight

November 7, 1938, had been *Kristallnacht*, the night 7000 Jewish stores were destroyed and 50,000 Jews were sent to concentration camps. In March, gangs of brown shirts invaded Freud's home and publisher's office and raided his safe. Later, Anna Freud was arrested by the Gestapo, but released later that day. Extensive preparations were made behind the scenes to obtain the right papers and to pay large sums of money. The Freud family was not able to leave for England until May 1938, but finally Freud arrived safely with the last of his family. In June 1939, Freud was in pain, his prosthesis unmanageable, his cancer suppurating. He had come to London, he said, to protect his Anna and to die in freedom. He passed away on September 23, 1939.

Freud's Influence

In 1952, Franz Alexander described the diffusion of psychoanalysis into a variety of scientific disciplines. The statement was somewhat hagiographic, in that he believed Freud was the first to "discover" the unconscious, and Alexander also ignored all forms of depth psychology except psychoanalysis. The penetration of psychoanalysis into psychiatry began with William Alanson White, Smith Ely Jelliffe, and Adolf Meyer, he said, forgetting the neuropsychiatry of James J. Putnam. By the 1950s, Alexander continued, six areas of psychoanalytic influence could be identified: clinical psychiatry proper, by which he meant the subfields of psychopathology and psychotherapy; the borderline between psychiatry and anthropology, where personality is studied across different cultures, which has led to the development of social psychiatry; in experimental psychology, which could refer to the experimental analysis of psychoanalytic concepts by Sears, Murray, Rosenzweig, and others (Alexander said that he was specifically referring to the Thematic Apperception Test and the Rorschach); in animal psychology, where learning theorists in the tradition of Pavlov (such as Dollard and Miller) had investigated frustration and aggression; in medicine, by which he meant the new subfield of psychosomatic medicine; and particularly in child psychiatry, where psychoanalysis had probably had its greatest influence.

The outgrowth of this "scientific cross-fertilization," Alexander called "dynamic psychiatry." Dynamic psychiatry, he said, "is liquidating" the isolation of psychoanalysis, maintaining that as a therapy it was being reunited with medicine and as a body of theory accepted as "basic science" in both psychiatry and the social sciences.[59]

This, of course, was a fantasy in Alexander's own head, based upon his hope for the fulfillment of a wish. His characterization of the diffusion of psychoanalysis into just those specific branches of the medical and social sciences he named seems accurate, but each one of those disciplines was clearly split on their opposition to psychoanalysis. Also, it is probably more accurate to say that between roughly 1933 and the early 1960s, psychoanalysis dominated clinical teaching in psychology and psychiatry, while psychobiology predominated in scientific psychiatry and behaviorism controlled the prevailing definition of psychology in the laboratories of the universities. Freud may have had a tremendous impact on modern culture, but it was chiefly through literature, the arts, and the soft side of anthropology, sociology, and psychology, which themselves had to fight continuously for legitimacy within the sphere of mainstream science, if even recognized there at all. At the same time, Freud's ideas were disseminated through his closest disciples, the Freudians, but also through a new iteration of psychoanalysis promulgated by the Neo-Freudians, before being radicalized in the psychotherapeutic counterculture. In this way, his ideas gained wide currency in the culture at large and disciplines in the so-called soft side of the academy.

Notes

1. Gay, P. (1988). *Freud*: *A life for our time*. New York: Norton, p. 531.
2. See Holt, R. R. (1989). *Freud reappraised*. New York: The Guilford Press and also Fancher, R. (1973). *Psychoanalytic psychology*: *The development of Freud's thought*. New York: Norton, for what I do not cover here.
3. Ellenberger, H. (1993). The story of Anna O. A critical review with new data. In M. Micale (Ed.), *Beyond the unconscious*: *Essays of Henri F. Ellenberger in the history of psychiatry* (pp. 254–272). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
4. Breuer, J., & Freud, S. (1893). Studies on hysteria. On the psychical mechanism of hysterical phenomena: Preliminary communication. *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 2*,* 1–18). London: Hogarth Press.
5. This is, of course, not completely true. Freud had defended Charcot's physiological explanation of hysteria before the Viennese Medical Society in 1886 and the session was briefly outlined in the *American Journal of Insanity* for 1888. Also, Freud was Breuer's second author and junior pupil, so one must always say "Breuer and Freud," not "Freud" alone before 1896 when talking about Freud's contribution to psychotherapeutics.
6. See, for instance, Pumpian-Mindlin, E., Hilgard, E. R., & Kubie, L. S. (1952). *Psychoanalysis as science*: *The Hixon Lectures on the scientific status of psychoanalysis.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
7. Freud, S. (1895). Project for a scientific psychology. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 1, pp. 281–392). London: Hogarth Press.
8. Freud (1900).
9. Jones, E. (1953). *The life and work of Sigmund Freud*: *The formative years and the great discoveries, 1856–1900* (Vol. 1*,* p. 360). New York: Basic Books.
10. Freud, S. (1905/1901). Fragment of an analysis of a case of hysteria. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 7, pp. 1–122). London: Hogarth Press.
11. Zaretsky, E. (2004). *Secrets of the soul*: *A social and cultural history of psychoanalysis*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
12. Zaretsky, 2004, pp. 53–54.

13. Freud, S. (1901). The psychopathology of everyday life. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 6, pp. 1–291). London: Hogarth Press; Freud, S. (1905a). Jokes and their relation to the unconscious. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 8, pp. 1–237). London: Hogarth Press; Freud, S. (1905b). Three essays on the theory of sexuality. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 7, pp. 123–231). London: Hogarth Press.
14. Gay, 1988, p. 336.
15. Freud, S. (1908). Character and anal eroticism. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 9, pp. 167–176). London: Hogarth Press.
16. Gay, 1988, p. 336.
17. De Bussy, J. H. (1908).Théories modernes sur la genèse de l'hystérie. *Compte rendu des Travaux du Premier Congrès International de Psychiatrie, de Neurologie, de Psychologie et de l'Assistance aux aliénés*. Amsterdam, September 2–7, 1907, pp. 264–270.
18. Ellenberger, 1970, pp. 797, 875.
19. Compare with Ellenberger, 1970, p. 800; Claparède, E. (Ed.). (1910). Vle Congrès International de Psychologie, 1909 Rapports et Comptes-Rendus. Geneva: Kündig.
20. Along with Gardner, H. (1985). *The mind's new science*: *A history of the cognitive revolution.* New York: Basic Books; Ross Stagner also mistakenly maintained that James had said to Freud, "the future of psychology belongs to your work." Stagner, R. (1988). *A history of psychological theories.* New York: Macmillan, p. 297.
21. Zaretsky, 2004, p. 87.
22. Gay, 1988, p. 326.
23. Freud, S. (1912–1913). Totem and taboo. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 13, pp. 1–161). London: Hogarth Press.
24. Freud, S. (1914a). On narcissism: An introduction. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 14, pp. 67–104). London: Hogarth Press.
25. Gay, 1988, p. 340.
26. Freud, S. (1914b). On the history of the psycho-analytic movement. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 14, pp. 1–66). London: Hogarth Press.
27. Freud, S. (1920a). Beyond the pleasure principle. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 18, pp. 1–64). London: Hogarth Press; Freud, S. (1921). Group psychology and the analysis of the ego. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 18, pp. 65–144). London: Hogarth Press; Freud, S. (1923). The ego and the id. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 19, pp. 1–59). London: Hogarth Press.
28. Gay, 1988, pp. 404–405.
29. Gay, 1988, p. 406.
30. Freud (1923).
31. Parenthetically, Freud also wrote about the type problem as a way to understand personality development. In 1931 he wrote on libidinal types and characterized different personalities in terms of the distribution of their libido. This led him on the basis of his clinical experience to the tripartite classification of erotic, narcissistic, and obsessional types. The erotic type is focused on love and being loved, dominated by the id, and is expressed differently depending on whether it is strong or weak. The obsessional is dominated by the superego. They suffer from the anxiety of conscience, tend to be conservative, and according to Freud are "the upholders of civilization." The narcissistic types can only be described in the negative. Erotic needs of the id and the moral conscience of the superego are given up for sheer self-preservation. Lots of ego aggression is available, there is a proneness to activity, and they may be identified as a result by others as leaders.

    While these Freud onsidered pure types, it is the mixed types that are more the norm. The erotic-narcissistic type is the most common, while erotic-obsessional and narcissistic-obsessional are seen frequently in therapy. There is no perfect combination of all three types, only dual combinations getting together to strengthen themselves at the expense of the third. There are pathological types

but in the neuroses they do not differ that much from the norm except in exaggerated ways. Freud, S. (1956/1931). Miscellaneous papers: Libidinal types. In J. Strachey (Ed.), *Collected papers* (Vol. 5, pp. 247–251). London: Hogarth Press.

32. Freud, S. (1927a). The future of an illusion. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 21, pp. 1–56). London: Hogarth Press.
33. Gay, 1988, p. 526.
34. Freud, S. (1930). Civilization and its discontents. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 21, pp. 57–146). London: Hogarth Press.
35. Reich, W. (1925). *Der triebhafte Charakter: Éire psychoanalytische studie zur pathologie des ich* [Character-analysis; principles and technique for psychoanalysts in practice and in training] Leipzig: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag. See also, Reich, W. (1945). *Character-analysis: Principles and technique for psychoanalysts in practice and in training* (T. P. Wolfe, Trans.) (2nd ed.). New York: Orgone Institute Press.
36. Ferenczi, S., & Rank, O. (1924). *Entwicklungsziele der Psychoanalyse zur Wechselbeziehung von Theorie und Praxis* [The development of psychoanalysis]. Neue Arbeiten zur ärztlichen Psychoanalyse, Heft 1. Wien: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag.
37. Rank, O. (1924). *Das trauma der geburt und seine* [*The trauma of birth*]. Leipzig: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag.
38. Zaretsky, 2004, p. 174.
39. Rank, O. (1996). In R. Kramer, & R. May (Eds.), *A psychology of difference: The American lectures.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
40. Zaretsky, 2004, p. 176.
41. Freud, S. (1926). The question of lay analysis. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 20, pp. 177–250). London: Hogarth Press.
42. Zaretsky, 2004, p. 180.
43. Zaretsky, 2004, p. 183.
44. Zaretsky, 2004, pp. 189–190.
45. Freud, S. (1927b). Fetishism. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 20, pp. 147–158). London: Hogarth Press.
46. His quantum mysticism was soon replaced by a profound period of interest in Catholicism, when he was permitted by the Pope to join the church, during which time he brought a mystical surrealism to religious themes such as the crucifixion and the resurrection in his paintings. He followed this with a period of his own spiritual revelations, before a final phase of paranormal, psychedelic-like art, sometimes working in non-traditional media. From "Dali": Exhibit at the Philadelphia Museum, of Art, May, 2005.
47. Reich, W. (1933). *Die massenpsychologie des faschimus* [*The mass psychology of fascism*]. 2 Auflage, Sexpol Verlag; See also first English edition: Reich, W. (1946). *The mass psychology of fascism* (T. P. Wolfe, Trans.). New York: Orgone Institute Press.
48. Freud, A. (1937). *The ego and the mechanisms of defence.* The International Psycho-analytical Library, No. 30. London: Hogarth Press.
49. Klein, M. (1932a). *Die psychoanalyse des kindes* [*The psycho-analysis of children*]. Vienna: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag. Also published in English in 1932 by International Psychoanalytical Library, No. 22. London: Hogarth Press.
50. Lacan, J. (1968). *The language of the self* (A Wilden, Trans.). Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
51. Zaretsky, 2004, p. 182.
52. Freud (1930); Freud, S. (1931). Female sexuality. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 21, pp. 221–246). London: Hogarth Press; Freud, S. (1937a). Analysis terminable and interminable. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 23, pp. 209–254). London: Hogarth Press; Freud, S. (1939). Moses and monotheism: Three essays. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 23, pp. 1–138). London: Hogarth Press.
53. Zaretsky, 2004, p. 226.

54. Horney, K. (1937). *The neurotic personality of our time.* New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
55. Dollard, J. (1939). *Frustration and aggression*. New Haven: Yale University Press; Kardiner, A. & Linton, R. (1939). *The individual and his society*: *The psychodynamics of primitive social organization*. New York: Columbia University.
56. Gay, 1988, p. 605.
57. Gay, 1988, p. 605.
58. Bakan, D. (1958). *Sigmund Freud and the Jewish mystical tradition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
59. Alexander, F., & Ross, H. (Eds.). (1952). *Dynamic psychiatry*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. vi–vii.