A CRITICISM OF PSYCHOANALYSIS

BY J. VICTOR HABERMAN, A.B., M.D., D.M. (BERLIN)

Instructor in Psycho-pathology and -therapy at the College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University; Attending Physician at Vanderbilt Clinic, New York.

CONCERNING the Freudian controversy much misunderstanding exists and the literature shows that the real points at issue are either evaded or misconstrued, and because of this the subject as a problem for solution clouded and made impossible. Can we not outline the matter so as to come to better evaluations? for does not our yes or no only too often refer to quite divergent claims? Besides, it is high time to point out that other forms of mental analysis — not sexuo-analysis — are employed in psychotherapy decidedly effectual, and that the problem is not, as many seem to think, one of either Freudian analysis of a patient's psychopathology or no analysis whatsoever — hence, no understanding of the psychopathy at all.¹

Of the many "parts" to the Freudian theory, not all are condemned, and some are lauded by even its severest critics. Which are condemned and why? Let us try to give some acceptable answer. The "parts" of the theory may be enumerated as follows: The infantile or childhood's *sexual trauma* as cause of hysteria; the pan-sexualism of mental life which makes every trend revert finally to the sexual; the mechanism of *repression* and *displacement*; this repressed material, always sexual,² forming a massive background — sub-ground — of the mind, namely a specially described "*unconscious*"; the discovery of such repressed ideas by a particular method of analysis or translation in which *sexuo-symbolism* is employed; the curing of the neuroses by such *psycho-(sexuo-) analysis*, etc.

¹The advertisements of the books on "Psychoanalysis" and "Dream-analysis," apart from being almost fraudulent in their exaggerations, make it appear that all other methods are "similar to treating the cough or fever, regardless of the causal disease. Psychoanalysis concerns itself with the individual as a personality," etc. (From W. B. Saunders Company's advertisement, for instance.)

²See Hitschmann, "Freud's *Neurosenlehre*," 1911, pp. 55-6.

In a general way it may be said that the critics of these theories have admitted that Freud has contributed much to our science by insisting on the psychogenic in determining the nature of the neuroses and in pointing out the importance of past psychic experiences in their bearing upon etiology, and that his intense and prolonged occupation with the patient gave us a better way of penetrating the mental life than we had used before.¹ They have also pointed to certain "mechanisms" as being possibly of potential value and deserving of deeper study, such as "*Verdrängung*" or the question of the working of "affects" of unconscious or partly conscious elements, etc. (Isserlin), though they at the same time emphasize the fact that these mechanisms have in no way as yet been shown to exist and that the method employed by Freud to prove their existence is scientifically false. The various strictures, however, have either been entirely ignored by the Freudians or answered with irrelevance or purposely misconstrued. This becomes evident when one, for instance, takes up the *sexual* of the Freudians — especially that of the American disciples. In a letter in the *Journal of the A. M. A.*, of March 28, 1914, we are told that Dr. Dercum certainly misunderstands the meaning of sexual manifestations in the Freudian sense. "In this sense it covers a broad and comprehensive field of experience and activity, whether bodily desires or mental longings. It embraces all desires, instincts, wishes, ambitions — like hunger, sex, acquisition, aspiration, the social sense, love, etc. This is a far cry from the narrow, vulgar conception of the term which seems to be understood by the men opposing the Frëudian psychology." In the same strain, a writer in the *Medical Record* (Feb. 21, 1914), after quoting Dr. Burr's remark that psychoanalysis "resolves itself into a searching and filthy examination into the past sexual life" of a patient, adds stentoriously, "any physician who entertains such Manichæan views about the sexual is unworthy of his calling and unfit to practice his profession." These reproofs are to be found in nearly every pro-Freudian article published in our American journals. Are they deserved? or is there some misunderstanding here as to who has the "narrow, vulgar" point of view?

¹Janet, however, also advised this.

My common-sense will vouch for the fact that neither Dr. Burr nor Dr. Dercum, nor any other critic of Freud's sexual theory the world over, has ever entertained such unseemly ideas against the sexual itself as these Freudian writers endeavor to make it appear — thus gaining the moral support of the righteous in order to condemn the anti-Freudians outright. The problem is quite different. Every normal-minded physician thinks of the gynecologic in the same colorless way as he does, for instance, of the laryngologic. In taking an anamnesis, the sexual has always been inquired into and considered, even long before Freudism saw the light. Nowhere has it ever been termed filthy or superfluous. Calm and scientific interest has always been taken in the subject, and many books—hundreds of them — written upon it. Krafft-Ebing's famous book, for instance, or that of Forel, or an entire sheaf of such by Havelöck Ellis, the books by Moll, Loewenfeld, Rohleder, Kötscher, Ivan Bloch, Fournier, Hegar's "*Der Geschlechtstrieb*," known to every gynecologist, the books of Eulenburg or of Magnus Hirschfeld on perversions, etc., have these over-zealous disciples ever seen any one throw his hands up in shame of them, or heard a word of aspersion cast upon their authors, or discovered that they themselves treated their themes as "filthy"? or has any common-sensed physician ever censured their works as such? And does not the writing of all these books prove that we as physicians hold the sexual instincts, acts, abnormalities and normalities, etc., as of vast importance in the life of an individual? The connotation "filthy," therefore, as occurring to the critic of Freud's sexual theory or such writings as Jung's "Analysis of a four-year-old boy," or such unpardonable perpetrations as we have read in American medical papers on erotics, anal and other, in the Freudian sense, has a distinctly different application. Issue, namely, has been taken, not with the sexual itself, but with *the interpreting*, by Freudists, of quite harmless and colorless ideas occurring in the thoughts and dreams of patients (even children) as sexual, where there was nothing sexual to start with. The sexual is interpreted *into* them. It is pure "*Deuterei*." Only too often it is n't interpretation at all, but the translating by fixed sym-

bois (see note 1, page 270). Nor is it sexual in the gynecologic sense, or let us say medical; no, it is in the terms of such social-associations which we look upon as "shady", improper or repugnant.

Now how does the psychoanalyzer get such meaning out of the data furnished him? He says words don't really signify what they apparently mean; they stand for something else (or may be made to). Hence *symbolism*. Anything that is long or tall or thin, or grows into the air, opens like an umbrella, shoots like a gun, wriggles like a snake — of course it's plain what that stands for; and boxes, cases, closets, stoves (!), carriages (or omnibus! !), tunnels, caves, rings, shells — indeed it's evident what they stand for. In a dream a room always means a woman's room, and if it's several rooms it means a harem or bordel. A covered table means a woman, so I believe does also a wagon and boards (? !). A staircase — that's something to go up (you understand), and a tunnel — you doubtless also fathom the idea. Should one dream of an arm, that belongs to the "long, thin" group. If it's the "left" arm it means illegitimate — hence, adultery! Going into any narrow place, or opening locked doors means nibbling at forbidden fruit, etc. And then from the joy of it we suddenly come to our senses and ask, with a 'good gracious me!' "How do you know?" Where has it been only remotely proven? If I dream of being a passenger in a Zeppelin balloon ascension (which dirigible I may have seen the day before), and I feel a trifle scared as we arise (as if we don't often feel scared at the mere waking thought of it), how do you know that dream meant (as Jung said it did) that I was wishing to make a *fortissimo* attempt at coitus, but feared it might only prove *pianissimo*! and because there was also a *very* young girl in the balloon, who, however, had but one tooth, — that was to be taken by opposites and meant an old woman who was to be assayed — in fact (because of the one tooth) my grandmother! Now, *sancta simplicitas*! Shall one call this "intuitive" or "psychoanalytic" or disgusting? Call it "wielding the deep psychology," or what you will, only one asks "How do you know it's so?"

There is n't the minutest exaggeration here. Let me cite a few instances from articles I happen to have before me: "To those acquainted with the language of hysteria, such things frequently mean the opposite" (*N. Y. Med. Jour.*, April 23, 1910). "For those familiar with dream symbolism, her dreaming that the man put his hand in her pocket requires no analysis. The pocket is a frequent dream-symbol for the vagina." In this analysis the girl (whose dream was being interpreted) yearned for her brother "to put *his* hand in *her* pocket." The brother, however, was, so to speak, only second fiddle, for she had craved for the hand of her own father to give her this delight, but he dying, by a transfer of *libido*, the desire fell upon the son, her brother, who was nearest like her father, etc., (*JOURNAL OF ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY*, Aug.-Sept., 1911, p. 194-5). For "left" side being the "illegitimate"—always in connection with coitus or similar ecstasy, see *Med. Record*, Dec. 24, 1910. In one of the most *ardent* dream interpretations (*N. Y. Med. Jour.*, June 14, 1913, p. 1234—a young man (in the dream) raises a round white wooden basket to a girl. The contents were small seeds and white syrup. When the seeds were pressed they produced milky syrup, etc. Now this is the way this Freudist interprets it: "The basket she associated with the vagina, the seeds with chicken ovaries; and the fluid from the seeds meant to her milk from the breast and semen. The man in the dream says, 'here sip.' This meant to her intercourse. In her early childhood she used to play with small girls and they would suck each others clitores. This dream expressed the wish for *cunnilingus* with her father, the idea of which she had cherished all her life." This might be taken as the high-water mark of sexuo-analytic accomplishment. A half dozen lines further on, this writer who has just given so remarkable an interpretation, says, "It cannot be too strongly emphasized that Freud's conception of the word sexual does not limit itself to the *gross* sexual (the italics are not mine), but embraces a wide scope of psychic manifestations of the sexual life," and this after so abhorrent an "interpretation" as the above. If you look through a dozen articles of these dream seers you will find each one, in spite of his lullabying about Freud's meaning of *sexual*, making out his patient to desire "*cunnilingus*" from her father, or as wishing to perform *fellatio* on him, or having her pockets picked, etc. You get the opinion that almost all daughters desire this. (What an orgy such an "evening" at the Psychoanalytic Society must be with all these brethren munching their themes!)

In brief, to Freudian writers the entire language is made up of two groups of symbolic words, half meaning the male, the other the female genitalia. If any words happen to be left over they stand for incest, rape, anus or *fœcal* associations, or the fornicative, generally speaking. Hence

the analyses, if not all, at least the larger majority, are filled with ideas of illicit love, masturbation, actual or desired or dreamed of adultery, incest or fellatio, or Lesbian and abnormal desires and practices. It is not analysis of the patient's actual mental life, it is nine-tenths or ten-tenths of his below-belt thinking! It cannot even be this in the major proportion of cases, for, Shades of the Vestal Virgins, are all the hysterical and obsessed women we see like those "shown up" by these dream interpreters? It is the construing into the patient's words, meanings occurring in the interpreter's mind.¹ "A diagnosis in the Freudian sense," said Streubli of Basel, "is a diagnosis of the mind that made it." Let us add that this applies not to all Freudists, as we shall see in a moment, for a change has come about, and many no longer believe in this pan-sexual phantastery, sexual symbolism, the sexual trauma as *the* cause of hysteria, the anal and penile as the be-all and end-all of our desires, mental association,—in short, our entire earthly existence; but it appears to apply as yet to all the Freudian disciples in America. If these writers state, as so many seem to, that Freud's sexual is not limited to the *gross sexual*, but embraces soul-wide aspirations, they may allude to something in their minds, mayhap, but certainly not to their writings, for these are entirely occupied with the "gross sexual" in its grossest form and with conceptions intensely "*narrow and vulgar*."

I trust this will make it clear — and a premise for any future discussion — that the physician who happens to oppose the Freudian sexual does not in any way condemn, belittle or eschew the sexual as such, but only the sexual *saturation* of the Freudian theories, and this *gross, narrow and vulgar sexual* which Freudian disciples, especially the American, see in, or interpret into, all our thoughts, actions

¹It will be remembered that in recent years the tendency has been to dispense as much as possible with the interrogation of the dreamer, for instance, as to his associated thoughts in connection with the dream, but to use "fixed symbols," hence, narrowing down real analysis and individual probing to the vantage of mere "translating" (see Isserlin *Ergeb. der Neur.*, p. 45, Bd. I, part 1). Even Freud wrote of this ("translating" through fixed symbols) that it will give the most valuable aid just there where the "*Einfall* (thoughts) of the dreamer are inadequate or become insufficient. See also Hitschmann's book and the severe criticism of just these facts in it by L. W. Weber in the *Deut. Med. Woch.*, No. 33 of 1913, p. 1605.

and desires. I trust also it will give an inkling to the piqued and recalcitrant why Burr, Dercum, myself and others may have chosen certain invirtuous terminology in labeling this matter.

And while still within call of this Freudian *sexual*, let us for a moment touch upon the criticism meted out to *symbolism*. Everything must be "interpreted" in order to get it to mean something else (the meaning looked for, or for the sake of the analysis, hoped for). This says the critic of the theory, is, of course, all subjective. Freud himself wrote that the universal symbols show great lability (*Schwankungen*). Therefore one is never sure whether an element of the dream content is to be taken in its actual or symbolic sense. Yet a certain conclusion must be come to. Let's remember what Isserlin wrote (*Ergeb. der Neurol. & Psych.*, Vol. I, No. 1). "'The interpretation' (*Deutung*) has constantly come more to the foreground in the work of analysis. To-day when the disquisitional search must lead without deviation into this infantile sexual constitution and to the kernal-complex of the infantile incestual, there is no direct way any more to the etioloical 'unconscious' . . . only the 'interpretation' can really lay bare the evidence (*Aufdecken*).'" So it's "up to" the analyzer. Now is n't he a poor craftsman if he can't, with such a variegation of symbol-meanings and the elasticity of symbolism itself, make ends meet? Or if this offends the Freudian psyche, by what rule of reason is the subjectivity of the thing, the mental play of the sexuo-analyzer to be kept within "accurate" bounds? In what way can this utterly subjective procedure be made "scientific?" Has it as yet been shown to be a scientific procedure, in even the vaguest, most-remotest way? What we have read thus far in dream-analyses, both in such *Leistungen* as Stekel's abroad, as well as in the papers published in America, shows that one can with greatest ease analyze and fabulize a dream in the *desired* direction and get to really any place you wish — and spin a tale the while,— 'twould put Monk Lewis or Old Bandello to shame.

Of *how* subjective the entire matter must be, the Freudian disciples have themselves shown, for we learn that a schism has occurred in the ranks, and that there are

henceforth to be two cults, the "Vienna School" and the "Zürich School," each sharply separated from the other. (See the report of the *Medicin. Gesellschaft, Basel*, 15, 1, '14).¹ The latter "school" has entirely thrown over the "sexual" ballast and is to interpret symbols differently — non-sexually! Here life interpretations (symbol-translation) will be colored in the twilight of metaphysical abstraction — and here those earnest disciples who have said "Oh fy" to us, may in truth find our entire gamut of desire, from our daub and earthy yearnings unto the ultrast violet of soul-deep aspiration, thrown up as on a screen in lime-illumination. It is here, for instance, announced (by H. Schmid, "*Die neuesten Entwicklungsstadien der Psychoanalyse und Ihre therapeutische Bedeutung*") that the Zürich School no longer shares Freud's views as to the sexuality of the child, and has dismissed the Œdipus and Incest-problems (strings upon which our psychoanalysts have played their chastest songs), and the generally "forced and unfruitfull sexual meaning." They even are to analyze the dream differently: "*Während Freud in den Träumen nur 'verdrängte,' meist unerlaubte Wünsche sieht, fassen wir schroff diese Wünsche als Symbole für volitionale Tendenzen auf.*" But there are many other changes noted that can't be gone into here, and we are told that the sexual childhood's trauma has long since — since years — been given up by Freud himself. Schmid even writes, "The trauma theory could not be maintained as more and more cases constantly became known, in which the trauma admitted by the patient as a real fact proved later to be phantasie." (Think of this admission from a Freudian himself!) That Jung has given up the sexual-etiological trauma we have for some time been aware. We also know that Frank has molded the theories to his own point of view, which disclaims symbolism, "*Deutung*," the "*durchgängig sexuellen Determinierung*," the infantile sexual, etc. It is with some surprise, however, that we hear Bleuler, the only really important adherent of Freud, saying (*Jahresversammlung des Deutschen Vereins für Psychiatrie*).² "The sexual theory is all in all insufficiently founded,

¹*Deut. Med. Woch.* March 5, 1914.

²See report in *Deut. Med. Woch.* June 19, 1913.

though details of it are correct," etc., (See note 2, page 276).

Let us therefore from now on remember that even a large contingent of the Freudians — the most important contingent, namely, the Swiss,—has given up this pan-sexualism, and that we therefore seem to have a right to challenge this gross, narrow and vulgar sexual, rampant in all the articles published on the subject in America; a right to challenge these disciples to bring some proof of the thing if they wish themselves listened to, and that one is justified (and "fit to practice his profession," etc., in spite of it) in acknowledging just a little nausea at this incest theme which runs like a fugue throughout the writings of all these Freudian enthusiasts.

There is another "mechanism" concerning which much misunderstanding exists, namely, regarding the Freudian *subconscious*. This word for most of us echoes with such strange witchery that it is difficult in its presence to keep one's equanimity. To understand hysteria, and much else, we have been told one must get into the subconscious of the patient — and if you cannot get into this subconscious you are not, of course, as masterful as such psychotherapists who can. And as for the Freudist, it is the very atmosphere he breathes. Now criticism has intimated that there probably was no such subconsciousness at all, and that no psychologist believes in it. The Freudian counter-criticism has been, on the one hand, that all the psychologists do believe in such a subconscious, and on the other hand that Freud knows no subconscious, but an "unconscious"—an unconscious which is the very key to his psychology. How can we simplify this tangle?

In the first place, many of our Freudists use the terms subconscious and unconscious indiscriminately,¹ not being quite sure which is which or whether there is a difference, some use the term subconscious, but point out that this is Freud's "unconscious"² (this is correct); while one will also

¹See, for instance, citations, p. 421-2. *Med. Record*, Sept. 6, 1913; see also *Med. Record*, Dec. 24, 1910, p. 1134; *Med. Record*, March 1, 1913; *N. Y. State Jour. of Med.*, April, 1914, p. 203, etc.

²*Wisconsin Med. Jour.*, May, 1913. See, also, in the article on "The Conception of the Subconscious," by B. Hart in "Subconscious Phenomena," p. 102. Badger, Boston, 1910.

find the word "subconscious" applied to phenomena, for instance, neither sub- nor unconscious in Freud's sense.¹

The term "unconscious," as used by Freud does not mean the "unconscious" as used by the psychologists, meaning, namely, that state in which there is no psychic correlate in which the psychical phenomenon has not been awakened. This is the state during deep sleep, or in a faint or during narcosis, etc. The great deposits of memory not active in the stream of consciousness at the time, the "latent memories" which *residuums* are physiological (the psychic correlate occurring only when the cells become activated,—hence, "conscious") — the psychologist also speaks of as "unconscious."² What, generally speaking, is termed *subconscious* in psychology is on the other hand covered by Freud's "*unconscious*." This latter is a specialized, particularized subconscious, conceived by Freud. It is something new, strikingly interesting — and *apart*, and Freud himself tells us³ that it is a differentiation which others have not yet made.

Now let us for a moment turn to the old familiar "subconscious" itself in which we have said the psychologists do not believe. It is a knavish word, this, under whose cloak more ignorance has been hid than even under the convenient mantle of "grippe," or the more recent "auto-intoxication!" A glance through the published papers of our Freudists will show in what capricious cacaphonics its mysteries are sung.⁴ But our Freudists do not err entirely alone in this. It is astounding what one reads of it in the medical magazines, in the medically informing books for the layman and in the lay press. It becomes a sub-cellar into which aught of the mental may be shoved or whence anything may be hauled forth on emergency. It is the Circe known of old, the Aphrodisiac in Isolde's draught, the demon within us who does in spite of our control, who shames us with his actions in our dreams, or plays the double when our ego's

¹For instance, *Med. Record*, Vol. 79, No. 26.

²See the author's paper on "Hypnosis, its Psychological Interpretation, etc.," *Internat. Clinic*, Vol. IV. Twentieth series.

³"*Traumdeutung*," 3d edition. Leipzig, 1911, pp. 409-10.

⁴See citations in my former article, "The Psychoanalytic Delusion," *Med. Record*, Sept. 6, 1913.

split! Indeed, just as for some writers, we are transcended by subliminal phenomena, spiritistic in essence (compared with which the mere work-a-day self is forsooth but poor stuff), so again for others our conscious self tarries not alone in its skully abode, but has for neighbor a lower order of tenant who *on a floor below* lives a life after his own fashion and desires,—imprudent, incautious or often lawless and shameless (to the *us* of upstairs), intruding with noises, vulgar thoughts or feelings (never very respectable!), a nether-fellow, all in all, “raising the roof” at times, and throwing *us* into confusion.

Now it was against this “floor-below-activity” kind of subconscious that Wundt long ago entered the lists, calling it nothing else but “*Scheinerklärung*,” an atavistic remnant of the old ideas of being “possessed,” which were used to explain supposedly unnatural phenomena in the early days of our race. Since then such continental psychologists and psychiatrists as Schrenk-Notzing, Ziehen, Binswanger, Kræpelin, Ribot, Bechterew, Vogt, Störing, Ranschburg, etc., took the same stand. Here in America our psychologists have all, to my knowledge, placed themselves on the same side (Catell, Woodworth, Ladd, Münsterberg, Jastrow, Watson, etc.). And it is of this type of subconsciousness that Freud’s “unconscious” consists—a metaphysically conceived realm to which certain happenings in consciousness are relegated by conflict and repression—and put under cover, as it were, to safeguard the conscious life,—unable to return, there living individual existences, unknown to consciousness (save maybe in masquerade—and we are not speaking figuratively), making it hot enough for the individual—who is unconscious of them! Conscious, yet unconscious! ?

Isserlin has characterized this conception of Freud as “a dissolving of the personality into a series of timeless, anthropomorphically conceived unconscious essences or beings who lastingly control the Marionette play of the conscious.”¹ Recently Hoche has also commented on it,² saying, “Upon the dark stage of the unconscious this teaching (of Freud) can, of course, let anything whatsoever occur. There live the idea groups which have been repressed out of the clarity of consciousness, the complexes, which lead an uncontrolled existence, detached from re-

¹*Ergeb. der Neurol. u. Psych.* Bd. 1, 1911, p. 65.

²*Archiv. f. Psychiatrie u. Neur.*, 1913. Bd. 51, p. 1057.

maining consciousness — the 'special-souls' (*Sonderseelen*), the 'subordinate souls.'” And Wundt spoke of it as a kind of occultism resembling the nature philosophy of Schelling's School at the beginning of the last century.¹

It might be remembered, for clearness sake, that in the theories as held by the Vienna School, this subconscious realm is made up of the repressed and displaced ideas (memories), and such are always sexual. Subconsciousness therefore (or “unconsciousness,” to use Freud's word) is composed of the suppressed sexual. We have then in Freud's *unconscious*, to recapitulate, a metapsychological or mythopsychological subconscious, a conception remarkably interesting, but a vague hypothesis nevertheless, nowhere accepted by psychologists,² built upon as yet undemonstrated fundamentals — and far removed from the path of factual science.

If the sexualism of these theories, then, is all phantasie, even now dismissed by a large faction of the Freudists themselves, if this “unconscious,” the supposed keystone of the entire teachings remains as yet within the purview of mere metaphysics, if sexuo-symbolism, by which one ferries on into this sub-mental, has so far been shown to be no less mythical than those shades of old across the Styx (now even paled to “thin air” by the Zürich apostasy), must we not stop to think for a moment that the present method of psychoanalysis which travels the above path of procedure has been sorely invalidated, not only by judicious criticism, but by the startling deflection of a large body of Freudists themselves, and that its present appraisal in America must be due to some deception or strangely active phenomenon of suggestion?

I say in America, for in Europe the most important

¹*Hypnotismus und Suggestion*, Leipzig, 1911, p. 24.

²It is rather surprising to find even Bleuler at the *Jahresversammlung des Deutschen Vereins für Psychiatrie* at Breslau in May, 1913 (I quote from a report in the *Deut. Med. Woch.*, June, 1913) saying: “The general structure of the Freudian psychology is false: a number of fragments of the same are valuable additions to our knowledge. . . . The sexual theorie is, all in all, insufficiently founded, though details of it are correct, etc. The importance of the dream as a guard (or warder — *Hüter*) of sleep is unproven.” With no “oracular arrogance,” but guardedly, Bleuler says, “All in all, psychoanalysis represents an experiment out of which one may often infer correctly certain definite psychic processes. With its help, healing may often be attained, etc.”

authorities have written against these theories, while scarcely a paper by any reputable man has appeared in the chief journals in their behalf. With us but a very few articles have been directed against the theories, while those in favor are being published by scores. These latter are being written chiefly by men of limited experience, and are of such low scientific calibre (in *most* absolutely no attempt is made at more than the mere statement of cases) that surely on no other subject in medicine would they be accepted for publication. Were a man to make a bold statement as to a new method of cure in carcinoma, sharp criticism would be applied to his work and his announcement; but the American Freudist may publish the very quintessence of inanity and it is accepted without challenge or comment. Here, for instance, is the advertisement sent out broadcast in connection with the publication of the English translation of Freud's "*Traumdeutung*:"

"The main facts of 'The Interpretation of Dreams' have never been refuted. The insight which this method of dream-analysis gives us into the past of the individual, and of the race reveals the depths of human nature in a way that is already revolutionizing our views on ethics, sociology, art, literature and philosophy. The central idea of the book, that all dreams are the fulfilment of past and present wishes, enables us to reconstruct the psychic life of the individual from infancy. The development of our personality from what it might have been at our unprejudiced birth to what it still aspires to become, the whole genesis of the abnormal psyche, all can now be unlocked by this open sesame of dreams.

The most immediate practical application of the Freudian dream-analysis has been the study of the nervous and mental diseases. Here the book has led to a revolution in the science and methods of psychotherapeutics. In it he develops his psycho-analytic technique, a thorough knowledge of which is absolutely indispensable for every worker in this field. It was Freud who divested the dream of its mystery and solved its riddles!" etc.

Think of a statement of such glaring scientific falsehood as this being circulated by mail to hundreds of physicians, without the slightest protest being raised! But everywhere in the journals (medical and neurological) and at academy meetings have we been treated with the same flimflam and fustian as if the stuff were virtuous, and in a tone as

assuring as if the majority and the important physicians stamped it with approval and complied.

In what ways then does the Freudist make his strong appeal? Apparently chiefly in two: the one is to publish cases concerning which the unqualified statement is made that such patients have been cured by the psychoanalytic method when all other methods failed; the other is to assume that the opponents can know nothing of the results, not having tried the methods, or if they have, could of course get no similar results, knowing nothing of the method.

It is astonishing what an appeal this first assumption makes on the average physician. And yet just what does it prove? Has one not heard of a hundred cases of long-standing disease cured by *persuasion* which nothing else had ever helped? Or of the hundreds made whole by *hypnosis* after they had been wandering the medicinal path for years, seeking solace? Or of the still vaster numbers "given up by all the doctors, — the greatest among them," — which Christian Science mended? And don't you think the Emmanuelists, Osteopaths, Chiropractics, Dieto-hydropaths, Vegetarians, Fletcherists, etc., all have their array of cases, too, cured, *though nothing else had helped before?*¹ In short, such a statement signifies nothing save that the physician in question was not keen to his own powers of suggestion.

The second assumption is even more startling, yet it too is gulped down by physician and layman. It is the shield behind which the Freudian saves himself. One finds it in constant use. Only recently in a paper² filled with misconstructions and veritably stammering with incompetence, a disciple, beside again assuring us that the repressed sexual "is the Alpha and Omega of the new theory of the psychoneuroses," states that the opponents of the theory are "ignorant of" and "know no touch of the subject," "are incompetent and unable to judge," etc.

Now why should Kræpelin, Ziehen, Hoche, Isserlin, Aschaffenburg, etc., men trained in psychology and psychiatry, men whose studies in association-psychology and in psychopathology (to say nothing of their neurological work) are familiar to every student in these fields, some of whose studies have become "classical" and the fundamentals for

¹To say nothing of the magnetizers, tractators, religious "shepherds" and others who for centuries cured just those very cases which legitimate methods had failed to heal.

²*Medical Record*, Feb. 21, 1914.

subsequent work — why should these painstaking investigators be “ignorant of” and “know no touch of the subject?” Why should they be “incompetent and unable to judge?” Why should it be that “they have not mastered the theory,” these real masters of psychology and psychopathology! — that they should not be able to comprehend and apprehend what these remarkable members of the Psychoanalytic Society have mastered with ease — some of them writing *ex cathedra* on the subject directly they were weaned to it — these wondrous wielders of the Deep Psychology, with their vast experience (whence derived?) and their profound learning in soul-analysis (whence acquired, — all from the reading of Freudian literature?) Or again, when Oppenheim or Isserlin say they have tried psychoanalysis on cases, or Hoche declares he endeavored to analyze his own dreams according to the Freudian mechanism, etc., why should these inimitable savants deem it untrue and tell us these men can know nothing about it, that they are too prejudiced to fathom its abstruseness, while they, however, being of the elect, could with such ease grasp its “rational” and immerse themselves, as with one leap, in its omnipotence! Neither von Roentgen’s discovery, nor that of the Curies nor Marconi’s have been proclaimed and pageanted in such “Tyrian purple,” such imperious robes of pompous inflation, as these theories (with absolutely no regard to the criticisms held out on every side), nor with such constant acclamation by little voices shouting loud and shrill of the ignorance of the non-initiated and the deep psychic discernment of themselves, — that Freudian discernment which is to enlighten and unravel the sexuo-megalic mix-up of our miserably straight-laced, “hypocritical” and “falsely modest” world.

And yet our criticism has shown and pronounced the several links in the process of psychoanalysis scientifically of falsest alloy,¹ and we must hold the entire sexual theory with its many ramifications as standing upon about as highly colored and *evident* ground as the green-cheese hypothesis regarding our much-maligned old moon.

Let us, pray, have some carefully and scientifically worked-out studies given to us — not “statements” error-

¹See also Isserlin’s criticisms, *Zeit. f. d. Ges. Neurol. u. Psych.*, 1910, Vol. I. *Ergeb. des. Neurol. und Psych.* I. c, also A. Hoche’s recent paper, *Arch. and Psych. u. Neur.*, 1913. Bd. 51. p. 1056, 1057; also Kraepelin’s *Lehrbuch*, 8th edition, Vol. III, p. 9391; also the *Med. Record*, Sept. 6, 1913.

ously called "studies" which go on without the slightest attempt to substantiate the principles employed. Let us have some wholesome and conservative investigation of such mechanisms as *Verdrängung*, of the carrying over of "affect" experienced in association with an incident, upon concepts not originally associated with such "affect" (Hellpach makes an attempt at it¹ — trying to explain this mechanism without Freud's aid of the "unconscious"). Or again let us see to what degree personality may be laid bare by judicious anamnestic probing, "*anamnestic analysis*," I have called it to differentiate it from the sexuo-analysis of the Freudians, incorrectly termed psychoanalysis. This is a type of inquiry always essayed to some extent by psychiatrists and neurologists, but now more carefully and thoroughly undertaken because of the renewed interest in the psyche and the psychic — a probing without the use of symbolism or interpretation or translation. Let the psychoanalyst in such a procedure show how much of the past makes up mind-tendencies of the present, to what degree past "affects" can produce negative influence in the present, to what degree the sexual (as found — not interpreted) plays a part, whether the incident causing such "affects" can drop out of memory, be forgot, and the "affect" still live on (Ranschburg, for instance, one of the foremost authorities on memory studies to-day, denies that it can), how symptoms may be explained without symbolism (for surely even the Freudist will admit that some *can*, by suggestion, for instance, and imitation), or if he needs his symbolism, first give some adequate proof of it, or show how it may be scientifically employed. To think himself among the chosen, and the rest of mankind numskulls is scarcely the manner for a young disciple of a new theory to deport himself. . . . Yet many of these writers keep peradventuring in column after column, without an iota of evidence for the facts stated save brazen assurance.

A little cautious and sane exploitation along the lines suggested above, with hands firm upon the brakes, will do more to further neurological science and the millennium than soaring on inflated statements and being stridulously vocal.

¹Hellpach's "*Psychologie der Hysterie*," p. 401, *et seq.*