THE JOURNAL OF ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY

AND

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

VOL. XVI

OCTOBER-NOVEMBER, 1921

NUMBER 4

ORIGINAL ARTICLES

SYMPOSIUM ON THE RELATIVE RÔLES IN PSYCHOPATHOLOGY OF THE EGO, HERD AND SEX INSTINCTS¹

I	The Ego Instinct	BERNARD GLUECK
II	The Herd Instinct	SANGER BROWN II
III	The Sex Instinct	C. MACFIE CAMPBELL
IV	Synthesis	JOHN T. MACCURDY

I

THE EGO-INSTINCT

BY BERNARD GLUECK, M. D.

DIRECTOR OF MENTAL HYGIENE DEPARTMENT, N. Y. SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

THERE is still ample reason why one should hesitate to state anything dogmatic concerning instinct as related to human behavior, notwithstanding the fact that psychological literature, especially of recent years, is pregnant with speculation concerning this subject. The situation is fairly simple when one finds it easy to pursue the common fallacy of confusing psychology with biology and physiology as many students of human behavior are in the habit of doing. Thus convictions and principles are rigidly adhered to and loudly proclaimed on no further proof than that gained from observations on the behavior of lower animals, and physiological processes or biological phenomena which may very well explain things in the behavior of the dog and cat are taken as absolute criteria for guidance to the psychological understanding of the behavior and endeavors of man. Such mixing and confusion of categories is held justifiable on the ground that man is but a more highly evolved ape and that any attempts at differentiation between that which is readily enough recognizable as a physiological process in a lower animal and

¹ Held at the Eleventh Annual Meeting of The American Psychopathological Association, Atlantic City, N. J., June 11, 1921.

that which is a strictly psychological problem in the total behavior of man is dismissed with a shrug of the shoulder as bordering upon the mystical.

This fallacious attitude — at any rate, a thoroughly impractical one in the realm of everyday human affairs, is but one of the penalties of a too great preoccupation with the gods of modern science.

The practical psychopathologist or psychiatrist cannot afford to permit this rigid and often misleading tendency, scientific though it may be called, to overawe him, and incidentally to work havoc with his task as a therapist, primarily concerned in the adjustment of mal-adjusted human relationships.

Those who have taken part in the struggle to emancipate psychiatry from the trammels of a too rigid nosology know how little concern is to be had over accusations of being unscientific and are not strangers to the amount of real mischief that is still being perpetrated under the guise of a respectful and respectable adherence to scientific classification and nosology. Only recently a candidate for a doctor's degree in philosophy, a man of considerable promise and achievement, was arrested for having stolen some books. The stealing on the part of this type of man, already a somewhat curious phenomenon in itself, received further uniqueness from the fact that this man exhibits a special penchant for stealing books on ethics and philosophy and in his personal conduct and relations is extremely ascetic and dogmatic about moral principles. Furthermore, there appears to be a significant temporal relationship between the death of a devoted sister, the abandonment of a habit of conduct which caused great moral conflicts and the beginning of these overt delinquencies of stealing books.

But formal and scientific psychiatry, finding the man neither insane nor defective in intelligence, declares its impotence in the matter and turns him over for treatment to the law. Repeatedly cases of misconduct or maladjustment, especially in adolescent boys and girls, have come to our attention with the story from a distracted parent that the psychiatrist, frequently the last hope in a long search for help, has declared with finality that it is not a case for him, since, forsooth, the boy or girl is neither defective nor insane, nor, if you please, psychopathic. And yet, the bulk of extra-institutional psychiatric practice, whether private or in the free public dispensary, is made up of cases which do not readily fall within the accepted psychiatric categories.

The experiences of the world war have given a new impetus to the already widely prevalent and genuine interest in psychiatry and mental hygiene on the part of the general public, and have rendered more urgent the obligations of the progressive psychiatrist to emancipate this branch of medicine from a too rigid domination by the various abstractions which have lately been passing as scientific formulations, and whose scientific procedure consists in a hopeless confusion of the psychological in human behavior with physiology or general biology, and in a complete identification of the aspirations and endeavors of man with the life phenomena of the dog and cat, as revealed by physiological and behavior studies of the laboratory. The type of psychiatry which promises the best results is the type so frequently stressed by Meyer and which depends for its formulations on the study of man as he is revealed to us in his everyday behavior reactions, in his ambitions and strivings, his successes and failures, etc. This involves a recognition of such things as "human values" which are unique as values because they are human values, and as such have no community of purpose with the dog or cat.

Psychoanalytic theory and procedure have been adversely criticized because of their avowed purpose to prove man to be no different from the beast. On the contrary, one of the most valuable contributions of the psychanalytic school has been the emphasis it puts upon the truism that for the understanding of man we must study men and not beasts.

What has been said thus far may sound, indeed, as a strange preamble to a discussion of instinct. I certainly hope that I have avoided giving the impression of not being in full sympathy with research in comparative anatomy and physiology, or with the efforts of the behaviorists. Neither am I at all inclined to depreciate the value of the contributions that have come from these fields. Particularly noteworthy along these lines are the efforts of McDougall, and his followers, to show how the simple instinctive reactions which are common to all living creatures become elaborated and shall I say, humanized, before they are expressed in the behavior of man. What I am contending against, is the widespread tendency to the often wholly unjustifiable and loose drawing of analogies between the behavior of man and the reactions of other animals. In the practice and teaching of psychiatry, one finds it inescapable to see in the fully integrated human being something different from a unity which can be wholly explained on mechanistic principles.

Man, such as he is, and such as one is obliged to deal with in everyday human intercourse, when viewed in his synthetic and integrated totality is neither a mere aggregation of vital organs and functions, nor a bundle of stratified hierarchies, one presiding over the other. A new quality seems to emerge from this anatomic, physiologic and psychologic synthesis which we call human personality with objectives of its own. No amount of insight into the various types of response, such as tropism, reflex, instinct, will in itself suffice for an understanding of the human personality, if these responses are viewed in their crude aspects and as reflected in the behavior of the dog or cat.

Any discussion of instinct, therefore, which has for its object some additional light upon the subject of human behavior must have in view, first, that in the behavior of the human personality as such, we are dealing with psychological phenomena essentially, and, second, that while due attention must be given in such a study to general biology, it is the special biology of man which is of prime importance.

The reasons for the first condition are obvious. The second condition is essential because the manifestation of crude and unmodified instinctive reactions in the behavior of man is a very rare phenomenon under present-day conditions of life, and something which we have only very exceptionally to deal with as psychiatrists.

Take, for instance, the subject of fear, an emotion associated with the all important danger instincts. This phenomenon, even in a very exaggerated form, is not uncommon in psychiatric practice, but only very exceptionally do we see it accompanied by reactions which are truly instinctive. Rather do we deal here in most instances with what Rivers has aptly called "manipulative reactions" which bear only faint traces, if any, of an instinctive character. Furthermore, accepting, as we are inclined to do, that there are certain innate instinctive determinants of the self-preservative manifestations in the behavior of the human being, we still cannot conceive of the ego as something apart and passively waiting for a stimulus which arouses some one or more of the egoistic trends, and only then manifesting the required reactions.

This may well be true of those instinctive determinants which have to do with the simple organic needs of the human organism, — such as food, drink, shelter, elimination, etc. But how often, I ask of you, do these simple and primitive organic needs give rise to psychopathological problems in the life of man under present-day social

organization? What we meet with as psychiatrists, in so far as the ego-instincts are concerned, are maladjustments with reference to the goal which a given human being has evolved for himself, with pathological phenomena which have to do with the individual's ego-ideal. The ego-ideal, to be sure, an elaboration which has its roots in crude instinctive determinants, is, nevertheless, something quite unique to the human organism, dealing not alone with organic needs, but with human values, and requiring, therefore, for an understanding, an approach which is quite different from that which we find adequate for an understanding of crude instinct. It is from this point of view that I would undertake the discussion of the ego-instincts in psychopathology, the subject assigned to me in this symposium.

As a preliminary, I think it quite justifiable to adhere to McDougall's list of instincts, since this estimate of the innate equipment of man is quite adequate to explain human conduct in the main. But I consider it distinctly advantageous to adopt Tansley's grouping of McDougall's list of instincts into the three main categories of herd, sex and ego.

According to this grouping we would include under the ego-instincts the following: Flight, pugnacity, repulsion, curiosity, self-assertion, self-abasement, construction and acquisition with their accompanying emotions.

Equally important, and eminently practical, especially in dealing with human behavior, is Tansley's proposed formula of the great and fundamental complexes. By "complex" he means, a well defined system of ideas and emotions, created in the mind by the play of experience upon the primary forces of the mind, the instincts. Instead, therefore, of dealing here with the crude and unmodified ego-instincts we consider it more to the point to take as our starting point what Tansley terms the ego-complex, since it is essentially with instinct as modified by experience and organized into patterns of behavior that we have to deal in the human being and not with simple conations. This brings us at once within the realm of human values and permits us to deal with the ego's strivings, desires, achievements and disappointments, rather than with the crude ego-trends.

What then are some of the strivings of the ego, which appear to be common to humanity in general? First and foremost, undoubtedly, is the *desire for security*. A great deal of the behavior of the human being, in so far as this behavior is intelligent and deliberative, has this for its goal. Then comes the *desire for recognition*. Underlying many

of the serious psychopathological disorders is a conscious recognition on the part of the patient of either a fear that he may lose the esteem of his fellows, or a painful conviction that he has lost their esteem. Much of the conscious striving of the individual has this for its goal, and the curious manipulative activities of mankind in the pursuit of this goal give more frequent occasion for serious maladjustment than is ordinarily recognized. Then comes the *desire for more intimate response*, in the nature of love, adoration, personal praise, the deprivation of which or the unsatisfied hunger for which is not infrequently reflected in the histories of our patients.

These fundamental and universal hungers of the human-ego constitute much of that which the man of the street means when he speaks of a fuller life. It is embraced in the phrase of a wise economist when he speaks of the universal desire of man to "put himself across" and of another, when he says, "every man strives to break through the western front along some sector," while the late Carleton Parker's concept of the "balked disposition" embraces much of that which we speak of as psychopathological.

This rather simple delineation of fundamental human desires in terms of humanly appreciable values is proposed by Professor Thomas, the eminent sociologist, to which he adds another, the desire for new experience. In view of the peculiar onesidedness which current psychopathological discussions have assumed, a onesidedness which deals with categories which seem in many respects quite remote from the practical daily tasks of the psychiatrist, I am taking the liberty of quoting Professor Thomas fully in his discussion of these fundamental desires. The material forms part of a guide to personality study in connection with some immigrant studies carried on by Professor Thomas.

1. The desire for new experience is seen in simple forms in the prowling and meddling activities of the child, and the love of adventure and travel in the boy and the man. It ranges in moral quality from the pursuit of game and the pursuit of pleasure to the pursuit of knowledge and the pursuit of ideals. It is found equally in the vagabond and the scientific explorer. Novels, theaters, motion pictures, etc., are means of satisfying this desire vicariously, and their popularity is a sign of the elemental force of this desire.

In its pure form the desire for new experience implies motion, change, danger, instability, social irresponsibility. The individual dominated by it shows a tendency to disregard prevailing standards

and group-interests. He may be a complete failure, on account of his instability; or a conspicuous success, if he converts his experiences into social values — puts them in the form of a poem, makes of them a contribution to science, etc.

2. The desire for security is opposed to the desire for new experience. It implies avoidance of danger and death, caution, conservatism. Incorporation in an organization (family, community, state) provides the greatest security. In certain animal societies (e.g., the ants) the organization and co-operation are very rigid. Similarly, among the peasants of Europe, represented by our immigrant groups, all lines of behavior are predetermined for the individual by tradition. In such a group the individual is secure as long as the group organization is secure, but evidently he shows little originality or creativeness.

3. The desire for recognition expresses itself in devices for securing distinction in the eyes of the *public*. A list of the different modes of seeking recognition would be very long. It would include courageous behavior, showing off through ornament and dress, the pomp of kings, the display of opinions and knowledge, the possession of special attainments — in the arts, for example. It is expressed alike in arrogance and in humility, even in martyrdom. Certain modes of seeking recognition we define as “vanity,” others as “ambition.” The “will to power” belongs here. Perhaps there has been no spur to human activity so keen and no motive so naïvely avowed as the desire for “undying fame,” and it would be difficult to estimate the rôle the desire for recognition has played in the creation of social values.

4. The desire for response is a craving, not for the recognition of the public at large, but for the more intimate appreciation of *individuals*. It is exemplified in mother-love (touch plays an important rôle in this connection) in romantic love, family affection, and other personal attachments. Homesickness and loneliness are expressions of it. Many of the devices for securing recognition are used also in securing response.

Apparently these four classes comprehend all the positive wishes. Such attitudes as anger, fear, hate and prejudice are attitudes towards those objects which may frustrate a wish.

Our hopes, fears, inspirations, joys, sorrows are bound up with these wishes and issue from them. There is, of course, a kaleidoscopic mingling of wishes throughout life, and a single given act may contain a plurality of them. Thus, when a peasant emigrates to America

he may expect to have a good time and learn many things (new experience), to make a fortune (greater security), to have a higher social standing on his return (recognition), and to induce a certain person to marry him (response).

The "*character*" of the individual is determined by the nature of the organization of his wishes. The dominance of any one of the four types of wishes is the basis of our ordinary judgment of his character. Our appreciation (positive or negative) of the character of the individual is based on his display of certain wishes as against others, and on his modes of seeking their realization.

The individual's attitude toward the totality of his attitudes constitutes his "*personality*." The personality represents the conception of self, the individual's appreciation of his own character.

Without undertaking to champion the sociologist's outline as something final or all-embracing, I must say that for the purposes of a practical psychopathology and psychiatry it is more helpful than many of the discussions of crude instinct as such. Besides, it does not in the least carry with it the necessity of ignoring any of the help which we might derive from general biology and physiology. It merely insists upon dealing with psychological facts, psychologically and in terms understandable for human beings. That it may also serve quite adequately as a basis for the discussion of the pathology of the ego-instincts, I hope to make clear as I go along.

The task assigned to me in this symposium is made difficult to start with on account of the necessity of fitting the discussion of the ego-instincts into the larger scheme in which the herd and sex trends of man are separately considered. For it is impossible for me to conceive of any consideration of the ego, — wholly apart from his sex and herd attributes. Indeed, in actual practice any attempt at such separation is a mere fiction and bound to lead to hopeless confusion. If I were to be at all dogmatic in anything I have to say in this paper it would be that in the behavior of man, as we are able to observe it, the instinctive component receives its value only in so far as it is expressed in the service of the personality as a whole, fused, integrated, and free from any determination for an independent expression. Conversely, instinct is apt to become pathological as soon as it tends to assume an independent existence. What we speak of as "conflict" is the immediate defense-reaction of the personality as a whole to any such tendency for independent expression on the part of any instinct.

Experience teaches us again and again, to avoid the fallacy, for instance, of speaking of a "sexual neurosis" as such. The very thing which brings the patient to us for treatment is the ego's reaction to the alleged sexual difficulty, and not the sexual difficulty per se. For there can be no difficulty of specific instinct unless it makes itself felt in some disorder of the personality as a whole.

So that health, or normality, as it concerns instinct is to be measured by the same standard as health, in other respects, is measured, namely, by the standard of integration. So long as an individual does not become especially aware of the fact that he has some instincts within him, his instincts are to all intents and purposes normal. On the other hand, any special or extraordinary claim upon the personality as a whole on the part of any instinct requires an extraordinary adjustive readiness and capacity on the part of the organism as a whole, and may lead to disease or abnormality. In fact, one might go a step further and say that normally, this special and independent assertion of any given instinct requiring a definite break in the integration of the herd, sex and ego-components of man is called for only in exceptionally critical situations, and that it seems that man is losing the capacity to act effectively, even in critical situations when such split in unity is called for.

Normal instinct, therefore, is instinct which fits the individual's scheme of life and behavior in its entirety. This dictum is simple enough when it concerns living creatures other than man. In man we have to reckon with another factor than the mere ego-instincts, the factor of the ego-ideal, and here we are at once confronted with the question, what constitutes a healthy ego-ideal? For it deserves frequent reiteration that in dealing with the human personality and its needs much remains to be said, still, after due attention has been given to the organic needs of the human organism. What constitutes a healthy ego-ideal? Unfortunately biology or physiology or even normal psychology helps us here very little. We can only infer what this is likely to be from a consideration of the evidence furnished by psychopathology.

The troubles of the ego, as we call them, are often troubles with reference to the ego-ideal, and of a nature of a too great discrepancy between aspiration and equipment. It would seem, therefore, that judging by this criterion, a normal ego-ideal would be something which is not static, but dynamic, either progressive or regressive and constantly adjusted in such manner as to avoid putting upon the

individual demands for achievement which are quite out of accord with his capacity for meeting them. I say that the dynamic nature of the ego-ideal may have to allow for the possibility of regression as well as of progression, because it is the lack of this very capacity to adjust to adversities which demand a regressive reshaping of the ego-ideal that frequently leads to pathological reactions.

This brief statement of what might be considered a healthy ego-instinctive component and ego-ideal with the general and specific elements of the latter, brings us to a consideration of the psychopathology of the ego-instincts.

What renders the ego-instincts, or better still, the ego-complex, in the sense of Tansley, pathological, and what are the manifestations of such a pathological state? It would be, to my mind, pure speculation to start with, to endeavor to determine what the situation may be here congenitally. In spite of the fact that we are apt to see in certain states of maldevelopment of personality, such for instance, as in epilepsy, feeble-mindedness, and in certain types of constitutionally inferior individuals, indications of a pathological ego-equipment it is not very safe to assume absolutely that the ego-instincts may be affected congenitally. Certainly, it would seem altogether too speculative an enterprise to endeavor to be in any way precise and specific concerning possible congenital modifications of the ego. What is true of the wider field of psychopathology is coming to be recognized more and more as being true also of those states which we were in the habit of stigmatizing as defects, namely, that the life experiences, in the broadest sense of this term, with which the individual has come in contact are the real determinants of personality and character, and that we are on much safer ground when studying these more tangible and concrete facts in their possible influence upon the personality than is offered by the speculations concerning heredity and congenitalism.

We are coming to recognize more definitely, for instance, that the character defects of the epileptic, while rooted in a defective soil, are conditioned very materially by the epileptic's life-experiences and are subject to a degree of modification hitherto undreamt of. Similarly, while we may prove statistically the congenital character of certain forms of feeble-mindedness, the student of this subject recognizes clearly that much remains still to be said concerning a specific individual that is of vital importance, after a diagnosis of feeble-mindedness has been established. One knows of cases of feeble-mindedness of a similar degree of mental-deficiency who differ

from each other as widely as possible, the differences being determined very often by the differences in the conditioning life experiences of these individuals rather than by any mystical hereditary selectiveness.

The feeble-minded boy whose defect is recognized early and who is accordingly spared the repeated humiliations and defeats which go with an unintelligent persistence in putting a defective child at tasks which are quite beyond his possibility of achievement, is apt to develop a different personality, and different ego, from that of the personality of the mismanaged feeble-minded boy.

The epileptic boy whose ego-centric dominations are checked and corrected from early childhood and in whom an effort is made to cultivate socially acceptable modes of self-assertion is apt to be a less distressing and annoying kind of epileptic than the one who is neglected or merely treated chemically. In both the feeble-minded and the epileptic the phenomena of make-up and behavior which are essentially psychological are subject to the rules governing all psychological phenomena. If there are differences here they are differences of degree rather than of kind. We shall, therefore, not speak any further of any pathological manifestations of the ego-instincts which may be supposed to have been determined congenitally. In doing so we naturally do not mean to suggest that the road to research along these lines is absolutely closed. We merely want to avoid futile speculation.

When we come, however, to those pathological manifestations of the ego which we believe to be traceable to conditioning life-experiences, we are entering upon distinctly firmer ground.

It would lead us considerably beyond the scope of this paper which deals primarily with psychopathology to enter into a too detailed consideration of the development of the ego. It would involve a consideration of those very fundamental and extensive constituents of the ego which are embraced in the body with its organs and mass of continuous stimuli which we designate as common sensations, and which contribute so largely to the shaping of the thoughts, emotions and strivings associated with the self.

It would take us necessarily into a discussion of the very intimate and important relationships between the development of the self as such and one's sexual development. It would involve us in the highly speculative realm of the genesis and advent of self-consciousness.

For psychopathological purposes it is safer and quite sufficient

to confine one's self to the more or less well integrated end-products which we may recognize as belonging to the ego-complex primarily.

Thus it is safe to deal with such of the conations of the ego-complex as we are familiar with in ourselves and others. As self-maintenance or the "will to live," being the primary conation and self-maximation or the "will to power," in its various and intricate manifestations, the conation of secondary importance, it is essentially with the pathological modifications of these fundamental strivings of the ego and with the means employed for their achievement that we are interested in as psychopathologists. For a correct estimation of these manifestations it behooves us to pay heed to what William James had to say in his discussion of the "hierarchy of the me's"; it demands a greater stressing in psychopathology of what some one has called the "bread life" of the individual with the underlying manifestations and influences of the acquisitive instinct. The positive value of the constructive instinct and its influence upon the shaping of the ego, specifically, in determining the relative social worth of a given personality deserve more of our attention.

Then the instincts of self-assertion, and self-abasement, with their accompanying emotions, components of the ego which play such a determining rôle in conditioning the degree of self-esteem as well as the degree of suggestibility to herd influence which the individual manifests, must claim our attention.

These various constituents of the ego-complex which we have mentioned are no less important as determiners of the character and reaction patterns of the individual, than are the more overtly expressed instincts of pugnacity, repulsion and flight. Moreover, whereas the latter come to the surface most commonly only in connection with certain critical situations, the former are the steady, habitual influences which go to shape the personality.

The emotions associated with the ego-complex in which we are particularly interested are those which are coupled with the twin instincts of self-assertion and self-abasement, namely, the positive and negative self-feeling of McDougall, or the feeling of elation and depression, since upon the condition of these twin instincts probably depends the habitual state of the morale of the individual. And is it not some sort of problem in self-respect, or feeling of adequacy, or of morale that we most often encounter in psychopathological reactions?

I shall touch briefly upon the relation of the emotions of fear,

anger and apathy to the ego-complex later on when considering some of the acute pathological reactions of the ego.

This brief reference to the constituents, conations and important emotions of the ego-complex ought to furnish us the starting point from which we might consider the pathological modifications of the ego-complex which may be brought about by the play of experience upon these instincts, modifications either in the shape of pathological character formations or of acute reactive phenomena.

We are concerned in the former mainly with two types of variations from the normal, namely pathological egotism and drive for self-maximation with all the accompanying phenomena, and a pathological degree of timidity and self-effacement with its train of manifestations. Since a normal state of the ego probably depends in the main upon a proper balancing of the instincts of self-assertion and self-abasement, it would be well to consider primarily the conditioning influences upon these two instincts. Among these conditioning influences those which have to do with various inferiorities are commonly met with in psychopathology. The inferiority to start with may be relative or actual and may depend upon some structural or functional defect or upon a mere feeling of inferiority induced psychologically as a result of any possible variety of life experience.

The subject of the inferiority feeling or inferiority complex has been dealt with adequately by many authors and requires no treatment here. Indeed, it forms the basis of Adler's psychological scheme. What must be emphasized over and over again is that the manifestations of a pathological exaggeration of the ego, or of the obverse state is much more often something in the nature of a reactive, compensatory manifestation than an inherited, fixed and unchangeable anomaly of character and make-up. Of considerable practical importance is the growing belief that it is distinctly within the realm of a practical mental hygiene to prevent the occurrence of these pathological reactive phenomena of the ego-variety. It is one of the most pressing problems of the day in the field of education, since a proper recognition of the rôle of success and failure in the shaping of the ego, and of the perniciousness entailed in the growing tendency on the part of the modern parent to wish to re-live his own life, only in a more elaborated and maximated degree through the lives of his children, should do much to prevent many a frustrated career. It is this pernicious tendency which is largely responsible for the maladjustments resulting from a too great discrepancy between aspiration and endowment. The

family tragedies at the basis of a pathological need for self-maximation on the part of one or both parents is almost inevitably reflected in the personality and make-up of the children, either in the form of an actual crushing of the self with a persistent state of timidity and lack of morale, or in a frantic need for a compensatory exaggerated egoism. These reactive phenomena of the ego may manifest themselves, as they frequently do in overt behavior reactions of a selfish, anti-social nature, especially when the behavior is the result of a reflective rationalisation, as in the case of habitual offenders against the law, of certain "captains of industry," or prophets of a new order. Or, the manifestations may be more or less symbolic, and by that token, are apt to be more strictly pathological as in the case of various delusional and hallucinatory elaborations of the intimidated hebephrenic or aggressive paranoiac.

Especially deserving of further study are those pathological elaborations of an ego-ideal, the roots and instigators of which have become definitely repressed into the unconscious. Since here any possibility of constructive adjustment is ruled out from the start, the patient is not even conscious of the main objective of his frantic drive for self-maximation and the goal persists in eluding him. In the meantime, the pathological need and drive for compensation, the roots of which remain out of reach of the individual's awareness lead to persistent behavior reactions which are distinctly pathological in their ego-manifestations.

My remarks concerning this extensive and important subject of instinct in human behavior are apt to be less complete than they are bound to be anyway, if I were not to mention, briefly, at least, the subject of the acute psychopathological manifestations which are related more or less exclusively to the ego-instincts of man. This phase of the subject before us is to my mind not nearly so important as is the aspect which we have more fully stressed, namely, that of the conditioning influences which life-experiences exert upon the shaping and development of the self. The subject deserves some mention, particularly, because of the controversy which has arisen in connection with the attempt to give clear definition to some of the neuroses of warfare. The question has been raised as to whether the war neuroses are the expression either in part or wholly of the ego-instincts. Those who have had to deal in civil life with situations which resemble to some extent the exigencies of warfare have been familiar with the pathological reactions which have received so much

attention in connection with the world war. I am referring to pathological reactions observed in connection with imprisonment, especially under exceptionally rigid conditions of deprivation and balking of the ego, and occasionally, in connection with the imminent threat to life in those condemned to execution. We have had occasion to observe repeatedly these reactions in all the various forms which were manifested at the front, and some years ago published case studies which showed clearly the situational character of those neuroses and psychoses and their essential recoverability when only the ego-instincts were involved.

The emotional accompaniments of these prison-psychotic reactions are limited as in the psychoses of warfare to the emotions of fear, anger and apathy.

Now that I have reached the end of my paper I realize how incomplete is my presentation of the subject, and what is more distressing, that because of the hurried fashion in which it was written, how much of the staccato nature it reflects, in that it touches unparadonably lightly upon many important points which deserve a much more extensive and erudite treatment than has been accorded them here. I hope, however, that the thesis which I am most anxious to bring before you has been made sufficiently clear — namely, that in the consideration of the subject of instinct as related to human behavior we must endeavor to avoid the fallacy of confusing the issues of human personality with those presented by a study of the behavior of the lower animals.