



**FREUD**

**R. J. RUSHDOONY**

# FREUD

R. J. Rushdoony

Chalcedon/Ross House Books  
Vallecito, California

Copyright 1965, 2006

Mark R. Rushdoony

Ross House Books

PO Box158

Vallecito, CA 95251

[www.ChalcedonStore.com](http://www.ChalcedonStore.com)

All rights reserved.

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means — electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or otherwise — except for brief quotations for the purpose of review or comment, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Library of Congress: 2006928674

ISBN: 1-879998-47-5

Other titles by

Rousas John Rushdoony

*The Death of Meaning*  
*Noble Savages*  
*Larceny in the Heart*  
*To Be As God*  
*The Biblical Philosophy of History*  
*The Mythology of Science*  
*The Institutes of Biblical Law, Vol. I*  
*The Institutes of Biblical Law, Vol. II, Law & Society*  
*The Institutes of Biblical Law, Vol. III, The Intent of the Law*  
*Systematic Theology (2 volumes)*  
*Commentaries on the Pentateuch: Genesis*  
*Commentaries on the Pentateuch: Exodus*  
*Commentaries on the Pentateuch: Leviticus*  
*Chariots of Prophetic Fire*  
*The Gospel of John*  
*Romans & Galatians*  
*Hebrews, James, & Jude*  
*Thy Kingdom Come*  
*Foundations of Social Order*  
*This Independent Republic*  
*The Nature of the American System*  
*The "Atheism" of the Early Church*  
*The Messianic Character of American Education*  
*The Philosophy of the Christian Curriculum*  
*Christianity and the State*  
*Salvation and Godly Rule*  
*God's Plan for Victory*  
*Politics of Guilt and Pity*  
*Roots of Reconstruction*  
*The One and the Many*  
*Revolt Against Maturity*  
*By What Standard?*  
*Law & Liberty*

For a complete listing of available books contact:

Chalcedon

PO Box 158 \* Vallecito, CA 95251

[www.ChalcedonStore.com](http://www.ChalcedonStore.com)

# Table of Contents

[Foreword](#)

[Preface](#)

[Introduction](#)

1. [The Man](#)

2. [Self-Analysis and Guilt](#)

3. [Anthropology](#)

4. [Lamarck's Influence](#)

5. [Psychology](#)

6. [The Libido Theory](#)

7. [Freud and Religion](#)

8. [The State](#)

9. [Freudian Revisionism](#)

[Selected Bibliography](#)

[Footnotes](#)

# Foreword to the 2006 Publication

“Freud Is Not Dead,” declared the cover of *Newsweek*, “The Couch Is Out, But the Culture of Therapy Is Everywhere ...”<sup>1</sup> The lexicon of our modern vocabulary contains lasting memorials to his ongoing influence: anxiety, defense mechanism, denial, repression, subconscious, displacement, projection, rejection, and transference, to name just a few. We feel a need to psychoanalyze others even if we do not want to submit ourselves to the process. Murder mysteries once focused on the intellectual effort of solving the riddle of clues. Now television’s crime and police shows cannot avoid depicting prosecutors and detectives analyzing the suspects and apprehending them because they, as trained professional observers, understand the patient/criminal better than he understands himself. History has turned from the writing of deeds of important men to their psychology. Biography is now less the story of a person’s life and impact and more his struggle with the ghosts of his past. We do not feel we know a person unless we analyze him and pretend to know the source of his strengths and weaknesses. Freud’s psychology is very much a part of our world. He is indeed still with us.

It is fitting that this work by my father is republished now, on the 150th anniversary of the birth of Sigmund Freud. He has long been considered, along with Karl Marx and Charles Darwin, as one of the three most influential thinkers since the Enlightenment. The writers of the *Newsweek* cover story perceptively called him “our secular Saint Augustine.”<sup>2</sup> Freud would be pleased with such a synopsis of his impact, for the purpose of his life’s work was the transferring of Augustine’s doctrine of predestination from God to man’s evolutionary ascent.

The work that follows is a Christian critique of Freud’s importance to modern thought and culture. His work provided the missing link that made possible the hegemony of science over modern man. Freud’s work was an assault on the foundation of the Christian gospel, the precept that guilt is a moral fact and result of man’s sin.

Unlike most naturalists after Darwin who believed guilt was a cultural imposition on man, Freud believed guilt was, in fact, a real part of the human condition. He forced naturalists to assault and lay claim to territory that, until then, had been held exclusively by religion. His purpose was to explain guilt in terms of Darwinian naturalism. Freud’s great contribution was the transference of guilt from an area of moral, and hence religious, concern to that of science. Guilt was said to come from man’s primeval ascent. Freud formulated a complex historical construct to explain man’s earliest prehistoric drives as oriented around cannibalism, homosexuality, incest, and parricide. These ancient impulses were forever implanted in the mind of man. In attempting to repress their impact, man became conflicted, and the subconscious effects of this struggle became an inescapable part of man’s being. These repressed memories were hidden to the individual and only occasionally made their appearance in the form of dreams, “Freudian slips,” and mental, emotional, or behavioral disorders.

Freud faced guilt as a scientist in order to remove its moral and religious connotations. He self-consciously pushed naturalism’s science and its claims. Guilt as a moral fact was replaced after

Freud with guilt as a scientific fact. In order to destroy the power of religion over naturalistic man, Freud replaced, as the author notes, God with Darwin's "biological myth" and Adam's fall into sin with his own "anthropological myth."

Freud's work was no less than an attack on all organized religion, which he held in contempt. The author notes that Freud, as a Jew, was particularly at war with Moses and the idea of divine law and the guilt it represented. To his credit, he did not pretend to offer a solution to guilt, only scientific explanation with the help of a professional psychoanalyst.

The author shows that Freud's approach to guilt, then, was not aimed at its resolution, but its "stoical acceptance" as a "biological predestination." Freud thus told man his hope was not in a religious absolution but in a scientific explanation. By removing sin, Freud obviated the need for atonement and Jesus Christ (and those branches of Christianity that followed naturalistic science also soon gave up their atoning Messiah in favor of a more humanistic Christ figure). Sadly enough, however, Freud's concept of the human condition still left evolutionary man with a permanent guilt. His theories seemingly removed the stigma of sin, but he did not pretend to be able to remove the reality of guilt. To guilty man all Freud could offer was scientific explanation consistent with Darwin. Health, he could urge, was understanding and accepting yourself. This is the closest modern humanism can come to salvation, the embracing of what Christianity calls the natural man. As a true post-Enlightenment figure, all he could really do was offer a rational scientific logic in a more consistent humanistic faith. The specifics of Freud's theories are now of little more than academic interest. It is Freud's repudiation of the Christian view of sin and guilt in favor of their anthropological explanation and acceptance that is still embraced as a fundamental tenant of humanistic man.

Sigmund Freud's critics are legion, as are those of Marx and Darwin. The strength of each man's work is, however, its consistent application of humanistic thought. To reject the presupposition of any of these men is to run counter to the secular trend of thought since the Enlightenment. Modern man may not call himself Marxist, but he has accepted the basic tenants of socialism and lives in terms of them. Darwin's methodology was early found to be inadequate to explain evolution. It was quickly revised, however, because modern man believes in naturalism as the premise of his life, thought, and science. Likewise, Freud is often ridiculed, and psychology has splintered into many different revisions of Freud, but the core of his thesis, the naturalistic origin of guilt, is fundamental to modern man's evasion of his moral problem.

To criticize Freud's core thesis on the basis of a supernatural faith is to invite a vicious response. Non-naturalists are not welcome at the intellectual bar of modern science. Critics are immediately trashed as religious fanatics who are themselves suppressing serious issues. After Freud not only man's body, but also his psyche have belonged to naturalistic science; religion is now warned to know its place, one of a purely personal nature.

The answer to the naturalism of Darwin and Freud is still the supernatural; the gospel of Jesus Christ is still man's only hope. Man needs, more than ever, to be confronted with his sin and guilt as his moral failure before a holy God. An understanding of the error of Sigmund Freud must point us to what his work sought to evade, man's accountability to God and the atoning

work of His Mediator. From that point we can establish a truly Christian approach to psychology, one from which Freud and humanists have long sought escape.

Mark R. Rushdoony  
May 2006

# Preface

Many facets of modern thought have been traced in Sigmund Freud (1856-1939): rationalism, scientism, romanticism, primitivism, and Darwinism, among others. Behind all of these movements and basic to them all, as to Freud, is the Enlightenment, and, we are told, “at bottom Freud belongs to the Age of Enlightenment.”<sup>3</sup> Freud has been named, along with Darwin and Marx, as one of the great men of the Enlightenment; indeed, the culmination of Enlightenment thought is seen in these three men. But these three, even as they pushed the Enlightenment faith to its logical conclusions, were also the destroyers of that same faith and hope, and may be best remembered as its grave diggers in the future.

# Introduction

Although “Freud belonged broadly to the spirit of the Enlightenment,” his system broke with the Enlightenment’s trust in man and in nature.<sup>4</sup> The Enlightenment had supplanted faith in God and his inscriptured Word with faith in man and nature. Attacks on man and nature from orthodox Christian theologians had been consistently brushed off as irrelevant and obscurantist by “the sons of light.” Now, from within their own ranks, came a trenchant attack on man and nature which spread a rapidly infecting contagion into the hosts of humanism. Attacks from other sectors of the same army were not slow in appearing. For Marxists, Freud’s thinking was to be written off as “idealist.”<sup>5</sup> The foundations for a scientific and materialistic psychology and psychiatry had been laid by Ivan P. Pavlov, in terms of experimentally-established facts and scientific laws, in contrast to which Freud could only be called “a pseudo-scientist.”<sup>6</sup>

Sigmund Freud, an Austrian Jew, studied medicine in Vienna, working extensively in physiology, then specializing in neurology, and then changing over to psycho-pathology. A specialist, Freud in his associations was exceedingly limited, his public lectures few, and his contacts limited to a small circle of followers. He remained always a reserved, kindly, and old-fashioned person. But he could write, as he did to Dr. Wilhelm Fliess, “I can hardly tell you how many things I — a new Midas — turn into filth. This is in complete harmony with the theory of internal stinking.”<sup>7</sup> In spite of a philosophical cynicism concerning man, Freud was known among his associates as a very poor judge of men, and as one naively given to “black and white judgment of people.”<sup>8</sup>

A reading of Freud’s life and letters makes abundantly clear that he was in very many respects a pre-Freudian man, often amazingly naive. But in one respect he clearly knew himself: he was aware of the impact of his thinking and the extent of his influence. He stated it without much false modesty. “Humanity has in the course of time had to endure from the hands of science two great outrages upon its naive self-love.” The first came with Copernicus, “when it was realized that our earth was not the centre of the universe, but only a tiny speck in a world-system of a magnitude hardly conceivable.” The second came with Darwin, “when biological research robbed man of his peculiar privilege of having been specially created, and relegated him to a descent from the animal world, implying an ineradicable animal nature in him.” (Note that Freud saw this “animal nature” as “ineradicable.”) Now, “The third and most bitter blow” came “from present-day psychological research which is endeavoring to prove to the ‘ego’ of each of us that he is not even master in his own house, but that he must remain content with the veriest scraps of information about what is going on unconsciously in his own mind.” This, more specifically, was the task of psychoanalysis, and, as Freud suggested, of his own life.<sup>9</sup>

Freud, while holding no brief for man and nature, held to the enlightenment faith in “Science,” a faith he came to in his adolescent need to “believe in something.” This “belief in scientific knowledge as the end”<sup>10</sup> is somewhat overstated by Ernest Jones, in that Freud came to see science, not in always a fully messianic sense, for he doubted that any salvation was possible for man, but in a stoical sense, in that science could help man to understand and to accept his destiny. He personally felt unequal to “governing, curing, and educating.”<sup>11</sup> *Understanding* was his mission and message.

## The Man

In view of this fact, it is not surprising that Freud had an essentially passive nature, as Jones has noted. One who holds to biological predestination will not have an activist perspective. Freud was clearly a stoic. “A favorite expression was ‘it is no use quarreling with fate.’” He took no credit for the “transformation” in Sandor Ferenczi, writing him in 1933, “Some psychological fate has brought it about in you.”<sup>12</sup> He disliked, on his trips to Rome which he loved, to see evidences of “the lie of salvation” — Christian Rome.<sup>13</sup> For the same reason — his dislike of panaceas and salvation — he was an indifferent voter, and, while a Liberal of socialist leanings, indifferent to political attempts to attain a good society.

Freud, as we have noted, from his youth was indoctrinated into the messianic faith in science by Enlightenment philosophy, and, in his early years as a scientist, hoped to gain fame through the discovery of a scientific panacea. His early research in and enthusiasm for the medical and psychological potentialities of cocaine very nearly cost him his reputation, and his subsequent enthusiasm for Jean Martin Charcot’s ideas on hysteria and hypnotism did not add to his stature. It is easy, from these episodes and some of Freud’s blunders with reference to cocaine, to charge him with scientific incompetence and even quackery, but the imputation is manifestly unjust. Freud’s passion was science. Ernest Jones gives the impression, at several points, that Freud was a man of the strictest sexual morality. Freud himself made no such claim, writing to James J. Putnam, July 8, 1915, “Sexual morality as defined by society, in its most extreme form that of America, strikes me as very contemptible. I stand for an infinitely freer sexual life, although I myself have made very little use of such freedom. Only so far as I considered myself entitled to.”<sup>14</sup> It is a little absurd for Jones to ask us to think of Freud as he impressed Jones, as “an unusually chaste person” and “puritanical.”<sup>15</sup> On the other hand, if we distinguish between love and sex, Jones was no doubt correct in saying, “His wife was assuredly the only woman in Freud’s love life, and she always came first before all other mortals.”<sup>16</sup> Before their marriage, Freud wrote of his passion for science to Martha Bernays on May 17, 1885, stating, “I am at the moment tempted by the desire to solve the riddle of the structure of the brain; I think brain anatomy is the only legitimate rival you have or ever will have.”<sup>17</sup> But sex was exceedingly important to Freud, for it represented the essence of man and his energy, so that to combine the liberating power of science with sex was for him a consummation most devoutly to be wished for. Even after his messianic hopes had been set at naught by his own conclusions, they could flare up, in flagrant contradiction to his own ideas. Thus, believing as he did in the harmful effects of all known contraceptives, we are told by Jones that “he dreamed of a satisfactory one that would free sexual enjoyment from all complications.” When Fliess began to develop his periodic law with the ostensible assurance of safe days in the menstrual cycle, Freud, in a letter of July 10, 1893, “set his hopes on Fliess’ solving the problem as on the Messiah.” When two years later it seemed as though success were nigh, Freud wrote on May 25, 1895, “I could have shouted with joy at your news. If you have really solved the problem of conception I will ask you

what sort of marble would best please you.”<sup>18</sup> Freud’s messianic hopes thus were always real and close to the surface. His stated negation of them was thus governed not by his heart but by hard-headed conclusions.

His quest, Freud believed, was in large measure governed by his nature, his Jewishness. He was “deeply moved” by an “old Jew,” he wrote to Martha, July 23, 1882, who asserted that “The Jew...is the finest flower of mankind, and is made for enjoyment. Jews despise anyone who lacks the ability to enjoy. The law commands the Jew to appreciate every pleasure, however small, to say grace over every fruit which makes him aware of the beautiful world in which it is grown. The Jew is made for joy and joy for the Jew.”<sup>19</sup> For Freud, to be a Jew meant to be a seeker after joy in the maturest and fullest sense, which meant in part being a Columbus, a discoverer, one who pushed out further the boundaries of the world and the potentialities of life. Marriage prospects tempted him briefly (September 4, 1883) to “renounce my ambition,” and he resolved to “try and live more like the Gentiles — modestly, learning and practicing the usual things and not striving after discoveries and delving too deep.”<sup>20</sup> It is thus apparent that Freud’s harsh conclusions did not come easily to him; they were first of all bitter personal conclusions. Long previously, Catullus had written:

I hate and love.  
And if you ask me why,  
I have no answer, but I discern,  
can feel, my senses rooted in eternal torture.<sup>21</sup>

Freud agreed that this “eternal torture” was all too real; he asked the “why” of it, and answered the question, but his answer was not a cure but only stoical understanding.

Freud did not come happily to his conclusions. They were born out of his own inner experiences, and he accepted their validity with stoicism. And basic to all stoicism is a certain reserve, so that, while Freud was more firmly wedded to his system of thought than any of his followers, his reserve and detachment, usually in evidence, preserved him from many of their follies and left him, in many respects, a pre-Freudian man. We have seen the romantic hope flare up at the prospect of Fliess’ discovery. As a young man, Freud had been the proper and romantic lover. His letters to Martha Bernays are full of simple, romantic love, written “With 100,000 kisses, all of which are to be cashed.” He saw her as “innocent” and needing protection from harsh realities. Although he urged her to finish reading *Don Quixote*, he admitted it had “shocking qualities.” He longed for her picture, to give it “a place among my household gods.”<sup>22</sup> Freud, in his late twenties, wrote Martha of his reactions to the mob in Carmen:

The mob gives vent to its appetites, and we deprive ourselves. We deprive ourselves in order to maintain our integrity, we economize in our health, our capacity for enjoyment, our emotions: we save ourselves for something, not knowing what. And this habit of constant suppression of natural instincts gives us the quality of refinement.<sup>23</sup>

Romantically, he wrote, “I am quite prepared to be completely ruled by my princess. One willingly lets oneself be dominated by the person one loves.”<sup>24</sup> On the other hand, even in the

midst of all of his romancing, Freud's stern realism could assert itself. He could write, "Don't forget that 'beauty' only stays a few years, and that we have to spend a long life together. Once the smoothness and freshness of youth is gone then the only beauty lies where goodness and understanding transfigure the features, and that is where you excel."<sup>25</sup> Freud, on the whole, was a romantic lover. When disturbed about Martha, he could write, "I lost at once all sense of values, and at moments a frightful dread comes over me lest you fall ill. I am so wild that I can't write more." When she proved to be well, he wrote, "So I was quite wrong in imagining you to be ill. I was very crazy. One is very crazy when one is in love."<sup>26</sup>

Freud was plagued with "bowel trouble" which he prudishly referred to as his "Konrad". He was a very superstitious man, holding for a time to a numerical periodicity which would doom him to an early death. He disliked aging and anything which reminded him of it. He was given to migraine headaches, psychosomatic ailments, and fainting fits, fainting twice in arguments with Carl Gustav Jung, and he was much given to provoking trouble and creating crises in his circle of followers.<sup>27</sup> In his later years, Freud, with heavy and poor humor, could blame his absorption with Martha before marriage for the fact "that I was not already famous at that early age." A visit with her gave someone else the time to make certain "decisive experiments" with cocaine and become the "discover" of its use in local anaesthesia, "but I bore my fiancée no grudge for her interruption of my work."<sup>28</sup> On his golden wedding anniversary he could comment to Marie Bonaparte concerning Martha, "It was really not a bad solution of the marriage problem, and she is still today tender, healthy and active."<sup>29</sup> When Freud was asked in 1907 to write on the sexual enlightenment of children, he wrote of its urgent necessity and of the dire consequences his work continually revealed to him of the failure by parents to instruct their children.<sup>30</sup> Not too long before that, however, as his son Martin was later to write, a family discussion concerning cattle revealed the ignorance of all the Freud children. "'You must be told these things,' father had exclaimed; but, like the majority of fathers, he had done nothing whatever about it."<sup>31</sup>

Freud's perversity regarding Vienna and the United States is noteworthy. Vienna rejected him, but, while he "always expressed extreme dislike of Vienna," he actually loved it deeply and hated finally to leave it for England.<sup>32</sup> Nowhere else did he receive the acceptance, following, and outright veneration which arose in many quarters in the United States, and so he chose to despise the United States and indulge in various absurd opinions concerning it.<sup>33</sup>

For a man who warred against innocence and held to the radical tension and taint of civilized life, Freud was again singularly blind to many aspects of his own nature. From a Christian perspective, he was seriously guilty of phariseeism. He could write of himself:

I believe that when it comes to a sense of justice and consideration for others, to the dislike of making others suffer or taking advantage of them, I can measure myself with the best people I have known. I have never done anything mean or malicious, nor have I felt any temptation to do so, with the result that I am not in the least proud of it. I am taking the notion of morality in its social, not its sexual, sense.<sup>34</sup>

For one who pointed to the sado-masochistic roots and elements in all men, this was a strange assertion of innocence! He was naive in reporting praise, even from sick patients.

“Does the Professor talk to God,” Hans asked his father on the way home, “as he can tell all that beforehand?” I should be extraordinarily proud of this recognition out of the mouth of a child, if I had not myself provoked it by my joking boastfulness.<sup>35</sup>

Another aspect of Freud is usually by-passed but needs attention. There is no better, and no more amusing, example of pre-Freudian prudery concerning sex than Freud himself, and many of his attitudes are rooted in his strange and ambivalent attitude towards sex, a mingling of worship and dread, so that it was almost both god and devil to him. It is quite possible that a future age may choose to see Freud as the classic example of a strange and fantastic prudery. Note, for example, this passage, which is so basic to his perspective:

Probably no male human being is spared the terrifying shock of threatened castration at the sight of the female genitals. We cannot explain why it is that some of them become homosexuals in consequence of this experience, others ward it off by creating a fetish, and the great majority overcome it.<sup>36</sup>

To the cynical post-Freudians, Freud himself has become ludicrous.

This pre-Freudian romanticism is in evidence, however, among the devout Freudians in their assessment of their master. Ernest Jones' three-volume biography reads often like a work from another era in its uncritical dedication and devotion to the master. “One feels that no one could ever have lied to him. Not only that it would have been useless, but any wish to do so would have melted in his presence.” Jones could write this after his long catalogues of Freud's naive illusions concerning his followers, and his readiness to believe his favorites in strange ways. But Jones concludes, “And so we take leave of a man whose like we shall not know again. From our hearts we thank him for having lived; for having done; and for having loved.”<sup>37</sup>

Even more telling, in this context, is the fact that the Freudian circle, romantically united to one another by rings bestowed on the members by Freud himself, was plagued not only by very serious bitterness and fighting but by serious mental, emotional, and other psychological disorders. Even the devout Jones recorded “the failing mental integration on the part of Otto Rank and Sandor Ferenczi” in the immediate circle, and the scandals associated with followers like H. W. Frink,<sup>38</sup> and this was only the most flagrant aspect of the situation. This fact is important, and, much as the piety of Jones and others would seek to veil it, is necessary to an understanding of Freud, a sympathetic understanding. Freud shunned biography and autobiography, while basing his theory on it. He held to a classical reserve and dignity in all matters personal. But Freud never denied that the sources of his theory were autobiographical, nor that his followers had insight precisely as he did, out of bitter inner conflict which had ripped off the hypocritical mask of social conformity and repression. They were veterans of a basic warfare, and they had been made both weaker and stronger by that warfare. They were weaker in that they could not live in terms of the illusions of other men and in hope through the “lie” of salvation, stronger because they had, out of their own exhausting battle, gained not cure, which was an impossibility, but understanding. It is thus possible to go far more deeply into the mental and moral aberrations of Freudians then and now than we have any intention of doing, and it would accomplish nothing, except perhaps to confirm the Freudians. They have, after all, faced the “reality” concerning themselves. The basic issue then lies elsewhere: Is the Freudian diagnosis and prognosis true?

## 2

# Self-Analysis and Guilt

Freud's theories began in self-analysis, were developed in self-analysis and were confirmed to his satisfaction in the psychoanalysis of others. In himself he found the dreams and desires for incest, parricide, and every other facet of his theory, confirmed in his unconscious feelings with respect to his father and mother as well as his daughters.<sup>39</sup> This self-analysis continued, so that in 1910 he could write to Ferenczi, "A part of homosexual cathexis has been withdrawn and made use of to enlarge my own ego. I have succeeded where the paranoiac fails."<sup>40</sup> Why should a man accuse himself, and all men, of these things? And why should Freud, a proud and reserved man, already smarting under the opprobrium imputed to him as a Jew, draw more fire by publishing theories seemingly calculated to offend men and to promote further hostility to the Jew? Freud hungered for appreciation and respect, and yet his every publication seemed determined to deny it to himself. What premises led Freud to a conclusion so alien to his quiet ways and his dreams of a pure, noncontroversial life of achievement in science? It was not the "unconscious," for the doctrine of the unconscious was an old one when Freud was born, and while an important aspect of his theory, is not the key to it.<sup>41</sup> Neither was it "sex," for in Freud's day, many scholars dealt with sex, such as Sir Richard Francis Burton (1821- 1890), Henry Havelock Ellis (1859-1939), Lewis Henry Morgan (1818-1881), Paolo Mantegazza (1831-1910), and others, without exerting a fraction of the influence Freud has had. Sex was important in Freud's theory, but to make it central is to ensure misunderstanding and to be unable to cope with it. What then was Freud's central concern and the key to his theory? It was his concern with the feeling of *guilt*.

Jones saw quite rightly that the central thesis of Freud's study, *Civilization and its Discontents*, was, in Freud's words, his "intention to represent the sense of guilt as the most important problem in the evolution of culture, and to convey that the price of progress in civilization is paid by forfeiting happiness through the heightening of the sense of guilt."<sup>42</sup> Alfred Adler and Carl Jung could be seen by some religious thinkers as more ready allies to their cause because they lacked Freud's hostility to religions, but Freud has had the greater impact on religious thought because, despite his militant scientism and materialism, his thinking was basically religious in its subject matter. Freud's concern reveals both his apparent nearness to Christian theology and his radical difference from it, because Freud dissociated guilt and sin, and this association is absolutely necessary for Christian theology.

Guilt, Freud rightly recognized, is man's basic problem, and, no matter what marvels scientific technology and socialism may bring forth (and he expected much of both), a guilty man is wretched amid riches. As a result, before anything else can be done for man, the fact of guilt must be reckoned with. This was an unheard-of starting point for a man of science, and Freud, however faithfully a strict materialist, immediately disqualified himself with most strict materialists, such as Marxists, for including a religious premise into a godless world. In other quarters, it was seen as the rebirth of the soul in Western culture.<sup>43</sup> Freud, however, was facing

up to the basic *religious* issue as a *scientist*, and, accordingly, instead of dealing with guilt in terms of God, creation, and man's fall, he went to anthropology.

# 3

## Anthropology

The anthropology he went to, moreover, was ostensibly religious but actually naturalistic, namely, William Robertson Smith's (1846-1894), whose works, in particular *The Religion of the Semites*, are basic to an understanding both of the nature and meaning of modernism in the churches and of Freudianism as a psychology. The basic influence of William Robertson Smith on modernism and Freudianism is also behind their increasingly closer ties and common allegiances. In *Totem and Taboo* (1913), Freud clearly and openly stated these premises. In every culture, he pointed out, the *holy* or *sacred* (the *taboo*) has a double meaning: "On the one hand it means to us, sacred, consecrated: but on the other hand it means, uncanny, dangerous, forbidden, and unclean."<sup>44</sup> An ambivalence of emotions is clearly revealed, and a like ambivalence is basic to conscience. Conscience when violated leads to strong guilt feelings, but conscience is violated by very strong feelings also. "Psychoanalysis here confirms what the pious were wont to say, that we are all miserable sinners."<sup>45</sup> But we are not sinners against God, for there is no God for Freud. Freud turned then to the "dark" sins that strike men with horror and yet are so deeply written into man's "primitive past" — incest, parricide, and cannibalism. To summarize his thesis briefly, in the primitive society or "primal horde," the "violent primal father" drove out the sons and claimed exclusive sexual possession of the mother and the daughters. This Oedipus complex is "the origin of morality in each of us."<sup>46</sup> "This violent primal father had surely been the envied and feared model for each of the brothers." He was power and the father-image incarnate. Finally, the rebellious sons banded, killed, and ate the father and possessed the mother and the sisters.

They hated the father who stood so powerfully in the way of their sexual demands and their desire for power, but they also loved and admired him. After they had satisfied their hate by his removal and carried out their wish for identification with him, the suppressed tender impulses had to assert themselves. This took place in the form of remorse, a sense of guilt was formed which coincided here with the remorse generally felt. The dead now became stronger than the living had been, even as we observe it today in the destinies of men. What the father's presence had formerly prevented they themselves now prohibited in the psychic situation of "subsequent obedience" which we know so well from psychoanalysis. They undid their deed by declaring that the killing of the father substitute, the totem, was not allowed, and renounced the fruits of their deed by denying themselves the liberated women. Thus they created two fundamental taboos of totemism out of the *sense of guilt of the son*, and for this very reason these had to correspond with the two repressed wishes of the Oedipus complex. Whoever disobeyed became guilty of the two only crimes which troubled primitive society.

The two taboos of totemism with which the morality of man begins are psychologically not of equal value. One of them, the sparing of the totem animal, rests entirely upon emotional motives; the father had been removed and nothing in reality could make up for this. But the other, the

incest prohibition, had, besides, a strong practical foundation. Sexual need does not unite men; it separates Freud, “them. Though the brothers had joined forces in order to overcome the father, each was the other’s rival among the women. Each one wanted to have them all to himself like the father, and in the fight of each against the other the new organization would have perished. For there was no longer any one stronger than all the rest who could have successfully assumed the role of the father. Thus there was nothing left for the brothers, if they wanted to live together, but to erect the incest prohibition — perhaps after many difficult experiences — through which they all equally renounced the women whom they desired, and on account of whom they had removed the father in the first place. Thus they saved the organization which had made them strong and which could be based upon the homosexual feelings and activities which probably manifested themselves among them during the time of their banishment. Perhaps this situation also formed the germ of the institution of the mother right discovered by Bachofen, which was then abrogated by the patriarchal family arrangement.”<sup>47</sup>

After Herodotus, Freud saw gods as created in man’s image, of the father in particular, so that “god at bottom is nothing but an exalted father.”<sup>48</sup> In Christianity, this myth is carried a step further. The son is now killed to make expiation for the murder of the father, and “with this sacrifice there follows the complete renunciation of woman, for whose sake mankind rebelled against the father.” The appeasing son becomes like the father a god, so that “the religion of the son succeeds the religion of the father.”<sup>49</sup> With Goethe, Freud repeats, “In the beginning was the deed.”<sup>50</sup> The answer would appear to be simple: knowing now that the gods are non-existent, why should not then man, after de Sade’s counsel, commit incest, parricide and cannibalism to his heart’s content and be truly “free”? Certainly, many followers of Freud in the world of art and elsewhere held that a thorough-going *primitivism* was the answer. Not so Freud, as we shall see. As is already apparent from his depiction of the primal horde, even so-called primitive man had powerful “suppressed” impulses, and, living totally outside any civil law, was himself, *an omnipotent acting law, so that his answer to his crime was to enforce the law with inexorable force. If primitive man was so firmly bound by inner law, how can modern man, in whom it has far deeper roots, hope to escape it?* Freud doubted that he could. And here we come to an important distinction. Freud offered no solution to the problem, only an *understanding* of it; the neo-Freudians have insisted that there is an answer. And it is at this point that many admirers as well as critics of Freud go astray. Trilling does not seem to be aware of the thrust of Freud.<sup>51</sup> Natenburg has attacked Freud for conducting psychoanalysis as research rather than therapy, and cites Freud as admitting therapeutic failure.<sup>52</sup> For Natenburg, the essence of the charge against the Freudians is that they “believe neuroses are incurable.”<sup>53</sup> The charge falls flat because it only proves Freud’s contention, namely, that psychoanalysis cannot indulge in wishful thinking and fall victim to “the lie of salvation” but must bear witness to truth as a scientific discipline, even if the witness is a counsel of despair. The problem is this: Is Freud’s conclusion based on a correct analysis of the facts, or is it based on a faulty anthropology?

At this point, as Harry K. Wells has pointed out in a very able analysis, comparative anthropology has been attacking Freud’s foundations at six key points, all of which Freud derived from “the spurious anthropological doctrines of British so-called evolutionary anthropology, especially the theories of Robertson Smith.” The “six fundamental concepts” of Freud now attacked by comparative anthropology are (1) “the *primal horde myth* on which Freud based his theories of the *id* and of the *Super-ego* and hence of society”; (2) “the *doctrine of*

*phylogenetic memories*” according to which remote primitive experiences “become biologically hereditary memories” of all persons; (3) “the *concept of biologically innate infantile sexual phases* through which every child must pass between birth and age of five or six,” these being centered around the erotogenic zones, the mouth with its oral cannibalistic drives, the anus with “its anal-sadistic- aggressive drives, and the primary sexual organs and their genital drives”; (4) “the *biologically predetermined Oedipus complex*”; (5) “a *primordial language composed of archaic symbols in the form of imagery*,” held to be a biologically hereditary feature of human nature and appearing in dreams, myths, and folk-lore; and (6) “a *biologically inherited racial unconscious*, the repository of all the phylogenetic memories, infantile sexual phases, and Oedipus drives and taboos against them, as well as of the primordial symbolic language.” The collapse of Freud’s anthropology has been responsible for much of Freudian revisionism.<sup>54</sup>

But Freud was in many respects wiser than his critics, and, in adopting the anthropological basis he did, was not unaware of its controversial character. Throughout his career, as that anthropology came under increasing fire, Freud made no attempt to alter it. Instead, he developed it more intensively in the face of criticism. Freud’s reason for this was a simple one: he was an evolutionary scientist, and he recognized that evolution was fundamental to his perspective. And evolution required somewhere an act of faith, or else it had to assume continuous miracles to provide the machinery or mechanism of evolutionary faith. Freud accordingly held that the only way out of the evolutionary impasse was to follow Lamarck, and, as Jones notes, “he adhered throughout his life” to the Lamarckian belief.<sup>55</sup>

## 4

# Lamarck's Influence

It was Lamarck (Jean Baptiste Pierre Antoine de Monet, 1744- 1829) who created the word “biology,” and the debt which modern science owes to him is greater than is generally acknowledged. His life-theory was, simply stated, that life is motion; the most essential quality of life is motion, so that the two can be equated. Life is thus development and growth, absorption and excretion, and it develops without external interference of a supernatural sort. All of man's properties and faculties were developed by exercise of them, through motion, so that experience is an important part of evolution, and past experiences constitute a part of man's basic equipment and heredity. How else could the instincts of animals, of ants, spiders, migrating birds, and other things of similar nature, be accounted for? They were either implanted, which pointed to the supernatural, or acquired, which pointed to the natural. Acquired characteristics are thus basic to Lamarckianism as they are to all evolutionary thought. Evolution must deny the transmission of acquired characteristics, because it is both unprovable and false; it must assume, however, the development and transmission of acquired characteristics, or else evolution is an impossibility. Freud understood this very clearly, and thus he remained a Lamarckian and trusted in a Lamarckian anthropology in the face of no small scientific hostility, because he was better aware than were his critics of the issue at stake. The Freudian revisionists, notably Karen Horney, have to a degree substituted contemporary culture for Lamarckian anthropology as the critical influence on man. But Freud never denied the impact of culture. He simply saw the power of man's Lamarckian past as too great for the present, a fleeting moment in comparison to man's vast unconscious, to alter it more than faintly. The revisionists were thus comparable to Trofim Denisovich Lysenko (1898-1976), who was ready to believe that heredity could be changed by good husbandry, which was to misread Lamarck, and to make the mechanism of acquired characteristics a light and trifling one. The acquisitions gained by millions of years are not changed lightly by an agricultural experiment station or a series of sessions with a psychoanalyst. For Freud, however ridiculous or insulting to many some aspects of his anthropology might seem, if evolution were true, it had to have happened in some such fashion. “If nothing is acquired nothing can be inherited.”<sup>56</sup> Lamarckism had to be maintained and developed.<sup>57</sup> Many, like Jones, who claimed to be unswerving Freudians, failed to see the important issue at stake.<sup>58</sup> For Jones, Freud was “what one must call an obstinate adherent of this discredited Lamarckism.”<sup>59</sup> Freud, on the contrary, saw the wisdom of Lamarck and sought to re-establish Lamarckism on post-Darwinian *and* post-Freudian theory, but his followers did not see the matter with Freud's own clarity of vision.<sup>60</sup> For Freud the issue was simple: invalidate Lamarck, and you invalidate evolution. His followers moved with the tides and fashions of scientific thought, so that Jones could dismiss Lamarckism on the authority of “Julian Huxley, than whom there is no higher authority”!<sup>61</sup>

Lamarck, moreover, offered the very slimmest hope possible to man. Perhaps, in his long future history, man might gradually learn to control and to modify his inheritance and to acquire new

characteristics, but Freud saw very little likelihood of this. As much as anyone else, Freud wanted a way out for man, and he was ready to search for it in every direction except religiously, in Biblical religion in particular. He was ready to consider many areas of study seriously, such as psychic research, which other scientists usually frowned upon, not because he was less scientific than they, but because he was more aware than most of the desperate circumstance of man. Man, guilt-ridden, was using all the products of technology only to intensify his will to death and to increase his masochistic potentialities. Freud wanted no less than anyone else to deliver man into the green pastures of uninhibited and free sexuality, but, however much many read Freud in these terms, Freud, despite occasional expressions of hope, saw it otherwise, and correctly so. For to deny God's sovereign and absolute law was also to deny God's way of escape, his sovereign and saving grace. In place of this, Freud had only the sovereign and total power of an infallible inner law, with no way of escape and absolutely no grace. Stoical self-knowledge was the only possible answer.

# 5

## Psychology

Let us examine briefly Freud's concept of man's psychology in the context of this anthropology. For Freud, "in the psychological field the biological factor is really the rock-bottom,"<sup>62</sup> and by this he meant evolutionary and Lamarckian biology. The human personality consists for Freud of three major systems, the *id*, the *ego*, and the *Super-ego*. Much of the misunderstanding of Freud comes from a failure to recognize these distinctions, which are seen as captious, novel, and utterly lacking in experimental evidence, being held to be mere inventions of Freud. This they may be, but if we translate Freud's terms into more familiar terminology, terms which he bypasses to avoid their non-scientific connotations, they become suddenly very clear.

Freud took pains to spell out the meaning of the *id* in *An Outline of Psychoanalysis*, *The Ego and the Id*, and in the *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*. The *id*, the oldest aspect of man's personality, contains everything that is inherited, fixed in man's nature, present at birth, and instinctual, and it is beyond the laws of logic, especially beyond the law of contradiction. It has no negation, no concept of time or recognition of the passage of time, and it is without knowledge of values, morality, good or evil. It is simply instinctual "cathexes" or sums of psychic energy seeking discharge. In itself it is without conflicts; everything in the *id* is unconscious and remains so. The *id* is fearless and totally amoral, and it "obeys the inexorable pleasure principle." The *id* was a more specific concept than the *unconscious*, which included the repressed impulses, and it represented undifferentiated energy derived "from the two primary Life and Death Instincts." The *id* is the foundation of the personality; it is infantile, wants instant gratification, believes in its own omnipotence, is incapable of thought but wishes and acts. The *id* seeks pleasure, self-gratification, and the avoidance of pain. The *id* is the inner world of man before a single experience of the external world occurs. The *id* is unconscious and unorganized libido. The *id* thus, despite very real differences, can be compared to what Christian theology speaks of as the first Adam or "old man" in man, or, more specifically, as his original sin, that aspect of his being which makes him federally one with Adam so that he is born into sin and is by nature a child of sin and death. For Freud the life and death instincts are both present in the *id*. For Christian theology, sin, or the desire to be as God, who is the author and wellspring of life and totally creative, is basic to the old man even as are the inevitable outworkings of death.<sup>63</sup>

The *ego* is the "I" of man, the organized aspect of the *id*, a psychological organization which mediates between his senses and his needs, and it is his urge to synthesis, to a unity of his conflicting impulses and the harsh reality of an external world which is not under the dominion of the *id*. The *ego* is governed by *the reality principle*; it is determined by the individual's own experiences. It must keep down the irrational demands of the *id*, for, being governed by the experiences of the man, the *ego* is aware of reality, whereas the *id* demands only its pleasure, total self-gratification. The *ego* is thus a transaction between the person and his world, so that the *ego* is molded by the culture in a way impossible for the *id*. In a well-adjusted man, the *ego*

governs both the *id* and the *Super-ego* and lives in harmony with the external world to the advantage of the total personality. Although the *ego* is culturally affected, its lines of development and adjustment are conditioned by heredity and by natural processes of growth. The *ego*, like the *id*, is capable of phantasy, but it has the ability to recognize that it is daydreaming. It does not confuse its pleasure-seeking hopes with reality. An important aspect of the *ego*, according to Freud, is this, "that the ego has no sexual currents, but only an interest in its own self-protection and in the preservation of its narcissism."<sup>64</sup> The *ego* is not necessarily at war with the *id*. It can be seeking its fulfillment in terms of reality. As Freud stated it,

Just as the pleasure-ego can do nothing but *wish*, work towards gaining pleasure and avoiding "pain," so the reality-ego need do nothing but strive for what is *useful* and guard itself against damage. Actually, the substitution of the reality-principle for the pleasure-principle denotes no dethronement of the pleasure principle, but only a safeguarding of it. A momentary pleasure, uncertain in its results, is given up, but only in order to gain in the new way an assured pleasure coming later. But the end psychic impression made by this substitution has been so powerful that it is mirrored in a special religious myth. The doctrine of reward in a future life for the — voluntary or enforced — renunciation of earthly lusts is nothing but a mythical projection of this revolution in the mind.<sup>65</sup>

Moreover, "neurosis is the result of a conflict between the ego and its *id*, whereas psychosis is the analogous outcome of a similar disturbance in the relation between the ego and its environment (outer world)."<sup>66</sup> Being governed by reality, the ego is compelled to exercise repression of certain demands of its own being.

When the *id* makes a demand on the *ego*, the natural reaction of the *ego* is to gratify that instinctual demand. *Cathexes*, or physical energies, in the *id*, almost like an electrical charge, want an outlet, and, in terms of the reality principle, the *ego* seeks to gain an outlet for the *cathexes*.<sup>67</sup> But the *ego* must also deal with *anti-cathexes*, a checking force or repression of the physical energies or *cathexes*. There is a process which maintains the repression and ensures its continuance; behind this process is the "*anti-cathexis*, by means of which the system Pcs (preconscious) guards itself against the intrusion of the unconscious idea."<sup>68</sup> Why this repression? "In the course of individual development a part of the inhibiting forces in the outer world becomes internalized; a standard is created in the Ego which opposes the other faculties by observation, criticism and prohibition. We call this new process the *Super-ego*." As a result, the *ego*, before it can satisfy the *id*, must "consider not only the dangers of the outer world, but also the objections of the Super-ego," so that repression is more prevalent than satisfaction. "The Super-ego is the successor and representative of the parents (and educators) who superintended the actions of the individual in his first years of life; it perpetuates their functions almost without a change. It keeps the Ego in lasting dependence and exercises a steady pressure." As a result, the *ego* seeks to satisfy these authorities, now fully internalized, and to court their praise in its sacrifices to the *Super-ego*.<sup>69</sup> The *Super-ego* can thus be an enemy of the *id* and a repressive force, but it can also unite with the *id* in condemning the *ego* as a vile and unworthy thing.

These are the three systems that operate within man and make up his personality. It is by this time apparent that, despite the strangeness of their names, they are very familiar categories to

Western thought. The *id* bears a marked resemblance to the old, fallen Adamic *will* of man, his inheritance as a member of the human race. The *ego* has a resemblance to the *mind* of man in the larger sense of the word, and the *Super-ego* is even more clearly to be compared to the *conscience*. The resemblance is close enough to tempt one to read Freud in terms of traditional categories, especially as we recognize that Freud made the question of *man's guilt* basic to psychology. But, when this is noted, it must then be added that Freud faced the guilt question openly and plainly, not in any even remotely religious sense, but in order to destroy ruthlessly the possibility of a religious concept of guilt by a biological, anthropological, non-moral and non-religious interpretation thereof. Thus he faced the religious issue of guilt with a messianic faith in science's ability, if not to dissolve guilt, at least to reduce it to *biology* and then to answer it with scientific understanding. Other psychologists have sought to ignore the religious implications of man's personality. Freud recognized them and sought to dissolve and destroy them. Not only was his approach to man and his guilt to be nonreligious, but it was to be purged also of philosophy and to become strictly biological. Freud labored under the illusion that science involved no pre-theoretical religious and philosophical presuppositions. Psychoanalysis could not serve any philosophy or philosophical outlook, for this would only be "tyranny, even though disguised by the most honourable motives."<sup>70</sup>

## 6

# The Libido Theory

To return again to Freud's concept of the personality, let us consider briefly one of its most controversial aspects, the *libido* theory. The analysis of character formation, and the establishment of repressions and character in childhood, is not too far from long established theories. But to describe man's instinctual energy as essentially sexual aroused a tremendous storm. Freud defined libido as "a term used in the theory of the instincts for describing the dynamic manifestation of sexuality."<sup>71</sup> The libido is ego energy, for the ego is its "first dwelling-place," which it energizes and makes its permanent headquarters.<sup>72</sup> The libido is the life instincts expressed, but death instincts also are present in man. For the present, however, let us consider the libido. Its sexual orientation has been the basis of a savage and protracted attack on Freud; it has also brought to his defense every kind of libertine force imaginable. Is there a justification for Freud's position? It is immediately apparent that sexuality has often had a religious centrality in man's history, as Baal worship and all fertility cults clearly indicate. Moreover, very often in times of crisis men have turned to sexuality as a religious synonym for life, and the proximity of death has intensified sexuality. At the end of the Middle Ages, the plague in Europe brought not only death but also a fanatical plunge into sexuality. More recently, when the 1906 earthquake brought ruin to San Francisco and a severe shaking to Oakland, terrified men "lined up for blocks" in Oakland in front of houses of prostitution "all day long and at night," seeking, in the face of the nearness of death, to affirm life by means of sexuality.<sup>73</sup> This evidence is real but far from conclusive. In each instance, what is involved is either a decadent and degenerate culture or a degenerate stratum of society. Freud's thesis here has been undercut by biological studies which indicate that sexuality is predominant among caged, zoo animals, who live in a maximum security welfare economy, whereas among wild animals the primary concern of the male is dominion, or hierarchy, and territoriality, or property.<sup>74</sup> Freud's biology was thus based on zoo animals, and his anthropology on decadent socialistic men, on welfare cultures rather than a free society. At this point Freud's thesis is hurt but not destroyed. His attempt to read guilt in biological terms can survive this crippling of theory.

For Freud, "the forces of the neuroses originate in the sexual life."<sup>75</sup> And sexual life is burdened by guilt, coming in part from the *Super-ego* and the early, repressive training of the child, and from the *id*, where ancient taboos are equally strong impulses as are biological energies. As a result, man is torn between a desire to violate the taboo and a desire to obey the taboo, the result being a continual ambivalence, a "wish and counter-wish."<sup>76</sup> This conflict leads to the repression of the libido, which repression produces *anxiety*.<sup>77</sup> Freud's concepts of neuroses and anxiety are thus clearly related to his biological interpretation of guilt.

## Freud and Religion

And biological it had to be for Freud, who sought to dissolve religion by science. Freud's own evaluation of his position is a significant one: "I regard myself as one of the most dangerous enemies of religion."<sup>78</sup> Of God, Freud said, "I stand in no awe whatever of the Almighty. If we were ever to meet I should have more reproaches to make to Him than He could make to me. I would ask Him why He hadn't endowed me with a better intellectual equipment, and He couldn't complain that I have failed to make the best use of my so-called freedom."<sup>79</sup> As a Jew, he felt a dislike for Christianity and referred in a letter to non-Jews as "the infidels."<sup>80</sup> Christianity was to him a "myth."<sup>81</sup> He explained it away with his anthropological myth of parricide by the primal horde.<sup>82</sup> His animosity was frequently in evidence.<sup>83</sup> But we miss the issue completely if we fail to see that Freud, as a Jew, was more in rebellion against Moses than against Jesus Christ. His hatred of even the forms of Judaism, and he was aware of its departures from the Biblical standard, was intense, because of its association with Moses and the God of Moses. His son Martin has pointed out that, despite his Jewish social orientation, Sigmund Freud "never permitted himself to be affected by religious considerations."<sup>84</sup> Jones stated it more plainly: Freud "despised" his parents' orthodox Judaism.<sup>85</sup> So strongly did he feel about it that, before his wedding, he seriously considered turning to a nominal Protestantism in order "to be able to marry without the complicated Jewish ceremonies he hated so much."<sup>86</sup> On occasion, he could express himself with cynicism or contempt toward Jews. Thus, on hearing of Alfred Adler's death, he told Arnold Zweig that he could not understand his "sympathy" for the death of "a Jew boy" who had been "richly" rewarded "for his service in having contradicted psychoanalysis."<sup>87</sup> Freud denied knowing Hebrew and Yiddish, although the evidence indicates he knew both.<sup>88</sup> On the whole, however, Freud, while contemptuous of the Mosaic authority, was a dedicated Jew. His letter, a year before his death, to the Committee of the Yiddish Scientific Institute (Y.I.V.O.) best expressed his feelings: "I gladly and proudly acknowledge my Jewishness though my attitude toward any religion, including ours, is critically negative."<sup>89</sup> A moderately interested Zionist, Freud was a dedicated member of the B'nai B'rith Lodge, to whom he wrote his earnest appreciation on May 6, 1926: "You were my first audience." He shared with them "an inner identity, the familiarity of the same psychological structure." He recognized "that it was only to my Jewish nature that I owed the two qualities that have become indispensable to me throughout my difficult life," first, a prejudice-free intellect, and second, preparation "to be in the opposition and to renounce agreement with the 'compact majority.'"<sup>90</sup>

Freud's background had deep roots in Jewish heretical thought — religious and philosophical thought in rebellion against the merest shadow of Mosaic law. The mystic, Jacob Frank (1726-1791), for example, had expounded the doctrine of the holiness of Sin. "Through sin, salvation would come. From the great sinning would emerge a world in which there would no longer be sin."<sup>91</sup> This concept was close to the whole illuminist tradition of the day, reflected also in the thought of Heinrich von Kleist. In the Jewish tradition, the purpose of these heresies was to break

the yoke of the Torah, the yoke of Moses, and to proclaim the Law dead. The Kabbalistic tradition, according to Bakan, is deeply imbedded in psychoanalysis, and the *Zohar* hinted symbolically “at the psychoanalytic notion that the depths of sexual satisfaction are in having intercourse with the Mother.”<sup>92</sup> Freud concealed the heretical Jewish nature of his theories lest it lead to increased hostility to the Jew as a concomitant of the hostility which psychoanalysis would assuredly arouse.<sup>93</sup> But Freud, Bakan holds, himself a Jew, was clearly in the line of Sabbatai, the false Messiah of the Jews of the 17th century, who “secularized Jewish Mysticism; and psychoanalysis can intelligently be viewed as such a secularization.” Freud had “Sabbatian tendencies.”<sup>94</sup> All this was true, and Freud was strongly desirous of an antinomian victory, but he himself was to pronounce judgment on those tendencies!

But the matter can be pushed further than the “mystical tradition.” Behind both Jewish and Christian heresies, there has often been a strong antinomianism rooted in ancient European, Asiatic, and New Eastern fertility cults, many of which long survived in Europe, including Russia. These are all comparable to what the Old Testament called Baal worship, wherein this faith was pushed to its logical conclusions. It is not surprising that, in both church and synagogue, heretical thinkers have been harking back to the values of Baal worship. This has been done more openly in Jewish circles, as witness Theodore H. Gaster’s vindication of Baal worship.<sup>95</sup> Dr. Richard L. Rubenstein, Director of the Hillel Foundation and Chaplain to Jewish students at the University of Pittsburgh, hailed, before a Protestant audience, “our rediscovery of Israel’s earth and the lost divinities of that earth. Once again, we have come into contact with those powers of life and death which engendered men’s feelings about Baal, Astarte, and Anath. These powers have again become decisive in our religious life.”<sup>96</sup>

Freud was very deeply a part of this tradition. He sought to cover traces of its immediate Jewish source by welcoming “Christian” followers.<sup>97</sup> It was important to Freud, as he very bluntly told his Jewish followers, that Jung become permanent president of the Psycho-Analytic Congress (1910) in order to remove the Jewish label from Freudian theory.<sup>98</sup> Jones later served a similar purpose, no doubt.<sup>99</sup> Freud saw himself both as the enemy of Moses and also another Moses, pointing the way to a new promised land, seen only from afar.<sup>100</sup> As “the new Lawgiver,” he “must be destructive of Moses. The new Lawgiver must revoke the older Law.” Freud, as he viewed Michelangelo’s Moses, saw himself as one of the mob who had turned to the fertility cult worship of the golden calf, and as the object of Moses’ law and wrath.<sup>101</sup> Freud wrote *Moses and Monotheism* to accomplish two things: first, to thrust Moses out of Jewry, to make him a Gentile, an Egyptian, and thus not one of the chosen people, and, second, to “murder” Moses and his Law.<sup>102</sup> Significantly, Freud identified himself, a “passionate identification,” Jones tells us, with Hannibal,<sup>103</sup> whom Freud saw as representing the old Jewish (Canaanite) opposition to Rome (the Catholic Church).<sup>104</sup> Freud took this ancient rootage seriously: “In his rooms Freud surrounded himself with every heathen god he could find.”<sup>105</sup> The Devil in Jewish legend tempted Jews to apostasy, in a sense to the golden calf. Freud saw himself as Satan in this sense, as a deliverer, and remarked, “Do you know that I am the Devil? All my life I have had to play the Devil, in order that others would be able to build the most beautiful cathedral with the materials that I produced.”<sup>106</sup> His role was messianic.

Thereby, under the ruse of “playing the Devil” he served Sabbatian interests. He narrowed the gap between Jewish culture and Western enlightenment. In this

respect, however, just as Freud may be regarded as having infused Kabbala into science, so he may be regarded as having incorporated science into Kabbala. Sabbatian-wise, by closing the gap between Jewish culture and Western enlightenment, he acts as the Messiah not only for Jewish culture but for the Western culture as well.<sup>107</sup>

His mission was to destroy Moses, who represented the Law and the *guilt* of the Law. By making Moses an Egyptian, and then “killing” him, “Freud becomes a Jewish hero in the history of the Jews. He performs the traditional Messianic function of relieving guilt, the very same function he ascribes to Jesus.”<sup>108</sup>

In *Moses and Monotheism*, Freud’s premise, without any evidence, is that Moses was an Egyptian. This is all-important for Freud: it is impossible for both Moses and Freud to claim the right to express authentically the elect, racial calling and the word of deliverance. And, for Freud, the bondage of the Law is more fearful than bondage to Pharaoh, so that Moses is a false deliverer. This Egyptian origin of Moses was “based only on psychological probabilities and lacked objective proof.”<sup>109</sup> The “psychological probabilities,” we might add, were entirely in Freud’s mind and premised on his own sense of his destiny as against Moses. Moses the Egyptian transmitted his own Egyptian faith, “that of Ikhnaton, the Aton religion,” to the Jews.<sup>110</sup> Jews rose up in rebellion against this enslaving tyrant, Moses, and murdered him. But they then faced the wrath of Moses and his Law in their own nature, through the return of the repressed, for even as with the primal horde, the Law of the Father remained. Moses, as a father, gained his vengeance through their *id* and *Super-ego*, in whom survives “the archetype of God, the primeval Father, and his reincarnations.”<sup>111</sup> Freud thus felt that his “research” freed man in that it “reduces religion to the status of a neurosis of mankind.”<sup>112</sup> Man’s freedom required the abolition of religion. “In Soviet Russia the attempt has been made to better the life of a hundred million people till now held in suppression. The authorities were bold enough to deprive them of the anodyne of religion and wise enough to grant them a reasonable measure of sexual freedom.”<sup>113</sup> It is thus quite clear that Freud hoped that by the abolition of religion man’s freedom would be effected. Brill goes so far as to speak of “Freud’s dictum that no neurosis is possible in a normal sexual life.”<sup>114</sup> Freud gave grounds for such a conclusion, but even more grounds against it.

Freud’s three favorites among his books were *The Interpretation of Dreams*, the *Three Essays*, and *Totem and Taboo*. But he made clear that, apart from these, “perhaps the one for which he had the greatest personal affection was his book on Leonardo.”<sup>115</sup> There is more than a little evidence for this comment. It is important to note that Freud’s *Leonardo da Vinci* (1910) was his one experiment in “biography.” Freud “had the utmost respect” for Leonardo’s greatness and identified himself with Leonardo as a lone searcher for natural knowledge.<sup>116</sup> Indeed, Jones goes so far as to say, “I am led to this conclusion by the feeling that much of what Freud said when he penetrated into Leonardo’s personality was at the same time a self-description; there was surely an extensive identification between Leonardo and himself. There we learned that Leonardo was torn by two impulses: the passion for scientific knowledge and the passion for creating works of art.”<sup>117</sup> It is not our concern here to evaluate Freud’s analysis, nor his absurd blunder at a critical point.<sup>118</sup> What is of interest is Freud’s identification with a man accused but acquitted of homosexuality of whom Freud said, “It is doubtful whether Leonardo ever embraced a woman in love, nor is it known that he ever entertained an intimate spiritual relation with a woman.”<sup>119</sup>

Moreover, Leonardo's desire for exhaustive knowledge led him to leave his works usually unfinished.<sup>120</sup> Freud, by contrast, was a family man and a bold and ready theorizer. "Leonardo's dictum," as Freud saw it was this: "Instead of acting and producing, one just investigates."<sup>121</sup> Here we begin to recognize the identification: Freud could be a Moses only to a point. He knew that there was in all likelihood no promised land; it could be envisioned from afar but not entered into. Investigation, understanding, then becomes the only proper work of the enlightened one. The hope concerning Russia which he had expressed in his last book, *Moses and Monotheism*, he had denied too many times before. Years before, in his Clark University lectures in the United States, he had denied the possibility of escape through sexuality. If guilt were the product of the Super-ego alone, then the freethinking education of the child would remove guilt and repression. But the id itself is a will to death as well as a will to pleasure, so that the id carries not only guilt within its being, but a sentence of death on that guilt.

In the inner conflict of man, therefore, "this conflict is not resolved by helping one side to win a victory over the other." Neither asceticism nor the advice to "live freely" will avail. Neither "solution" will end the inner conflict; "one side in either event will remain unsatisfied," for man is a walking law or Torah of ancient taboos which govern him infallibly. But Freud does not want to defend "conventional morality. That is at least as far removed from our purpose as the other." Freud is not a "reformer" but an "observer." Conventional sexual morality, he firmly and strongly condemns: "what the world calls its code of morals demands more sacrifices than it is worth." Neither "sexual license" nor "unconditional asceticism" (although he stated that its neurotic implications could be and often were over estimated), nor any middle course were of any avail. If any "therapeutic effect of psycho-analysis" were in evidence, it was "the substitution of something conscious for something unconscious, the transformation of the unconscious thoughts into conscious thoughts, that makes our work effective."<sup>122</sup> In other words, understanding is the key, so that, whether we follow the way of asceticism, license, or conventional morality, our "liberty" is not in a change of ways but is an understanding of why we behave as we do.

Freud stated this most clearly in a letter of April 9, 1935, to a woman whose son was a homosexual. He rebuked her for her horror and shame. "Homosexuality is assuredly no advantage, but it is nothing to be ashamed of, no vice, no degradation; it cannot be classified as an illness; we consider it to be a variation of the sexual function, produced by a certain arrest of sexual development." Many "highly respectable individuals" have been homosexuals, such as Plato, Michelangelo, Leonardo and others. "It is a great injustice to persecute homosexuality as a crime — and a cruelty, too. If you do not believe me, read the books of Havelock Ellis." As for curing her son, i.e., to "abolish homosexuality and make normal heterosexuality take its place," Freud said "in a general way we cannot promise to achieve it ... what analysis can do for your son runs in a different line. If he is unhappy, neurotic, torn by conflicts, inhibited in his social life, analysis may bring him harmony, peace of mind, full efficiency, whether he remains homosexual or gets changed."<sup>123</sup>

Freud has thus accomplished his purpose to a degree. God has been replaced by the biological myth, evolution, and the fall of man by the anthropological myth, parricide by the primal horde. The law has been abolished, and Moses exorcised. Guilt remains now, not as a violation of the law of God, but as an offense against the inner law of man's unconscious. The penalty is real,

however mythical the original offense. But, in the face of this, *enlightenment*, while not freeing a man from the penalty of guilt, at least enables him to recognize it as mythical so that he can live with it and in a sense deny it. Freud's enlightenment is thus comparable in a sense to Christian Science faith: sickness is unreal, because all is Mind, and the body (matter) non-existent; hence, there is no death, but, if in the meantime we break a leg or begin to die, we have the consolation of knowing that all is Father-Mother-Mind, and hence nothing we experience is real. Frank Podmore's *From Mesmer to Christian Science, A Short History of Mental Healing*, could be properly extended to include psychoanalysis and Freud. Podmore (1855-1910) was one of the founders of the Fabian Society; the interconnections of occultism, mental healing, socialism, and relativism run deep.

Let us return to Freud's letter to the homosexual's mother. It is apparent here that he does not flinch from his conclusion that, *because there is no law, there is no sin, no crime*. As a result, the most that one can call a criminal offense is "mental sickness," a concept clearly stemming from Freud. If we think in terms of sin, we imply responsibility and hence restitution and punishment. If we think in terms of mental illness, we deny responsibility and make it a medical or psychiatric matter. As a poster widely circulated in the 1950's stated it, "Mental sickness is no disgrace. It might happen to anyone." In other words, there is *no* responsibility.<sup>124</sup> This means that man, not being responsible, has no true liberty, and hence is not entitled to civil liberties either. He can be hospitalized indefinitely for crime and experimented on by psychiatrists. He has no rights.<sup>125</sup>

# 8

## The State

To return to Freud's thesis, no law, no crime, *only guilt*: This guilt is primeval and it haunts man, *whose nature both demands and denies* three "instinctual wishes of incest, of cannibalism, and of murder."<sup>126</sup> The reaction of most people to this concept is one of disgust, but the matter becomes more understandable if we recognize that the incest is directed against the mother and sisters, the murder and cannibalism against the father, and all three involve in Freud's mind a kind of murder of God and a violation of his law. This his nature both demands and savagely condemns, and this tension tears man apart. Socialism is thus a specious answer, however much Freud wanted it to be true.

At first we were tempted to seek the essence of culture in the existing material resources and in the arrangements for their distribution. But with the discovery that every culture is based on compulsory labour and instinctual renunciation, and that it therefore inevitably evokes opposition from those affected by these demands, it became clear that the resources themselves, the means of acquiring them, and the arrangements for their distribution could not be its essential or unique characteristic; for they are threatened by the rebelliousness and destructive passions of the members of the culture. Thus in addition to the resources there are the means of defending culture; the coercive measures, and others that are intended to reconcile men to it and to recompense them for their sacrifices. And these last may be described as the psychical sphere of culture.<sup>127</sup>

But he did favor some kind of elitism, such as the dictatorship of the proletariat represented, for "government of the masses by a minority" is "impossible to do without, for the masses are lazy and unintelligent."<sup>128</sup> On the other hand, "culture has little to fear from the educated or from the brainworkers." These men are secular and enlightened. The masses, on discovering the atheism of the leaders, would follow their scientific results and atheism "without having effected in themselves the process of change which scientific thought induces in men." Having no fear of God and incapable of scientific enlightenment, they "will certainly kill without hesitation.... And so follows the necessity for either the most rigorous suppression of these dangerous masses and the most careful exclusion of all opportunities for mental awakening, or a fundamental revision of the relation between culture and religion."<sup>129</sup> What hope is there then for a religion-free future of any value to man?<sup>130</sup> What will man be without the "narcotic" of religion?<sup>131</sup> The problems will be real, and Freud admitted "the possibility that I too am chasing after an illusion," but man should still hope and experiment with "a non-religious education," meaning a value-free one as well.<sup>132</sup> The "childishness" must be outgrown and "overcome," for "man cannot remain a child forever; he must venture at last into the hostile world. This may be called 'education to reality'; need I tell you that it is the sole aim of my book to draw attention to the necessity for this

advance?”<sup>133</sup> But the implied aim was that a totalitarian state was needed to ensure this growth without anarchy.

If you wish to expel religion from our European civilization you can only do it through another system of doctrines, and from the outset this would take over all the psychological characteristics of religion, the same sanctity, rigidity, and intolerance, the same prohibition of thought in self-defense. Something of this sort you must have in justice to the requirements of education.<sup>134</sup>

This passage, by-passed by most discussions of Freud, is a plain call for a psychoanalytical Grand Inquisitor who will institute, in the name of “justice to the requirements of education” a totalitarian state which would even resort to the “prohibition of thought in self-defense,” the “thought” in question being clearly biblical faith. All this is in the name of a hope which Freud admits may be illusory and is certainly remote!

What avenue of hope was there to be explored? Religions are all “mass-delusions.”<sup>135</sup> Sustained happiness is unbearable to man, who finds “it is much less difficult to be unhappy,” for “we are so constituted that we can only intensely enjoy contrasts, much less intensely states in themselves.”<sup>136</sup> Moreover, “the liberty of the individual is not a benefit of culture,” which rests on repression.<sup>137</sup> “Human civilization rests upon two pillars, of which one is the control of natural forces and the other the restriction of our instincts. The ruler’s throne rests upon fettered slaves.” The sexual instincts in particular are strong, savage, and anti-social.<sup>138</sup> But “civilized” sexual morality is injurious and produces a nervous, sickly person. Hence “the urgency” of sexual reform.<sup>139</sup> Yet people cannot be urged to sexual measures against which they have inner repressions.<sup>140</sup> And “sublimation of instinct” is necessary to cultural evolution; it is productive to science. There has to be an economy of deprivation so that serious disorders may be avoided, but deprivation there must be to a degree.<sup>141</sup> Where then is there any hope? *Eros* offers hope, for it “aims at binding together single human individuals, then families, then tribes, races, nations, into one great unity, that of humanity.” *Eros* thus is an avenue of hope. “These masses of men must be bound to one another libidinally; necessity alone, the advantage of common work, would not hold them together.” In this line of thinking, Freud was a father of the Brock Chisholm type of belief that one worldism is the culmination of *Eros* and of true mental health, with opposition to one being mental sickness. But with Freud’s relativism, how can he say *Eros* is more important than *Death*, the will to love more basic than the will to death? His position is a form of ancient dualism but one without a criterion of discrimination between light and darkness.

The natural instinct of aggressiveness in man, the hostility of each one against all and of all against each one, opposes this programme of civilization. This instinct of aggression is the derivative and main representative of the death instinct we have found alongside of *Eros*, sharing his rule over the earth. And now, it seems to me, the meaning of evolution of culture is no longer a riddle to us. It must present to us the struggle between *Eros* and *Death*, between the instincts of life and the instincts of destruction, as it works itself out in the human species. This struggle is what all life essentially consists of and so the evolution of civilization may be simply described as the struggle of the human species for existence. And

it is this battle of the Titans that our nurses and governesses try to compose with their lullaby-song of Heaven!<sup>142</sup>

These are “two ‘heavenly forces’” of equal power, Death and the “equally immortal adversary,” “eternal Eros.” Freud thus declines the attractive role of a prophet of glad tidings. “I bow to their reproach that I have no consolation to offer them; for at bottom this is what they all demand--the frenzied revolutionary as passionately as the most pious believer.”<sup>143</sup>

Freud’s hopes might be on the side of Eros, socialism and one-worldism, but he could only renounce such hopes as illusory. Thus, he expressed his respect for Romain Rolland in a letter to him of March 4, 1923, as one whose “name has been associated with the most precious of beautiful illusions, that of love extended to all mankind.” Being himself a Jew, Freud said, he was not readily given to believing in illusions. Moreover, “a great part of my life’s work,” he continued, has been spent in destroying personal illusions “and those of mankind.” Freud’s writings could not be what Rolland’s were, “comfort and refreshment for the reader.” And yet Freud had a good word for Rolland’s “beautiful illusion”:

But if this one hope cannot be at least partly realized, if in the course of evolution we don’t learn to divert our instincts from destroying our own kind, if we continue to hate one another for minor differences and kill each other for petty gain, if we go on exploiting the great progress made in the control of natural resources for our mutual destruction, what kind of future lies in store for us? It is surely hard enough to ensure the perpetuation of our species in the conflict between our instinctual nature and the demands made upon us by civilization.<sup>144</sup>

Freud again expressed both his pessimism and hope in “Why War?” (1932), an exchange of letters with Albert Einstein (1879- 1955) for publication. In answering Einstein on “Right and Might,” Freud pointed out “that right is the might of the community. It is still violence, ready to be directed against any individual who resists it; it works by the same methods and follows the same purposes.” Is there no difference then? One difference, Freud held: “What prevails is no longer the violence of an individual but that of a community.” This transition is psychologically effected when “the union of the majority” is “a stable and lasting one,” thereby assuring the identification of might, right, or law. This community of the majority must be permanent, well-organized, capable of anticipating and suppressing rebellion and executing “legal acts of violence.” It is violence within a community that produces peace. Moreover, wars between nations are “a far from inappropriate means of establishing the eagerly desired reign of ‘everlasting’ peace, since it is in a position to create the larger units within which a powerful central government makes further wars impossible.” The weakness of this method is the lack of cohesiveness between the constituent parts. The answer is some kind of world order stronger than the League of Nations. “Wars will only be prevented with certainty if mankind unites in setting up a central authority to which the right of giving judgment upon all conflicts of interest shall be handed over. There are clearly two separate requirements involved in this: the creation of a supreme authority and its endowment with the necessary power.” Nationalism is hostile to such an order, while Communism is held by many to be congenial to it. In any case, force cannot be replaced by “the force of ideas,” for “law was originally brute violence and that even to-day it cannot do without the support of violence.” For Freud there was no higher law and no right to

which power must be subservient. There are only human instincts, and these are of two kinds, *Eros*, or the sexual in its broadest sense on the one hand, and “the aggressive or destructive instinct” on the other. We have here a polarity, *but not a moral one*. “We must not be too hasty in introducing ethical judgments of good and evil. Neither of these instincts is any less essential than the other; the phenomena of life arise from the operation of both together, whether acting in concert or in opposition.” Thus, Freud reduced his own preference for a one-world socialist order to a purely non-moral matter of personal taste. The death instinct and the life instinct are equally valid, if value can be used as a criterion. “There is no use in trying to get rid of men’s aggressive inclinations.” Communists are guilty of illusion if such is their hope.

But how can Freud’s own one-world hopes be achieved? “Our mythological theory of instincts makes it easy for us to find a formula for *in-direct* methods of combating war.” *Eros* must be encouraged to stand more strongly against *Thanatos*. Two kinds of ties between men can be encouraged: first, a love of neighbor, and, second, “identification” through a community of interests. This will correct imbalance. The encroachments of Church and State “upon freedom of thought” need to be removed. “The ideal condition of things would of course be a community of men who had subordinated their instinctual life to the dictatorship of reason.” And for Freud this “dictatorship of reason” meant a total power like that of Plato’s philosopher-kings, enlightened rulers of absolute power. “Nothing else could unite men so completely and so tenaciously even if there were no emotional ties between them. But in all probability that is a Utopian expectation.” This last sentence is typical of Freud; his hope is real, but his denial of that hope is equally real. He was ready to make a case for war and yet call himself a pacifist “for organic reasons” and hope that “the rest of mankind become pacifists too.” Thus he hoped, but even in hoping called his pacifism “an idiosyncrasy.”<sup>145</sup> The one-world order he hoped for was an order built on violence, and reason itself was no more than a biological aspect of man, a thin veneer over a vast unconscious. Freud had written at length on the nature of dreams as an infallible index to the unconscious forces in man. Could not the dream of reason, including Freud’s own, be dismissed also as a significance only in terms of the unconscious in man, rather than a valid ground for action? Freud could not say.

The death instinct was for him equally valid, equally real with the will to live. “It is not a question of an optimistic as opposed to a pessimistic theory of life.”<sup>146</sup> “From the first origin of life” the two have been in operation, for “life would consist in the manifestations of the conflict or interaction between the two classes of instincts.”<sup>147</sup> As Freud admitted, “We have unwittingly steered our course into the harbour of Schopenhauer’s philosophy. For him death is the ‘true result and to that extent the purpose of life,’ while the sexual instinct is the embodiment of the will to live.”<sup>148</sup> But does not the *id* with its pleasure principle offer a way of escape? Would it not be logical to assume that the pleasure principle is on the side of *Eros* alone? Freud closes this last door: “The pleasure principle seems actually to serve the death instincts.”<sup>149</sup> Indeed, there are grounds for assuming that *Eros* itself serves death for Freud, or is part of it. One Freudian has spoken of the “confusion” in Freud “that made him formulate the Nirvana-principle first as *Eros*, then as *Death*.”<sup>150</sup>

Man’s nature thus is not only burdened with a sense of guilt (with no meaning or responsibility behind it), but man is also doomed to seek expiation of that guilt through masochistic activities, to inflict self-punishment upon himself by way of atonement, or by sadism to lay his guilt upon

an innocent one. Freud's preliminary studies in this area were carried to their fuller implications by Theodor Reik, *Masochism in Modern Man*, and by Edmund Bergler in a series of works, *The Basic Neurosis*, *Homosexuality: Disease or Way of Life?*, and others. Freud had sought to dissolve guilt by science; he had only fastened it more firmly on man. Like Karma, it remains. The religious concept of guilt he had warred against had atonement through Christ. His concept merely doomed man to endless self-punishment, and made his will to live by implication a servant of the will to death. "The sense of guilt" led to sadism and masochism.<sup>151</sup> Freud himself did not see the implications of masochism as clearly as did Reik and Bergler, but he went far enough to see man's hopeless plight. *And, having denied sin, he had also denied salvation, for, in reducing guilt to biology, he had no way of enabling man to transcend his biology and hence transcend or escape his biological sense of guilt.* His biological myth and anthropological myth had become the new dimensions of man's hell.

The cartoonist Marcel Vertes caught the meaning of Freud's work in a cartoon in his series of satires on psychoanalysis, *It's all Mental*: "You mean to tell me that if Van Gogh had been psychoanalyzed, he wouldn't have cut off his ear?" "Of course he would, but he would have known why."

Moreover, whatever man did, he was *guilty*, so that guilt was intensified by Freud. Thus, "When her prospective new employer asked why she had left her former job with a psychiatrist, a Los Angeles secretary replied, 'I couldn't win. If I was late for work, I was hostile. If I was early, I had an anxiety complex. And if I was on time, I was compulsive.'"<sup>152</sup> Lest we be tempted to dismiss this as humorous overstatement, let us consider Bergler's comment:

The best summary of my opinions on this topic that I know was presented by a patient, a famous humorist, who told me in analysis: "According to you, there are two items that are 'musts' on the psychic menu — the 'masochistic stew' to stew in and nibble on, and the 'pseudo-aggressive cocktail,' to counteract the effects of the stew. Misuse of reality serves the first, wit the second purpose." A witty if malicious explanation, but at least on the periphery of the facts as I see them.<sup>153</sup>

However much Bergler's last sentence indicates unhappiness over this evaluation, his first sentence calls it "the best summary." And rightly so, for Freud's pessimism closes the door of hope for man and leaves him only sickly "musts." Freud analyzes; he does not cure. He seeks to give understanding, not to save. Over the doorway of strict Freudianism can be entered the words, "Abandon hope, all ye who enter here." There is no man without guilt feelings, which, because they are biological, are not expiable. Civilization for Freud is impossible without repression, but the more civilization grows, the more savagely the repressed forces lash out against it. The growth of civilization is thus in this view a guarantee of its destruction.

Freud provided a tool for the total state and its control of man. Thus, the enlightened elite, although guilt-ridden, "know" that guilt is illusory and without meaning except as a biological fact; but the "dangerous masses" can be held in guilt more firmly than ever while the elite seek to guide man's evolution.

## Freudian Revisionism

As a result, because Freud offered so little hope, he had to be followed by revisionism. His followers, as practicing rather than strictly theoretical psychoanalysts (for Freud's psychiatric work was always primarily research for him) wanted to offer hope and to be useful members of society. Moreover, as strong partisans on the whole of socialist causes, they were unwilling to see such movements as futile. Moreover, Freud's influence and impact were felt far beyond the frontiers of psychoanalysis. He had raised issues which colored all psychiatry. Revision was thus forced upon the non-Freudians as well. This revisionism took two forms: *first*, among those who remained psychoanalysts and among those as well who insisted on traditional psychiatry, i.e., dealing with the psyche or mind of man, there was a *repression* of the forces of guilt and death. Marcuse, thus, while condemning the revisionists for bypassing certain aspects of Freud or revising him, still insisted that in Freud some grounds existed for hope that the life instincts could be strengthened and guilt and death curbed.<sup>154</sup> But however much any in this school sought to claim loyalty to Freud, when they offered hope, it was at the cost of suppressing an aspect of Freud's theory. *Second*, a growing group of scientists favored a by-passing of man's inner conflicts by means of the electrical and chemical control of man. *This means total outer control by experts in order to obviate total inner control by ancient biological forces.* The implications are totalitarian: government by scientific philosopher-kings. And this answer, as well as the first, had roots in Freud, as we have noted. We can speak also of a *third* group, whose trust is in "social arrangements" as themselves fully capable of effecting the desired end for men. One such person is Ernest Becker, Instructor in Anthropology, Department of Psychiatry, at the College of Medicine of the State University of New York in Syracuse. According to Becker, "We have been lulled by a strong current in Western tradition— and most recently by Freudianism—into seeking faults within ourselves, rather than 'in the stars' (that is, in the social arrangements which guide us)."<sup>155</sup> Becker's reference to "the stars" is apt; such sociology and anthropology is comparable to astrology and part and parcel of the same ideology.

*First*, to consider the Freudian revisionists, their problem as we noted, was caused by Freud's failure to provide a way out, and, as a healing profession, this placed psychiatrists and psychoanalysts in an almost untenable position. Much of this has taken place in the United States, where Freud has exercised his greatest influence. And significantly, in no area has his influence been greater than among the modernist clergy.<sup>156</sup> The revisionists have called attention to Freud's every scientific error and false conclusion, but their answers have been weaker than Freud's because they have sought to evade the central question which Freud sometimes obscured but never fully side-stepped, namely, that *man* can do nothing about man's guilt. It is not surprising, therefore, that in a very highly theoretical system, open to attack at every point, attack was first and foremost launched against the doctrine of the racial unconscious and the myth of the primal horde. This was, as Wells has noted, the first bastion to be "sacrificed," an "entire half of Freudian thought" and "the first line of defense." Innate drives, memories, the unconscious,

taboos, and dreams were retained but “their source was denied.”<sup>157</sup> But this “sacrifice” eliminated the determinism in Freud! Freud had held to a strict determinism of the mental life.<sup>158</sup> By eliminating the *source* of the determinism, revisionists, like Karen Horney (1885-1952), *The Neurotic Personality of our Time* (1937), *New Ways in Psychoanalysis* (1939), *Self-Analysis* (1942), *Our Inner Conflicts*(1945), and *Neurosis and Human Growth* (1950), could then ascribe the symptoms to the immediate culture. Two things were thus accomplished: first, the deterministically biological basis was shaken, if not destroyed, and second, because the source was immediate or local in the cultural sense, it was largely remediable. From this perspective, Freud’s position was a “mechanistic-genetic philosophy.”<sup>159</sup> The biology of psychoanalysis was now a malleable one. This revisionism culminated, as Wells points out, in the “psycho-philosophy of love” of Eric Fromm, neo-orthodoxy, existentialism and Zen Buddhism. Love became “a panacea for the ills of contemporary man.” Human separation and alienation became the new original sin, and capitalism was seen as a dehumanizing, alienating force, hostile to love. “In love alone can man find the true solution.”<sup>160</sup> Religious syncretism is basic to this position, which calls for a new religion or a union of the best in the old ones, dedicated to love. Man’s life with his fellow men must be personal, an “I-thou” relationship, not one which treats people as things. Any sexual relation can be holy *if* it is truly loving and personal. On this basis, the Rev. William Glenesk, of Brooklyn’s Spencer Memorial Church, could call *Fanny Hill* a moral book, because the heroine was “not out for kicks — she was out for love.”<sup>161</sup> This same position, in other and more popular forms, is the faith in the power of love, and in the power of positive thinking. The major work in exposition of this position is Norman O. Brown’s *Life Against Death*, in which Freudian revisionism and neo-orthodoxy meet. The doctrine of the resurrection of the body is taken to be a symbol for and to mean the resurrection of man from the sense of guilt, a kind of death, into the fullness of eros. The “abolition of repression” is mankind’s problem. “The perfect body, promised by Christian theology,” is not a matter of the future life but “is a body reconciled with death.” In Henry Miller’s words, “The cultural era is past,” that era born of repression. Eventually, the new order of the resurrection, Brown says, “a social project facing mankind as a whole,” will come in. A one-world order will prevail, and, according to Miller, “Governments will give way to management, using the word in a broad sense.” This is Brown’s gospel of love.<sup>162</sup> This thesis has had extensive support from John Wren-Lewis, for whom it is repression or resurrection, but who pleads for a more than- this-worldly interpretation of the resurrection.<sup>163</sup> In this perspective, not law but love should govern man, so that premarital or extra-marital sexual relations are moral or immoral in terms of love, not law. This position is increasingly the new gospel of many of the major churches and their agencies.<sup>164</sup> This gospel of erotic freedom is proclaimed widely from many quarters.<sup>165</sup> Indeed, for some years sex has been so closely associated with life and salvation, that, as early as 1929, one researcher found that, in studying the adulteries of a group of women, their purpose in adultery was a sense of obligation to exercise ideas of “spousal freedom.”<sup>166</sup> It can be more FREUDIAN REVISIONISM 59 plainly and accurately stated as a belief that one has not truly lived if sexuality is not promiscuously indulged in; it is seen as *life*, as a revitalizing, revivifying force, and this is precisely the rationale of the ancient fertility cult. It is not surprising that at least one professor of religion has taken the logical step and called sexual intercourse, in true fertility cult faith, “an outward and visible sign of communion, not merely between man and wife but with God.”<sup>167</sup> It is thus a religious exercise, but also one beyond morality, except when impersonal. At an important point, all have remained Freudian. Freud made sex a purely biological function and removed it from the realm of morality, so that not even homosexuality could be called immoral. As a result, sexual practices

passed from ethics to prophylaxis. Ministers accordingly began to preach psychology instead of theology; ministerial book clubs ostensibly given over to other subjects, pushed such works. Thus, in March, 1964, one of the major clerical book clubs, which already had as an adjunct another club specializing in pastoral psychology, offered its members a six-volume, 2,496 page *Encyclopedia of Mental Health*. In Sweden, morals were termed the province of psychiatrists, not of “physicians or priests”.<sup>168</sup> In San Francisco, May 27-30, 1960, a homosexual organization’s convention drew as speakers among others, a clergyman, psychologists, psychiatrists, an ethnologist archeologist, and an attorney to speak on civil liberties. Despite the illegality of homosexuality, these “dignitaries” attended and gave their papers at the conference.<sup>169</sup> Since perversion is no longer a moral matter, at worst a medical concern, at best a new freedom, there is an increasing freedom of expression on the part of such persons. Dorothy Thompson took care apparently that posterity would learn from her diary of her own homosexuality.<sup>170</sup>

Having pre-empted the role of Christianity, the psychiatrist proceeds with his good news to deal with man’s offenses as sickness, not sin.<sup>171</sup> Into this situation of sickness, the analyst and psychiatrist enter “as savior.”<sup>172</sup> Instead of the harsh strictures of the moral law, we have the “accent on love.”<sup>173</sup> Guntrip deals with mental health and religion without considering the matter of sin.<sup>174</sup> Moreover, the accent on love is a meager one, in that love is reduced by Freud to sexuality.<sup>175</sup> Not the triune God and his Word but the principles of mental health are the new canons of family life and child-rearing.<sup>176</sup> Ministers were advised to be humble and loving, and to treat homosexuals in Freud’s manner, without condemnation or moral judgment. Homosexuality is simply a deflection of the love impulse.<sup>177</sup> One former patient of psychoanalysis, a call girl, speaks of analysis as a means of rebirth, and concludes, “For love gives you life.... It is the godhead of our world, the only secret and the only security.”<sup>178</sup> Another ex-patient wrote, “I feel like paraphrasing an old quotation in this way: ‘If the Analytic Physician make you free, ye shall be free indeed.’ To my mind, your role is that of a new priest, who under the mantle of science penetrates modern life, teaching the now strange doctrines of Jesus himself.”<sup>179</sup> One psychiatrist, John N. Rosen, plays the role of God literally with his schizophrenic patients, declaring, “I am God!”<sup>180</sup> For Gilbert Russell, Register at St. Marylebone Hospital in England, the doctor or psychiatrist is the messianic sin-bearer by “the eternal principles of substitution” and “the analyst is wounded afresh with each of his patients’ sufferings,” not because of identification “but because he too has suffered the same pain; and is healed again with his patient.” The patient “must be born again” by forgiving himself through understanding; he does not seek God’s forgiveness. His ability to forgive is his justification and the ground of his “salvation.”<sup>181</sup>

These revisionist positions represent real departures from Freud, but they are faithful to him on a number of counts, a few of which especially concern us in this context. *First*, they in effect destroy or seek to destroy the religious meaning of guilt, and dissolve religion, by rendering guilt a medical or biological problem, and, *second*, they further Freud’s hope for “the dictatorship of reason” as the replacement for Christian faith or any religious faith. At other points, Freudian theory has been pushed to the breaking point, so that it will soon be difficult to trace the theory. At these two points, Freud is still the master. At a *third* point, Freud is increasingly important. In Freud’s perspective, “the line between health and illness melts away, and the latter becomes merely an ‘exaggeration’ of the former.”<sup>182</sup> Even more bluntly, it can be said that all people are

in some sense sick, because of the racial *id*, as well as because of its tensions with *ego* and *Super-ego*. Who then is capable of government? The masses are ruled by unconscious forces. For Freud, only “the dictatorship of reason,” of an elite that knows itself and hence knows man, offers man even a slim hope. And the evidence is extensive that the mental health experts hold this opinion. Their opponents are both “sick” and “dangerous,” for what right-thinking man could oppose “the dictatorship of reason”? A *fourth* point is also of great importance. Freud not only dissolved the line between health and sickness, but he also made perversion very close to being normality. We have seen his comments to a homosexual’s mother. This is an opinion shared by his followers. In this context, immorality in any sense of violation of ultimate law is gone; only that which is socially or personally harmful is bad. As one prominent doctor in this field had declared, “What is sexually immoral? That which victimizes; that which works harm to another human being; not that which violates some completely dogmatic theory.”<sup>183</sup> Any perversion is thus acceptable if there is no victimizing and no physical damage. But this is not all. As we have seen, the anthropological, evolutionary myth of the primal horde is the foundation of Freud’s thought, which meant for him that the three basic instincts are incest, parricide and cannibalism. This means that the “stronger and freer” man’s life becomes, the more radical will its will to perversion and its contempt for biblical law become. This view has been widely popularized. Thus, one periodical has stated,

No civilized man, Freud insisted, can be completely potent with a woman he loves. “The respect for the partner that love brings always inhibits to some extent sensual pleasure. Therefore, many men are only capable of intense physical pleasure with a woman socially, morally, or aesthetically of a lower order. With women, a corresponding difficulty sometimes comes about from similar causes,” Freud wrote.<sup>184</sup>

This passage needs the qualification that Freud was here speaking of the *Super-ego*’s inhibiting force, but the vitality of the sexual instinct from the *id*, unhampered by any *Super-ego*, would still be strongest, as would the counteracting taboo, with reference to incest. All perversion has been given an imprimatur of primordial power and energy. As a result, popular primitivism has seen perversion as vital and energizing, and has indulged in Freudian phantasies as a means of vitality. Thus, one such “liberated” man, in writing of his sexual act with a Parisian prostitute, indulged in the phantasy in the midst of it: “The odd thought struck me that, if it were legal, one ought to try eating human flesh, that perhaps a new sexual thrill could be derived from masticating a hunk of a woman’s thigh or virgin’s breast, broiled lightly on either side, and garnished with parsley.”<sup>185</sup> Freudianism thus leads to the concept of perversion as a potency pill, which it has increasingly become to many. For many more, adultery has become a milder form of rejuvenation. In every instance where Freudian concepts have permeated thought, the old fertility cult concept of revitalization and rejuvenation through a return to chaos and through Saturnalia, an overthrow of moral order, is close to the surface.<sup>186</sup> The abnormal is the primitive and the primitive is the vital. If Freud is right, then the well-springs of vitality from the *id*, man’s basic reservoir of energy, are best tapped when the repressions are defeated and incest, murder and cannibalism prevail!

At a *fifth* point, the revisionists have intensified a previously existing danger in Freud, the removal of personal responsibility by means of biological determinism. By making the *id* less a

product of the racial unconscious (the primal horde myth) and more a product of the immediate culture, they have created two villains, the culture, i.e., capitalism, and the family. Karen Horney opened the door to this evil. With Freud at least the guilt was remote: the *Super-ego* could be blamed on church, state and family, but the *id* was ages old. Now, with the revisionists, it was all immediate. Judges, teachers, social workers and clergymen began to indulge in this quackery of blaming all the sins of the child on the poor parents and the social structure. As a result, there has been a demand for a “loving” and permissive home and society. The consequence is a loss of character and what La Pierre has seen as “the subversion of the American character.”<sup>187</sup>

We noted earlier that, while the revisionists sought to deal effectually with man’s problem by means of revised Freudian theory, a *second* school of thought has by-passed the inner conflict by means of media of outer control of the mind, electrical and chemical. This has been both criticized and defended within psychiatry.<sup>188</sup> The chemical controls gained first attention when, after World War II, the “tranquilizers” began to appear. The public reaction was largely favorable: wonder-working science had found a simple means of “curing insanity” and for relieving the miseries of life. The popularity of tranquilizers was extensive, and they were freely prescribed and freely used for minor anxieties as well as major difficulties. Not many paid too much attention to the beliefs of some scientists “that human behavior *can* be and *ought* to be controlled by scientists,” who, some of them hold, “owe it to humanity to take charge of events and arrange things so that people behave in ways that will be for their own good.” These men hope that soon psycho-chemicals will be developed “which change and maintain human personality at any desired level.” One of these psychochemicals much debated and often condemned by some scientists is LSD, whose effect is often similar to that of psychoanalysis, i.e., *self-acceptance*. As a doctor stated it, “During LSD therapy a point is reached in which the patient accepts himself completely for what he is with a massive reduction in self-conflict and guilt.” This is then another answer to the guilt problem. The power-potential in a man’s “morning coffee would very soon destroy his and his associates’ belief in his sanity.” In a city’s water supply, such as New York or Moscow, “a single pound” would produce psychosis in “the whole population” and make possible its occupation by any enemy. Researchers are not only working to produce psycho-chemicals geared for total control but are planning in terms of it.<sup>189</sup> One of the appeals of psycho-chemicals was that the individual himself, as he took it, enjoyed some of the same power as the scientist, that of playing god over his own life, of suppressing guilt and anxiety with a swallow, and ensuring “happiness.” The scientist might devise the pills, but it was up to him to take it or leave it.

In 1956, such persons faced a more chilling scientific development. “An industrial scientist said the time may come when humans will be equipped from infancy with enslaving, built-in electronic controls.” At the National Electronics Conference, at the Illinois Institute of Technology, this process was described by C. R. Schafer, who said that it might follow another great war. A socket would be mounted under the scalp “a few months after birth” with “electrodes reaching selected areas of brain tissue,” and, “a year or two later, a miniature radio receiver and antenna ... plugged into the socket,” and, from that time on the child would be modified “or completely controlled by bio-electric signals radiated from state-controlled transmitters.”<sup>190</sup> A large number of researchers are at work experimenting in this area. Yale’s Dr. Jose M. R. Delgado has applied this electrical control to animals and claimed that “Under the influence of electrical stimulation of the brain the cats and monkeys performed like electrical

toys.” For only “medical purposes and techniques,” there have been, we are told, “a few hundred deep implantations” in human subjects: we are not told of how many shallow implantations. The results indicate success, it is held. Such persons, with implantations from childhood could in the future “be the cheapest of machines to create and operate” for the super-state. Scientists are most hopeful of the potentialities of ESB (Electrical Stimulation of Brain), and one is quoted as saying of these and other developments in the sciences of human behavior, “We are just on the threshold. And where we will go, I don’t know. But it is so far, so fast, that our wildest dreams are likely to be ultra conservative.”<sup>191</sup> The implications are very evident. The problem of guilt is avoided. Total outer control by experts obviates the problems unnecessary, because man usurps fully the jurisdiction, sovereignty, control and predestinating power of God.

It is apparent thus, that the *third* group, those whose trust is in social arrangements, differ from the first two schools only in the nature of the control of man. Man’s destiny is not between himself and his Creator God, but in the hands of the new creator, the social planner. The mind of man is to be bypassed, therefore, as a mere product of “the stars,” the social context, and man and his society subjected to that re-organization which will produce the desired social goals. There is thus *no essential difference* between these three schools of thought. Each is determined on playing god, and each sees man as his potential new creation. Man must be born again, not of the Holy Spirit, but of the new god, the human planner. As one psychoanalyst told his patient, the therapeutic uncovering of childhood experiences had as its goal the re-creation of the child. “This artificial transformation into a child is one of the goals of our technique.” The “final goal,” according to this psychoanalyst, “is to *increase* his responsibility over his thoughts, feelings and actions — not to eliminate it.” This responsibility is not in the Biblical sense; it is not moral responsibility, but self-knowledge for “the elimination of all the childish wishes he’s retained from the past.”<sup>192</sup> Responsibility and conscience, however, have a new frame of reference, and it is not to God. Michael Fraenkel has rightly termed the Freudian and modern theme “guilt and punishment.”<sup>193</sup> But Reiff has indicated the contemporary framework of this concern in the title of an essay, “The American Transference: From Calvin to Freud.”<sup>194</sup> It has ceased to be theological and has become purely relativistic and humanistic, so that Dr. J. L. Moreno, in a study in the Nervous and Mental Disease Monograph Series asked the title question, *Who Shall Survive?* (1934), and answered that it was those who fitted into the social group so as to enable it to function at maximum security; for him mankind is “a social and organic unity,” and mental health is harmonious integration into that unity.

But what of those who deny that mankind is the standard, and who hold that biblical faith requires separation and division? The prophets of mental health of this religion of humanity know the answer: they are mentally sick. God’s hell is outlawed, but a new hell has opened up for apostates: mental sickness, with its many mansions. Mental health is so defined that not only political and economic conservatives but all orthodox Christians are clearly sick. Did not Freud say that religious people avoided the personal neuroses by accepting the cosmic neurosis? The fact that they are more responsible, stable and neurosis-free is itself proof of their sickness, i.e., acceptance of the cosmic neurosis, God! The prophets of mental health must be given free reign to “heal” mankind by “a vast reorganization of the world.”<sup>195</sup> The results of the mental health programs have been a steady encroachment on civil liberties of a most flagrant sort. The power of the psychiatrist is the foundation of a new and more fearful inquisition.<sup>196</sup> The relationship of the psychiatrist to courts of law is increasingly seen by many as “a threat to society.”<sup>197</sup> To

criticize the mental health movement is to draw fire on oneself as mentally disturbed and also, an added “evil,” a champion of political and economic conservatism.<sup>198</sup> This is not surprising. Freud provided two “impregnable” defenses. First, since the questions of man’s nature are biological and not religious; they are therefore *expert, medical* and not lay problems. A do-it-yourself program may be valid in religion but not in medicine. As a result, laymen are denied the right to criticize the mysteries of the mental health program. Second, any resistance to acceptance of his theories was for Freud an infallible sign of truth, for the person was fighting against the exposure of his unconscious with its darkly hidden impulses and sickness. Thus, the critic of Freud merely proved himself guilty! These two techniques of defense have been widely adopted. It would indeed be possible to write a separate study on the vast variety of mental evasions and techniques of appraisal which Freud bequeathed to modern man. In a very real and thorough sense, he has been a major shaper of the modern mind.

But, as stated previously, Freud, while expressing Enlightenment thought, was also its culmination, an end of an age thinker. The modern era had its first stirrings with the Renaissance, and came into its own with the Enlightenment. Its key concept was the centrality of autonomous man, so that man assumed the prerogatives of God. As a result, autobiography assumed a new and auspicious role. Beginning in Descartes and culminating in Kant and existentialism, human thought was determinative of reality and of law, if any law existed. The inner explained the outer. Freud applied this to man, so that totemism and taboo are to be understood in terms of psychology, autobiography, and anthropology is reduced thereto to a great extent. Freud sometimes rebelled against the “general over-evaluation of all psychic processes,”<sup>199</sup> seeing it as an animistic technique, as a belief in the “Omnipotence of Thought,” but on the whole he was a part of that tradition. This exaltation of autonomous man early started the dissolution of all standards extraneous to man’s will, so that all things are relative to man, whose will is the only law. Thus Casanova (1725-1798) could boast of his freedom and enlightenment as a freemason and gives the proud account of his incest with his illegitimate daughter, describing objections thereto as “prejudice.” In Freud, these tendencies found vocal outlet. Trilling has described Freud’s position as “rationalistic positivism” with overtones of Romanticism: that deny validity to myth or religion.<sup>200</sup> Validity was by some denied to any area excepting man’s will; Freud retained it for science and “the dictatorship of reason” in the scientific sense. One social anthropologist has seen Freud’s work as “the application to individual human beings of a method of which geology had established the canon.”<sup>201</sup> The canon of geology, here referred to represents the triumph of evolutionary hypothesis over scientific observation. It is not surprising that this anthropologist accordingly found the Enlightenment beliefs “confirmed” in research: “I had been looking for a society reduced to its simplest expression. The society of the Nambikwara had been reduced to a point at which I found nothing but human beings.”<sup>202</sup> Thus, science itself leaves us only autonomous man! In a valueless world, science itself loses value; in a lawless world, science itself can have no law. The result is the existentialist isolation of the individual, who now knows no law except himself and his own gratification and then finds himself a prison house of frustration. In a book widely read by intellectuals and circulated by a book-club geared to relativism, Lundin has stated, “I’ll leave the pleasures of marriage to the gentlemen who enjoy being bossed by a withering female, just because, at one time, many years ago, they felt they couldn’t get along without a daily round of sex with her body. As for me, I can dispense with any one person’s body; there are so many bodies around! I’m not going to be one of those people who buy a cow just because they like to drink milk.” Lundin concludes, “I’m the center of my

own moral universe.”<sup>203</sup> “The decline of the individual” is a common topic of discussion; that the individual has declined is no wonder. Having made himself the ultimate law, man has reduced all being to the limited measure of his fallen will, which, as Paul noted in Romans 1:27, *burns out* in perversion to the destruction of man and his culture. The individual shrinks when the individual is ultimate, but, measured against God’s calling and the requirements of the image of God in man, he gains true stature in Christ.

But relativism is indigenous to modern culture, the culture of the Enlightenment. And Marxism itself is but another form of liberal relativism. Engels declared, “Our dialectical philosophy abolishes all the notions of absolute and definitive truth, and any absolute human conditions that correspond to them. For dialectics nothing is definitive, absolute or sacred; it reveals the relativity of all things and nothing exists for it but the uninterrupted process of development and change.” Stalin made clear that “Marxism has no room for fixed and unchanging conclusions and formulations, valid for all times and all periods. Marxism is hostile to all dogmatism.” All the forces of modern theory alike point to relativism, so that, as Jean Ousset has pointed out, there are “two logical consequences of the ‘modern mind,’” anarchism, or, to avoid total chaos, total statism (Marxism) in the name of social efficiency.<sup>204</sup> Freud, by his major contribution to the erosion of religious faith and order, has been a master architect of this modern world view.

Has the work of Freud been all loss? Entralgo found very great gains in Freud, notably, “that pathography is, and should be, basically, biography.” Freud has indeed in a sense revised “ancient Semitic medicine,” but this has restored, in spite of Freud, the moral life of man to the province of medicine in a Christian sense, so that a Christian concept of disease can be again developed as the answer to the problem of man and his guilt. The patient had ceased to be a person under the older science. But, “*Thanks to the work of Freud, Western pathology has begun to be anthropological. Both clinically and pathologically, the patient has come to be considered as a person.*” Freud tried to reduce anthropology to biology but failed.<sup>205</sup>

Freud has also contributed, in spite of himself, to epistemological self-consciousness. The issues of history are more sharply drawn, more extensively clarified, because of the relentless vigor with which he pressed his conclusions home. The enlightenment hope he shared, he himself laid bare as empty of meaning and futile of hope. In his own fashion, he prepared the way for what Charles Hodge called “the last issue” of history, the conflict “between Atheism and its countless forms and Calvinism. The other systems will be crushed as the half-rotten ice between two great bergs.”<sup>206</sup> Freud, like Nietzsche, forced man to the edge of the abyss. Modern man has been warned, and it is from within his own ranks that this warning has come. He is thus in every respect without excuse.

# Selected Bibliography

The following list is of the works of Freud which are both of most interest to the general reader and student and also most readily accessible. Others are referred to in the text and notes, and Jones surveys most of Freud's works in his *Life*.

By Freud:

*The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud*, translated and edited with an introduction by A.A. Brill. New York: Modern Library, 1938. Six major works by Freud are included.

*Totem and Taboo* being the most important and best introduction to Freud.

*Civilization and its Discontents*, translated by Joan Riviere. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, n.d.

*Collected Papers*, in 5 volumes, authorized translation under the supervision of Joan Riviere. New York: Basic Books, 1959. These papers, because they deal with specific and limited subjects, often are the best indices to Freud's thought.

*The Future of an Illusion*, translated by W.D. Robson-Scott. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, n.d.

*A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis*, authorized translation of the revised edition by Joan Riviere, prefaces by Ernest Jones, G. Stanley Hall. New York: Garden City Publishing Company, 1938.

*Letters of Sigmund Freud*, selected and edited by Ernst L. Freud, translated by Tania and James Stern. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

*Moses and Monotheism*, translated by Katherine Jones. New York: Vintage Books, 1955.

*Freud, Dictionary of Psychoanalysis*, edited by Nandor Fodor and Frank Gaynor, with a preface by Theodor Reik. Greenwich, CT: Premier, 1963. A useful tool, this is a dictionary of Freudian terms, with definitions culled from Freud's works.

About Freud:

Bakan, David, *Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand, 1958.

Brown, Norman O., *Life Against Death, The Psychoanalytic Meaning of History*. New York: Modern Library Paperback, 1959.

Entralgo, Pedro L., *Mind and Body, Psychosomatic Pathology: A Short History of the Evolution of Medical Thought*, translated by Aurelio M. Espinosa, foreword by E.B. Strauss. New York: P.J. Kennedy, n.d. This work contains little on Freud, but is important in terms of the basic problems facing medicine today.

Hall, Calvin S., *A Primer of Freudian Psychology*. New York: Mentor, 1955.

Jones, Ernest, *The Life and Works of Sigmund Freud*. New York: Basic Books; Vol. 1, 1953: The Formative years and the Great Discoveries, 1856-1900. Vol. 2, 1955: Years of Maturity, 1901-1919. Vol. 3, 1957: The Last Phase, 1919-1939. Half of this volume is given to "Historical Reviews of Certain Topics," i.e., anthropology, sociology, religion, etc. A one-volume edition of Jones is in print, but the full text is much to be preferred.

La Piere, Richard, *The Freudian Ethic*. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1959.

Mowrer, O. Hobart, *The Crisis in Psychiatry and Religion*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand, 1961.

## The Author

Rousas John Rushdoony (1916-2001) was a well-known American scholar, writer, and author of over thirty books. He held B.A. and M.A. degrees from the University of California and received his theological training at the Pacific School of Religion. An ordained minister, he worked as a missionary among Paiute and Shoshone Indians and pastored two California churches. He founded the Chalcedon Foundation, an educational organization devoted to research, publishing, and cogent communication of a distinctively Christian scholarship to the world at large. His writing in the *Chalcedon Report* and his numerous books spawned a generation of believers active in reconstructing the world to the glory of Jesus Christ. Until his death, he resided in Vallecito, California, where he engaged in research, lecturing, and assisting others in developing programs to put the Christian Faith into action.

## The Ministry of Chalcedon

CHALCEDON (kal-SEE-don) is a Christian educational organization devoted exclusively to research, publishing, and cogent communication of a distinctively Christian scholarship to the world at large. It makes available a variety of services and programs, all geared to the needs of interested ministers, scholars, and laymen who understand the propositions that Jesus Christ speaks to the mind as well as the heart, and that His claims extend beyond the narrow confines of the various institutional churches. We exist in order to support the efforts of all orthodox denominations and churches. Chalcedon derives its name from the great ecclesiastical Council of Chalcedon (AD 451), which produced the crucial Christological definition: “Therefore, following the holy Fathers, we all with one accord teach men to acknowledge one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, at once complete in Godhead and complete in manhood, truly God and truly man...” This formula directly challenges every false claim of divinity by any human institution: state, church, cult, school, or human assembly. Christ alone is both God and man, the unique link between heaven and earth. All human power is therefore derivative: Christ alone can announce that, “All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth” (Matthew 28:18). Historically, the Chalcedonian creed is therefore the foundation of Western liberty, for it sets limits on all authoritarian human institutions by acknowledging the validity of the claims of the One who is the source of true human freedom (Galatians 5:1).

The Chalcedon Foundation publishes books under its own name and that of Ross House Books. It produces a magazine, *Faith for All of Life*, and a newsletter, *The Chalcedon Report*, both bimonthly. All gifts to Chalcedon are tax deductible. For complimentary trial subscriptions, or information on other book titles, please contact:

Chalcedon  
PO Box 158 \* Vallecito, CA 95251 \* USA  
(209) 736-4365  
[www.chalcedon.edu](http://www.chalcedon.edu)

---

<sup>1</sup> *Newsweek*, March 27, 2006.

<sup>2</sup> Jerry Adler with Anne Underwood, "Freud in Our Midst," *Newsweek*, March 27, 2006, 46.

<sup>3</sup> Abraham Kaplan, "Freud and Modern Philosophy," in Benjamin Nelson, editor: *Freud and the 20th Century* (New York: Meridian Books, 1957), 226.

<sup>4</sup> Abraham Kaplan, "Freud and Modern Philosophy," in Benjamin Nelson, editor: *Freud and the 20th Century* (New York: Meridian Books, 1957), 226. .

<sup>5</sup> G. I. Kositsky, "The Subconscious, Dreams and Intuition: A Materialist View," in *The Soviet Review*, vol. 2, no. 4, April, 1961, 61.

<sup>6</sup> Harry K. Wells, *Sigmund Freud, A Pavlovian Critique*, 233.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 194.

<sup>8</sup> Ernest Jones, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, vol. II (New York: Basic Books, 1955), 412. Thorne Shipley, *Classics in Psychology* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1961), 684.

<sup>9</sup> Sigmund Freud, *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis* (New York: Garden City Publishing Co., 1938), 252. Jones, *Life and Works*, II, 226.

<sup>10</sup> Jones, *Life and Works*, I, 34, 40.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 53.

<sup>12</sup> Jones, I, 53; III, 145, 177.

<sup>13</sup> Jones, *op. cit.* II, 18.

<sup>14</sup> Ernst L. Freud, ed., *Letters of Sigmund Freud* (New York: Basic Books, 1960), 308.

<sup>15</sup> Jones, *op. cit.* I, 271.

---

<sup>16</sup> Jones, *op. cit.* II, 386.

<sup>17</sup> *Letters*, 145.

<sup>18</sup> Jones, *op. cit.*, I, 300.

<sup>19</sup> *Letters*, 21.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 54.

<sup>21</sup> Horace Gregory, trans., *The Poems of Catullus*, poem 85. (New York: Grove Press, 1956), 151.

<sup>22</sup> *Letters*, 155, 84, 182, 8, 55.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 50

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 51.

<sup>25</sup> Jones, *op. cit.*, I, 102.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 132.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 128, 133 f., 271 for his general prudishness; migraine headaches, 169 f., 308 f.; fainting during quarrel with Jung, 317, and C. G. Jung, "Jung on Freud," *The Atlantic*, vol. 210, no. 5, November, 1962, 47-58. Jones, *ibid.*, II, fainting fits, 55, 146, 386; other illnesses, 192, 391; prudery re. bowels, 83, 183, 391; superstitions, 184, 196, 392; dislike of aging, 416. Jones, *ibid.*, III, Freud's views of death, 89 ff., 126, 140, 219, 247, f., 279 f.; provoking trouble, 65, 69 f., 132 f., cf. 134 f., 137, 294 ff.; superstitions, 145, 213, 382, 390.

<sup>28</sup> Sigmund Freud, *Autobiography* (Translated by James Strachey. New York: Norton, 1935), 22f.

<sup>29</sup> Jones, *op. cit.*, III, 209.

<sup>30</sup> Jones, *op. cit.*, II, 38.

---

<sup>31</sup> Martin Freud, *Sigmund Freud, Man and Father* (New York: Vanguard, 1958), 80.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 47 f.; Jones, *op. cit.* I, 293f.

<sup>33</sup> Jones, *Ibid.*, II, 59 f., 90, 103; “He even went so far as to tell me that his handwriting had deteriorated since the visit to America,” 60.

<sup>34</sup> *Letters*, 308.

<sup>35</sup> Sigmund Freud, “Analysis of a Phobia in a Five-Year Old Boy” (1909), in *Collected Papers*, vol. III. Alix and James Strachey, trans. (New York: Basic Books, 1959), 185.

<sup>36</sup> Sigmund Freud, “Fetishism” (1927), in *Collected Papers*, V, 201.

<sup>37</sup> Jones, *op. cit.*, III, 248.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 46, 105.

<sup>39</sup> Jones, *op. cit.*, I, 319-327. According to Rollo May, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, and Freud “shared a significant fact: all three of them based their knowledge chiefly on the analysis of one case, namely, themselves,” in Rollo May, Ernest Angel and Henri F. Ellenberger, editors: *Existence, A New Dimension in Psychiatry and Psychology* (New York: Basic Books, 1958), 24.

<sup>40</sup> Jones, *op. cit.*, II, 83.

<sup>41</sup> See Lancelot Law Whyte, *The Unconscious Before Freud*. (New York: Basic Books, 1960).

<sup>42</sup> Jones, *op. cit.*, III, 342.

<sup>43</sup> Egon Friedell, *A Cultural History of the Modern Age*, vol. III. Charles Francis Atkinson, trans. (New York: Knopf, 1933), 483.

<sup>44</sup> A. A. Brill, trans., “Totem and Taboo,” *The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud* (New York: Modern Library, 1938), 821.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, 862.

---

<sup>46</sup> "The Economic Problem in Masochism" (1924), in *Collected Papers*, II, 265.

<sup>47</sup> "Totem and Taboo," *Basic Writings of Freud*, 916 f.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 919 f.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 925.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 930.

<sup>51</sup> Lionel Trilling, *Freud and The Crisis of Our Culture* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955).

<sup>52</sup> Maurice Natenberg, *Freudian Psycho-Antics, Fact and Fraud in Psychoanalysis*, citing the report by Dr. C. P. Oberndorf that Freud "did not feel obligated to try to prevent a patient's suicide." (Chicago: Regent House, 1953), 29 f., 33, 97; cf. 95.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 97.

<sup>54</sup> Harry K. Wells, *The Failure of Psychoanalysis, From Freud to Fromm* (New York: International Publishers, 1963), 40-42.

<sup>55</sup> Jones, *op. cit.* I, 347.

<sup>56</sup> Jones, *op. cit.* II, 222.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 194 f.

<sup>58</sup> Jones, III, xii.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 311.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 286, 309 ff.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, 310.

<sup>62</sup> Sigmund Freud, "Analysis Terminable and Interminable" (1937), in *Collected Papers*, V, 357.

---

<sup>63</sup> See Jones, *op. cit.*, III, 280 ff.; Calvin S. Hall, *A Primer of Freudian Psychology* (New York: Mentor, 1955), 22-27; Joseph Nuttin, *Psychoanalysis and Personality, A Dynamic theory of Normal Personality* (New York: Mentor-Omega, 1962), 65f.

<sup>64</sup> Sigmund Freud, "From the History of an Infantile Neurosis" (1918), in *Collected Papers III*, 594.

<sup>65</sup> Sigmund Freud, "Foundation Regarding the Two Principles in Mental Functioning" (1911), in *Collected Papers, IV*, 18.

<sup>66</sup> Sigmund Freud, "Neurosis and Psychosis" (1924), in *Collected Papers, II*, 250 f.

<sup>67</sup> Sigmund Freud, "The Interpretation of Dreams," 514-516, 533-537, and "Wit and its Relation to the Unconscious," 734-738, in Brill, *Basic Writings of S. Freud*.

<sup>68</sup> Freud, "The Unconscious" (1915), in *Collected Papers, IV*, 113.

<sup>69</sup> Freud, *Moses and Monotheism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1955), 149.

<sup>70</sup> Freud, "Turnings in the Ways of Psycho-Analytic Therapy" (1919), *Collected Papers, II*, 399.

<sup>71</sup> Freud, "The Libido Theory" (1922), *Collected Papers, V*, 131.

<sup>72</sup> Freud, *Civilization and its Discontents*. Trans. by Joan Riviere, (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, n.d.), 69.

<sup>73</sup> Herbert Asbury, *The Barbary Coast* (New York: Garden City Publishing Company, 1933), 279.

<sup>74</sup> See Robert Ardrey, *African Genesis* (New York: Atheneum, 1961).

<sup>75</sup> Freud, "The History of the Psychoanalytical Movement," in Brill, *Basic Writings of Freud*, 937.

<sup>76</sup> Freud, "Totem and Taboo," in Brill, *ibid.*, 835.

---

<sup>77</sup> Freud, "Sexuality in the Aetiology of the Neuroses" (1898), in *Collected Papers*, I, 227; see also *Totem and Taboo*, chapt. 2. See further, "The Justification for Detaching from Neurasthenia a Particular Syndrome: The Anxiety-Neurosis" (1894), 76-106, and "A Reply to Criticisms on the Anxiety-Neurosis" (1895), 107-127, *Collected Papers*, I.

<sup>78</sup> Jones, *ibid.*, III, 124; cf. 192

<sup>79</sup> *Letter of Sigmund Freud*, 307 f.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 29.

<sup>81</sup> "Totem and Taboo" in Brill, *Basic Writings of Freud*, 924 f.

<sup>82</sup> Freud: *Moses and Monotheism*, Katherine Jones, trans. (New York: Vintage Books, 1955), 110ff., 129, 179ff.

<sup>83</sup> Freud, *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*, 33-35; *Civilization and its Discontents*, 13f., 57, 65, 72, 100; *Leonardo da Vinci, a Study in Psychosexuality*, A. A. Brill, trans. (New York: Random House, 1947), x.

<sup>84</sup> Martin Freud, *Sigmund Freud, Man and Father*, 190.

<sup>85</sup> Jones, *op. cit.*, I, 116.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, 167.

<sup>87</sup> James, *op. cit.*, III, 209.

<sup>88</sup> David Bakan, *Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition* (Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand, 1958), 49ff.

<sup>89</sup> Jones, *op. cit.*, III, 237.

<sup>90</sup> *Letters of Sigmund Freud*, 367; for other comments concerning Jews, see 165, 202 f., 210, 365-368. For further expressions of Freud's attitudes on Jews, see Jones II, 18, 116, 149, 153, 162 f., 353 f., 398 ff. (Jones comments), 458 III, 109 f., 124, 159 f., 187, 194, 221, 237, 306. For

---

Freud's robust delight in Jewish humor, see his *Wit and its Relation to the Unconscious*. On the other hand, Freud was accused by a Jew of hating Jews, Jones III, 369 f.

<sup>91</sup> Bakan, *Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition*, 107.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, 288.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, 38-43.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, viii, 25, 132.

<sup>95</sup> Theodore H. Gaster, "The Religion of the Canaanites," in Vergilius Ferm, editor: *Ancient Religions* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1950), 111-143; see especially the concluding paragraph, 140.

<sup>96</sup> Richard L. Rubenstein, "Person and Myth in the Judaeo-Christian Encounter," in *The Christian Scholar*, XLVI, 4, Winter, 1963, 284.

<sup>97</sup> Jones, *op. cit.*, II, 48, 51.

<sup>98</sup> Bakan, *op. cit.*, 58, 122.

<sup>99</sup> For Jones' comments on Freud and Gentile followers, see Jones, *op. cit.*, II, 43f. 48ff., 69f., 72.

<sup>100</sup> Jones, *op. cit.*, II, 33; cf. 96, 363ff.

<sup>101</sup> Bakan, *op. cit.*, 127; cf. 159 f.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, 147, 164.

<sup>103</sup> Jones, *op. cit.*, II, 19.

<sup>104</sup> Bakan, *op. cit.*, 177, 181, 227.

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, 134.

---

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*, 181.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, 229; cf. 169 ff.

<sup>108</sup> Bakan, "Moses in the Thought of Freud, An Ambivalent Interpretation," in *Commentary*, vol. 26, no. 4, October, 1958, 331. For an earlier interpretation looking somewhat in the same direction at points, see Charles E. Maylan, *The Tragic Complex of Freud*, cited with dismissal by Joseph Jastrow, *Freud: His Dream and Sex Theories* (Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1932), 253-257.

<sup>109</sup> Freud, *Moses and Monotheism*, 16; cf. 3-15.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, 27.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, 115.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, 68.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*, 67.

<sup>114</sup> A. A. Brill, trans., in "Introduction," Freud, *Leonardo da Vinci*, viii.

<sup>115</sup> Jones II, *op. cit.*, 401.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, 346.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*, 432.

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*, 348.

<sup>119</sup> Freud, *Leonardo*, 16.

<sup>120</sup> *Ibid.*, 18.

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid.*, 22.

---

<sup>122</sup> Freud, *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis*. Joan Riviere trans. (New York: Garden City Publishing Company, (1920) 1938), 375-377.

<sup>123</sup> *Letters of Sigmund Freud*, 423 f.

<sup>124</sup> See O. Hobart Mowrer, *The Crisis in Psychiatry and Religion* (Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand, 1961), and Thomas S. Szasz, M.D., *The Myth of Mental Illness* (New York: Hoeber-Harper, 1961).

<sup>125</sup> See Thomas S. Szasz, "Psychiatry's Threat to Civil Liberties," in *National Review*, XIV, 10, March 12, 1963, 191-193, and Szasz, "What Psychiatry Can and Cannot do," in *Harper's*, vol. 228, no. 1365, February, 1964, 50-53; see also Szasz, *Law, Liberty and Psychiatry* (New York: Macmillan, 1963).

<sup>126</sup> Freud, *The Future of an Illusion* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1927), 12f.

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, 11 f.

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*, 6 f.

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid.*, 69 f.

<sup>130</sup> *Ibid.*, 79.

<sup>131</sup> *Ibid.*, 87.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid.*, 86 f.

<sup>133</sup> *Ibid.*, 88 f.

<sup>134</sup> *Ibid.*, 92.

<sup>135</sup> Freud, *Civilization and its Discontents*, 23.

<sup>136</sup> *Ibid.*, 16 f.

---

<sup>137</sup> *Ibid.*, 40.

<sup>138</sup> “The Resistances to Psycho-Analysis” (1925) in *Collected Papers V*, 170.

<sup>139</sup> “‘Civilized’ Sexual Morality and Modern Nervousness.” (1908) in *Collected Papers II*, 76-99.

<sup>140</sup> “Observations on ‘Wild’ Psycho-Analysis” (1910), *Collected Papers II*, 297-304.

<sup>141</sup> *Civilization and its Discontents*, 42 f.

<sup>142</sup> *Ibid.*, 74 f.

<sup>143</sup> *Ibid.*, 105.

<sup>144</sup> *Letters of Sigmund Freud*, 341 f.

<sup>145</sup> “Why War?” (1932) in *Collected Papers V*, 273-287. See also Gregory Zilboorg, *Sigmund Freud* (New York: Scribner’s, 1951), 91ff.

<sup>146</sup> “Analysis Terminable and Interminable” (1937), in *Collected Papers V*, 346.

<sup>147</sup> “The Libido Theory” (1922) in *Collected Papers V*, 135.

<sup>148</sup> Freud, “Beyond the Pleasure Principle,” James Strachey, trans. (New York: Bantam Books, 1959), 88.

<sup>149</sup> *Ibid.*, 109.

<sup>150</sup> Norman O. Brown, *Life Against Death, The Psychoanalytic Meaning of History* (New York: Random House, 1959), 92.

<sup>151</sup> Freud, “‘A Child is Being Beaten’ A Contribution to the Study of the Origin of Sexual Perversions” (1919), in *Collected Papers II*, 189. See also, in the same volume, 257, “The Economic Problem in Masochism” (1924).

---

<sup>152</sup> A. W. Stinson, in *Coronet*, 34, October, 1961, vol. 50, no. 6.

<sup>153</sup> Edmund Bergler, *Laughter and the Sense of Humor* (New York: Intercontinental Medical Book Corporation, 1956), 66. The “point” of psychoanalytic treatment is to “feel more at home with your *real self*,” not cure; John Knight, *The Story of My Psychoanalysis* (New York: Pocket Books, 1952), 25, cf. 204.

<sup>154</sup> Herbert Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization, A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955).

<sup>155</sup> Ernest Becker, “The Significance of Freudian Psychology,” in *Main Currents in Modern Thought*, vol. 19, no. 3, January-February, 1963, 66.

<sup>156</sup> See O. H. Mowrer, *The Crisis in Psychiatry and Religion*.

<sup>157</sup> H. K. Wells, *Failure of Psychoanalysis*, 34.

<sup>158</sup> Freud, “Psychopathology of Everyday Life,” Chapter XII, “Determinism-- Chance--and Superstitious Beliefs,” in Brill: *Basic Writings of Freud*, 150-178.

<sup>159</sup> Wells: *Failure of Psychoanalysis*, 105.

<sup>160</sup> *Ibid.*, 171, 180.

<sup>161</sup> “A Moral Book,” Oakland (California) *Tribune*, Monday, March 9, 1964, 3; George Williams, “Pulpit Meditations on ‘Fanny Hill,’” in *Christianity Today*, vol. VIII, no. 13, March 27, 1964, 43 (617). In the New York court trial, the Rev. S. Van Meter, an official of the Protestant Council of the City of New York “defended” *Fanny Hill*.

<sup>162</sup> Brown, *Life Against Death*, 305-322. See Thomas B. Morgan, “How Hieronymus Bosch and Norman O. Brown Would Change the World,” in *Esquire*, LIX, 3 March, 1963, 100-105, 135.

<sup>163</sup> John Wren-Lewis, “Repression or Resurrection? A Reconsideration of a Challenging Book,” in *The Christian Scholar*, XLVI, 3, Fall, 1963, 267-271.

<sup>164</sup> See William Graham Cole, *Called to Responsible Freedom: The Meaning of Sex in the Christian Life*. Published for the United Christian Youth Movement, National Council of the

---

Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., New York, 1961. See also "Moral, The Second Sexual Revolution," *Time*, vol. 83, no. 4, January 24, 1964, 57, for remarks of Protestant churchmen.

<sup>165</sup> See any issue of *The Campus Voice, The Magazine of Sexual Awareness*, San Jose, California; Shane Alexander, "Singular Girl's Success," *Life*, vol. 54, no. 9, March 1, 1963, 60, 65-67; George Williams, "Collector's Item for Lent," in *Christianity Today* VIII, 10, February 14, 1964, 36f. (466 f.); Martin Cohen, "Life, Love, Affairs and Marriage, Actress Joan Collins tells why an affair might be good for you," *Coronet*, vol. 19, no. 4, October, 1963, 64-71.

<sup>166</sup> Lewis Joseph Sherrill, *Family and Church* (New York: Abingdon, 1937), 116f. See also William Boquist, "Sex--the Modern Pain Pill," San Francisco *Examiner*, Sunday, November 17, 1963, 1, 14.

<sup>167</sup> Robert H. Bonthuis, *Christian Paths to Self-Acceptance* (New York: King's Crown Press, 1948, 1952), 214. Freud held to the fertility cult view of woman as "the principle of vitality, the ground of creation and death," Philip Rieff, *Freud: The Mind of the Moralizer* (New York: Viking Press, 1959), 180.

<sup>168</sup> "Sweden, Taking Sex Seriously," in *Time*, vol. 83, no. 10, March 6, 1964, 35.

<sup>169</sup> Michael Leigh, *The Velvet Underground* (New York: Macfadden, 1963), 148f.

<sup>170</sup> See Vincent Sheean, *Dorothy and Red* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1963). Note Lisa Hobbs' comments, "Dorothy and Red," review, San Francisco, *Examiner*, People, The California Weekly Section, Sunday, December 29, 1963, 14 f.

<sup>171</sup> See Richard V. McCann, *Delinquency, Sickness or Sin?* (New York: Harper, 1957).

<sup>172</sup> Arvid Runestam, *Psychoanalysis and Christianity*. Oscar Winfield, translator. (Rock Island, IL: Augustana Press, 1958), 82.

<sup>173</sup> See Bernard Ikeler, On Karl Menninger, "Accent on Love," in *Presbyterian Life*, vol. 12, no. 12, June 15, 1959, 6-9. On the Menningers, see Walker Winslow, *The Menninger Story* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1956). For Karl Menninger's Freudian beliefs, see his selected papers, *A Psychiatrist's World*, (New York: Viking Press, 1959), 415-427, 819-825, 844-855. See also Karl Menninger's *Theory of Psychoanalytic Technique*, (New York: Basic Books, 1958).

<sup>174</sup> Henry Guntrip, *Psychotherapy and Religion* (New York: Harper, 1957).

---

<sup>175</sup> W. Earl Biddle, *Integration of Religion and Psychiatry* (New York: Macmillan, 1955), 151.

<sup>176</sup> See Edmund Ziman, *Jealousy in Children, A Guide for Parents* (New York: Wyn, 1949); and Flanders Dunbar, *Your Child's Mind and Body, A Practical Guide for Parents* (New York: Random House, 1949). Both writers are psychiatrists.

<sup>177</sup> "The Church and the Homosexual," in Simon Doniger, ed., *The Minister's Consultation Clinic, Pastoral Psychology in Action* (Great Neck, NY: Channel Press, 1955), 257ff.

<sup>178</sup> Georgiana Hunter, *The Girl on the Couch* (New York: Pyramid Books, 1958), 68f., 144.

<sup>179</sup> John Coignard, *The Spectacle of a Man* (New York: Jefferson House, 1937), 248.

<sup>180</sup> *A Psychotherapy of Schizophrenia: Direct Analysis*, 121. By Albert E. Scheflen, M.D.; forward by O. Spurgeon English, M. D.; preface by Lawrence S. Kubie, M.D.; appendix by Arthur Auerbach, M.D. Kubie's mild comment on this is noteworthy: "A criticism might be made that Rosen, almost literally takes over the role of a Godhead to become an unreal and magical figure. 'As long as you have me you will remain well. If you ever give me up you will become insane again,'" xii.

<sup>181</sup> Gilbert Russell, "Individual Treatment in Psychiatry," in Philip Mairet, ed., *Christian Essays in Psychiatry* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1956), 143-146.

<sup>182</sup> Wells, *Failure of Psychoanalysis* 20.

<sup>183</sup> Benjamin Karpman, *The Sexual Offender and his Offenses* (New York: Julian Press, 1957), 418.

<sup>184</sup> Ruth Winter, "What Freud Really Said About Sex," in *Pageant*, vol. 18, no. 6, January, 1963, 69.

<sup>185</sup> John Philip Lundin, Ph.D., *Women, The Autobiographical Reflections of a Frustrated Male* (New York: Julian Press, 1963), 69. In the introduction, R.E.L. Masters rejoices that "Today, science, not theology, is increasingly becoming the arbiter of sexual morality. Physicians and psychologists, sociologists and anthropologists, not clergymen, are the effective authorities on sexual behavior...Their findings seldom lend any support to the view that continence is a desirable way of life," xiii.

---

<sup>186</sup> See Roger Caillois, *Man and the Sacred* (The Free Press: Glencoe, IL, 1959).

<sup>187</sup> Richard La Piere, *The Freudian Ethic* (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1959).

<sup>188</sup> See "Psychiatrist Raps Over-Use of Drugs," Oakland, California, *Tribune*, Wednesday, March 25, 1964, 2; and Mortimer Ostow, "The New Drugs, in Charles Rolo, editor, *Psychiatry in American Life* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1963), 114-127. These essays appeared as a supplement in *The Atlantic*, vol. 206, no. 1, July, 1961, 61-111, with some differences.

<sup>189</sup> See Robert Coughlan, "Control of the Brain, Part II, the Chemical Mind- Changers,": in *Life*, vol. 54, no. 11, March 15, 1963, 81-94.

<sup>190</sup> San Francisco *Chronicle*, Sunday, October 7, 1956, 4.

<sup>191</sup> Robert Coughlan, "Control of the Brain, Part I, Behavior by Electronics," in *Life*, vol. 54, no. 10, March 8, 1963, 90-106.

<sup>192</sup> Ludwig Eidelberg, *Take Off Your Mask* (New York: Pyramid Books, 1957), 67f.

<sup>193</sup> Michael Fraenkel, "Freud and the Modern Writer," in Jacob Sonntag, *Caravan, A Jewish Quarterly Omnibus* (New York: Thomas Yoseloff, 196), 296.

<sup>194</sup> In *The Atlantic*, vol. 208, no. 1, July, 1961, 105-107.

<sup>195</sup> Hervey M. Cleckley, "Psychiatry: Science, Art and Scientist," in Helmut Schoeck and James W. Wiggins eds., *Psychiatry and Responsibility*, (Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand, 1962), 89. All of the essays in this symposium are able critiques of some contemporary mental health trends. See also T. Robert Ingram, ed., *Essays on the Death Penalty* (Houston, TX: St. Thomas Press, 1963), for applications to a particular area of the challenge to the psychiatric answers.

<sup>196</sup> In the Billy Sol Estes case, a secretary, Mary Jones, was seized and held for a time in a mental institution when it was discovered that she knew of and had files containing information on the affairs of Estes. "Government Employee Railroaded to Mental Institution," Senator John Walker was seized also, and, it has been charged without contradiction that he had been scheduled for a lobotomy but his release was secured in time. Elmore Douglass Greaves, *The Blackamoor of Oxford* (Jackson, MS., 1963), 49.

---

<sup>197</sup> Dr. Jerome Hall, "The Psychiatrist and Crime: A threat to Society?" in *The National Observer*, Monday, August 20, 1962, 8; Thomas S. Szasz, *Law, Liberty and Psychiatry*; Lewis Albert Alesen, *Mental Robots*, (Caldwell, ID: Caxton, 1957); American Public Relations Forum *Bulletin no. 96*; Robert Morris and T. S. Szasz, two articles reprinted as *Mind Tapping*, Belmont, MA; American Public Relations Forum, *Brain Washing, A Synthesis of the Russian Text Book on Psychopolitics*, Burbank, CA; C. O. Garshwiler and E. Merrill Root, *Secret Files for Secret Purposes* (Education Information, Inc., 1961).

<sup>198</sup> For an example, see Alfred Auerback, "The Fight Against Mental Health" in *Fact*, vol. I, issue 1, January-February, 1964, 47-51. For some psychiatrists, mental sickness is replacing sin as the universal condition of man; as Dr. Daniel Lieberman of San Francisco stated it at the Palo Alto Unitarian Church, "We all have it, at one time or another." (Palo Alto, CA, *Times*, 1, Saturday, April 11, 1964). The implication is that we therefore all need the new priesthood, psychiatry. In the movie, *Captain Newman, M.D.*, the point is made, "In some way, however small and secret, each of us is a little mad." (Movie Review, "Captain Newman, M.D.," in *Look*, vol. 28 no. 7, April 7, 1964, 94) Not sin but madness is the condition of man, and his need is thus changed from moral responsibility to proper social reconditioning.

<sup>199</sup> "Totem and Taboo," in Brill, *Basic Writings of Freud*, 872 f.

<sup>200</sup> Lionel Trilling, *The Liberal Imagination* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1953), 51.

<sup>201</sup> Claude Levi-Strauss, *A World on the Wane*, John Russell, trans. (New York: Criterion, 1961 (1955 in original French edition), 60.

<sup>202</sup> *Ibid.*, 310.

<sup>203</sup> Lundin, *Women*, 145f. 321. Dr. Lundin's subtitle is of interest in more than the intended sense: "Autobiographical Reflections of a Frustrated Male."

<sup>204</sup> Jean Ousset, *Marxism Leninism*, G. A. Lawman, trans. (Quebec: International Union, 1962), 1-51.

<sup>205</sup> Pedro L. Entralgo, *Mind and Body, Psychosomatic Pathology: A Short History of the Evolution of Medical Thought*, A. M. Espinosa, translator (New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, n.d.), 131-136

<sup>206</sup> Charles Hodge, *Princeton Sermons* (London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1958), XV.