THE JOURNAL OF ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY

VOL. XII

AUGUST, 1917

NUMBER 3

ORIGINAL ARTICLES

SYMPOSIUM

THE THEORIES OF FREUD, JUNG AND ADLER*

I. THE WORK OF SIGMUND FREUD

BY JAMES J. PUTNAM

WHAT are the features of the work of Sigmund Freud¹,—that is, of the psychoanalytic movement,—which will make it of enduring value; and what are its weaknesses and false aims? Finally, what justification was there for the defection of Adler and of Jung,—events which must be rated as of marked significance?

The present seems a fitting time for making these inquiries, for the psychoanalytic movement has been subjected to severe criticism for many years, and yet is slowly, but steadily, attracting more attention, not only from physicians and from patients, but also from psychologists.

Its elements of strength, which have secured for it a lasting place, are, first, that it has demonstrated afresh, from a relatively new standpoint and with a marvellous

*Presented at the Eighth Annual Meeting of the American Psychopathological Association, Boston, Mass., May 24, 1917.

¹For brevity's sake, I have made no attempt, in this short communication, to assign to the several members of the able group of men who have worked hand in hand with Freud, the recognition which is their due. I trust that this omission will be overlooked and its cause appreciated.

Copyright 1917 by Richard G. Badger. All Rights Reserved.

fullness of illustration, the importance of studying men's unconscious, or unacknowledged motives, and impulses to thought and action, and, next, that it has described an extraordinarily effective method for doing this, which is practically new.

When one considers all that has been accomplished by Freud and by his colleagues, in the course of the researches that have led to these results;—the light that has been thrown upon the meaning of dreams, of the symptoms of neurotic illnesses and so, virtually, of neurotic illness itself, of personal and social customs and institutions, both of primitive and civilized men and races of men; and when one considers the explanations—important even though partial—through which Freud has sought to account for men's tendency to express themselves in poetry and art and philosophy and religion, it excites no wonder that this great movement is steadily attracting more and more attention, and from unexpected quarters.

Who would have dreamed, a decade or more ago, that to-day college professors would be teaching Freud's doctrines to students of both sexes, scientific men turning to them for light on the nature of the instincts, and educators for hints on the training of the young?

These phenomena do not indicate much of a change of heart on the part of early critics, it is true, for prejudices die hard; but they do indicate two significant facts. The first is that the task to which Freud found himself committed,—namely, the study of the thoughts, feelings, and motives of which men are unconscious yet which strongly and strangely influence their moods and conduct,—is one² that all thoughtful men must and will study.

The next most noteworthy fact is that, in dealing with this task Freud showed, not only a remarkable ability and power of insight but a still more remarkable fearlessness, a tireless energy in seeking evidence, and an unsurpassed fidelity in observation. This is, indeed, one of the cases where it is impossible to consider a man's work without taking his personality into account, and Freud's personality was such that up to a certain point his testimony is as re-

²Consider the hold which novels and dramas have upon everyone.

liable as the wax impression of a coin.

But every man has his weaknesses and limitations, and in Freud's case these were shown in the fact that while he became exceedingly adept in recognizing certain influences, he failed, mainly, though, I think, not wholly, because his attention was thus engrossed, to take sufficient note of others that likewise were at play. For a time this made no obvious difference. He has never pretended to do more than to demonstrate the presence of one group of repressed motives (the sexual group); or, rather, to bring to the surface repressed thoughts of all sorts, but in the belief that the sex classification was the best. This portion of the work has given rise to bitter criticisms, which were largely based on prejudice and need not be considered here. After a time, however, when, following a sort of logical destiny, he was led to apply his explanations to the whole range of human life, new obligations were involved and new sorts of criticism came to view. These were not wholly dictated, like the earlier ones, by narrow prejudice, based on the very repressions that he sought to study, but on the fact that the type of mind of which his is an example is not the only sort that is useful even for purposes of scientific investigation; nor is the method which he followed the only suitable one for the study of human life.

The breaking away of Adler and of Jung are, I think, partly to be explained on such grounds as these, though it was partly due, likewise, I believe, to a misconception of their scientific duty,—a misconception which led them to reject without sufficient reason, formulations of Freud's which were of permanent value.

It is, however, true, as I believe, that Freud's strong accentuation of the sex motive, and of the merits of the sex mode of classification, although dictated, no doubt, by an instinctive feeling that, otherwise, the goal sought—primarily the therapeutic goal—would not be won, did, nevertheless, prevent him from adequately filling the position of judicial student of human motives as a whole, that circumstances almost forced him to assume.

There are empirical grounds for this criticism and also scientific, or philosophic grounds.

The arguments brought forward, for example, by Josiah Royce in almost all his recent books,³ by Trotter,⁴ by Coe,⁵ by Stanley Hall,⁶ and others, while they do not in the least impugn the value of Freud's arguments *ad hoc*, *i. e.*, as contributions of immense importance to the subject of sex-motivation, do emphasize, in their turn, social motives other than sexual, and not to be classed as sexual without some forcing, which one could wish that Freud had studied. Similar comments can be made with regard to the effects of his rigid acceptance of the "scientific" method in his studies.

One may succeed in showing that the motives of a given philosopher, a poet or adherent of religion, are permeated by sensual longings of infantile origin; and one may then go to work, if one will, to pick to pieces the rational postulates on which a given philosophy or religion rests its claims. Still, something will remain that the mind feels to be of vast importance, and for which "sublimation," as usually defined, does not adequately account. The grown man recognizes motives which are foreign to the child, or to nature, but which, on monistic grounds, one must assume to have been represented there, in some fashion.

Freud's own arguments show this. He is avowedly a scientific monist, and, properly speaking, should classify himself with the "realists" or "behaviorists" of the present day, who are, virtually, materialists. But science, physics, chemistry and mechanics know no "emotion," in the best human sense, and even the James-Lange theory, although it may explain *almost the whole* mystery, still leaves something unexplained.

Professor Holt⁷ praises Freud's formulations and, with great justice, adopts his views about the "wish" as the corner-stone of his psychology. But Holt's "wish," like James's "emotion," leaves one cold, while the "wish" in Freud's sense is anything but cold. A "something," undiscoverable by reason, seems left out when one accepts the realistic scheme as binding, and Freud was quick to see

³Cf. *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, for ex.

⁴*The Instinct of the Herd, in Peace and War.*

⁵*The Psychology of Religion.*

⁶Auger. *Jr. of Abn. Psychol.*

⁷E. B. Holt: *The Freudian Wish.*

and reprobate this tendency when it came to estimating the value of Adler's conception of the nature of human motives, as he does in his history of the psychoanalytic movement.⁸ Adler, as Freud points out, in throwing so much emphasis upon aggression, in his analysis of motives, leaves no room for love. But it is hard to see how Freud, if he would be a strictly logical follower of the scientific method, can bring in love. Unless one assumes that the essence of love, in the most spiritual sense, is in some way, represented even in the physical world, then it cannot get in at all, and it becomes necessary to accept a building, the base of which is not broad enough to support the superstructure.

Some of these points may now be taken up for further study, and I would say, to begin with, that Freud's personality presents itself under several different aspects, which may be defined as those of the clinician, the scientific (psychologic) student, the student and conscientious member of society, and finally (little as he would be inclined to admit the fact), of the philosophic thinker, seeking to generalize his conclusions and to state them in universal terms.

These phases of Freud's thought are not all, as I have said, of equal value.

As detector of unacknowledged motives and definer of methods for detecting them; as analyzer of the personal and social situations in which these hidden motives play their part [interpretation of dreams, wit, conduct, tabus, etc.]; above all, as founder of the "free association" method, he is without a rival. If, however, one looks to him for broad and balanced views of life in all its manifold aspects, and for a judicial-minded interpretation of men's acts and thoughts under conditions where many motives—conscious as well as unconscious, and both conscious and unconscious in varying degrees—come into play, one is doomed to partial disappointment: his job is of a more specialized sort. As a philosopher¹ he is weak. On the whole, he stands out as a courageous, unflinching, pioneer-investigator and a man of genius;—and it should be recognized that where he is weak he has never

⁸Sigmund Freud: *Zur Geschichte der psychoanalytischen Bewegung*. (Now to be had in English.)

claimed to be strong.⁹ Had he not been so daring, so sincere, so faithful, and, withal, so much of a sleuth-hound as he was (in a good sense and in the interests of knowledge), the science of psychology would still be without its best impulse to real growth and practical utility; and psycho-neurological therapists, ignorant of a large portion of the forces which they aspire to manipulate, would still be fumbling in the dark with powerful, two-edged weapons, in the use of which they could obtain no adequate, systematic training. On the other hand, had Freud's splendid analytic powers been supplemented by an equally powerful capacity and impulse to make himself acquainted with all the forces shaping human lives, at their best, in all their fullness and richness, before he studied them in their narrowness and weakness and in the imperfect stages of their development, and had he—equipped as he is with strong intelligence—been moved to recognize the limitations of the scientific method, and to see that, just as the language of signs and feeling transcends that of logical concept-building at one end of the scale, so the language of trained and illumined intuition transcends it at the other end; had he, in short, been a man of more idealistic type, then psychoanalysis—if it had come into existence at all—might perhaps have been kept free from what even certain fair-minded men have considered as one-sidedness. But *would it have come into existence at all?* Probably not. For although it is, I believe, easily conceivable that a man of philosophic, idealistic, or religious tendencies and training should be able, if intelligent, to make himself a useful and even a progressive and orthodox psychoanalyst, yet it is exceedingly improbable that such a man would have become a psycho-analytic *pioneer* of a thoroughgoing type. It is hard to believe, in short, that psychoanalysis could have had a development

⁹Freud has disclaimed interest in the philosophic mode of approach, or familiarity with its methods and arguments; it is the "libido" of the philosopher that, alone, he has felt concerned to study, and the philosophic attitude has seemed to him a mode of seeking compensation, like (in his estimation) the religious attitude. This mode of looking at the matter has its real value, especially in so far as it is based on direct character-analysis. But when he (and his co-workers) make the sweeping statements they do—though without arguing them out critically—about the standing of physical law in the determination of mental phenomena, they assume the authority of philosophers and make themselves correspondingly responsible.

equally fruitful with that which it has had and yet one markedly different in origin and detail. This portion of medical progress needed to be guided by just such a man as Sigmund Freud, and we may be deeply grateful for his advent. He taught us to abstain from referring psychopathic "symptoms" (exclusively or primarily) either to bodily malnutrition or hereditary taint (often such lame and insufficient modes of explanation), still less to lack of will on the patient's part; and threw the primary emphasis, instead, on a set of definite psychologic causes which he showed how to bring out, in detail, with reference to each special case. But in his eager search for causes, he took as his standard the rigid kinds of causation studied by the physicist, and so became committed to a mode of conceiving the manifestations of human effort which does not do them justice. This was a misapplication of the scientific method, but the effort of which it formed a part was practically fruitful and stimulating to research.

The different phases of Freud's thought followed each other, to some extent, in chronological series. I prefer, however, to disregard this circumstance, which has no significance for the purpose of this study, and ask your attention rather to the fact that they are present and closely interwoven throughout all his work. That is, the same constitutional tendencies of mind, the same sort of personal equation, have been operative continuously, from the outset, and have acted, I believe, very favorably as regards one portion of his work, less so, and even unfavorably, as regards other portions.

Assuming, for example (what is substantially correct), that these various attitudes or tendencies of mind, by virtue of the fact that they belonged to Freud's personality, came, all, rapidly into play, and taking into account, as one should, his rugged courage and thorough-going honesty, and the fact that he had been trained in the scientific rather than in the philosophic school, one may perceive that something of the following sort must have taken place: He began his work with a therapeutic aim,—that is, with the interests of given patients in his mind. If he had been content to remain a therapist, without publishing much beyond an

enumeration of the cures that he had made; or if he had confined his published statements to a few clinical generalizations, and a few broad hints about the importance of the sex issues, such as Charcot had thrown out, he would undoubtedly have achieved reputation and success. But his genius (untempered and unhampered, in the main, by considerations of practical policy and personal aggrandizement) would not permit this cramping. Obviously, he soon perceived that the needs of his patients—if they were to gain anything through the truth as he saw it—would require them to look on their lives with the same inexorable seriousness that would be required for the successful carrying through of a difficult scientific research. And more than this, he soon gained a vision of the needs of society as reflected and expressed in those of the single patient; and a vision, too, of the vastness of the part played, in the lives of historical characters and of the imaginers of those described in fiction and in myth, by the hidden motives of which he had found himself on the trail. Finally, stimulated by his success in using the genetic method (that is, in tracing out the working of the apparently blind, will-less, primary instincts in even the highest, that is, the most complex, manifestations of conscious human life), Freud was led to adopt the general views which must be classified as “deterministic” in a philosophic sense. But he gives no adequate arguments to support these views, and it is here, in my opinion, rather than in his (monographic) over-emphasis of the sex-motive, that the scientific weakness of his work is to be found. It has been urged against him,¹⁰ that in his sociological studies—which have been incidental rather than serious or exhaustive—he has not given sufficient attention to the various influences, other than those based on sex, by which men living in social groups are practically moved,—preeminently the gregarious instinct in its different forms. Freud has met this criticism indirectly in one of his recent papers, where he admits that he has not as yet studied with care what he calls the “ego” complexes. He seems to refer this failure to lack of time and opportunity; but he says, also, that he has

¹⁰Trotter: *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War*. Dr. G. Stanley Hall and others have given voice to similar criticisms.

as yet seen no unifying principle that promises more for the purposes of such a study than the sex-principle. I would offer, as a partial explanation of this situation, the fact referred to at the beginning of this paper, that his chief instinctive interest and the best opportunity for his method have lain elsewhere than in the fields of sociologic research, in a broad sense. In spite of this, he has been obliged to figure, more or less, as a sociologist, and cannot long escape from assuming, explicitly, the responsibility attaching to the authority thus thrust upon him.

The recognition of the wider needs and scientific issues which his empirical study of men's unconscious motives brought to light, together with the increasing realization of the therapeutic difficulties involved in many of his cases, doubtless augmented Freud's determination to search out to the utmost every indication of repressed "sexuality," and this brought him much criticism, which was only relatively sound.

The time is not ripe, even yet, for laying down rules that would enable the physician to decide how far he should encourage a given patient to go in this spying out of the repressed sensual elements in his thoughts and conduct.

Freud started from the thesis¹¹ that the conscientious psychoanalyst ought to be considered as within his rights and duty in dealing with these issues—or encouraging his patients to deal with them—just as with any other issues. He held it to be best to encourage plain speaking, as in line with the assumption that both he and his patients were to be regarded as engaged, single-mindedly, in carrying out a serious research, and as aiming for an education which, so far as it went, should be genuine at least. Conscious of the rectitude of his own motives, Freud felt convinced that the evils attendant on this plan of outspokenness were far less serious than those attendant on the plan of covered speech and careful phrasing that would permit of much juggling with subtle tendencies to sensuality. Doubtless there are dangers in all methods, and perhaps time will show that the essential point is that the physician should know himself

¹¹Sharply defined and illustrated, for example, in his "Bruchstück einer Hysterie-Analyse," *Monatschr. f. Psychiatrie u. Neurologie*, Bd. XXVIII, H. 4.

with a thoroughness that should be as nearly absolute as possible, and then vary his method more or less with reference to the given patient's symptoms, habits of mind and previous training. That he should do this is, indeed, implied by Freud in his urgent insistence on letting the patient virtually lead in the research while the physician and his views are held as in abeyance. But this is a recommendation difficult to follow in some cases. Patients, by virtue of their instinctive power of insight, are close students of the physician's personality, and whatever he may say or leave unsaid, his standards will always be taken, more or less, as guides. This, too, the patient, by the theory, must learn to see and voice, but even such an antidote to harm will sometimes fail.

The therapeutic situation was unsatisfactory in several respects at the period when Freud began his investigations, and indeed it is so still. The relationship between physicians and their neuropathic patients, in particular, was marked by subtle evils of a somewhat serious sort. In proportion as neurological practitioners were successful, their own personalities played too pronounced a part: they were prone to become either too masterful or too intimate, in response to a willingness and even a longing, on their patients' part, to play a complementary role in these respects.

This was an abuse, which, in accordance with Freud's definition of the term, could fairly be called "sexual" in its nature; and the fashion for hypnotism, so prevalent at one time, only increased the danger while making it more difficult of detection. One of the benefits to be expected as an outcome of the psychoanalytic movement is that relationships of a more straightforward sort between doctors and patients, will, hereafter, be encouraged, and equivocal, debilitating relationships discouraged. Freud and his followers¹² have striven hard for a better state of things in this respect, but it must be clearly seen that the condition essential for a permanent improvement is the adoption of high standards among physicians themselves. Self-knowledge can be a stepping-stone to this, but it must lead to an instinctive attitude, transcending knowledge; and it is as difficult for

¹²See "Presidential Address" by Dr. W. A. White, in forthcoming issue of the *Psychoanalytic Review*.

the physician to gain this for himself as it is for the patient to overcome his more obvious symptoms. It is extremely difficult to bring about a genuine and permanent elevation of the character-level in any person, sick or well, and sometimes one has to rest content with a gain which is but superficial. But even this is of some value, as Freud himself has pointed out¹³ in his comments on the breaking down of pseudo-civilization under the stress of war.

Considerations of the above sort should help, to explain, if not altogether to justify, some of Freud's interpretations in another field.

It is true that one does not find, in the character-studies by him and by his closest followers, of such men—actual or fictitious—as Leonardo, Hamlet and the like, or of the myth-makers and the primitive-culture men, signs of a well-balanced, judicial weighing of the all-various forces actually in play. This is not even attempted, indeed; and instead, we are given an interesting and keen analysis of certain concealed influences which, in their turn, the antecedent biographers had neglected. This situation is typical of the whole psychoanalytic movement, in its strength and in its weakness, or defect. These character-analyses are not biographies but monographic studies of certain tendencies which ought to be better understood. One should not rail against the defects of this tendency, however, without remembering that except for this exaggerated emphasis the vitally important motives now brought out would never have been seen. A community ignorant of itself, and ignorant of its ignorance, yet stung by the suspicion of its own narrowness, and of weaknesses and temptations which it does not realize the importance of facing in all their bearings, is naturally hostile to a frankly truthful interpreter of the facts as they seem to him, and one prepared to state them baldly in accordance with the principle *de potiori denominatio fit*.

It was inevitable that, in proportion as his observations accumulated, Freud should generalize them, in the form of propositions which came to serve at once as expressions of his past experience and formulations for his and others'

¹³Cf. "Zeitgemasses über Krieg und Tod; die Enttauschung des Krieges."

use in further studies. To many persons, amongst whom I would include myself, these formulations seem in the main sound and useful. Their validity has, however, been strongly called in question, and certain of the objections—those by Adler and by Jung—must be very briefly commented on. I refer especially to the propositions about infantile sexuality, fixation and regression.

It is of great interest to decide whether, on strictly scientific grounds, there is any good justification for the claim made by Alfred Adler¹⁴ that Freud is entirely at sea in using the category of sexuality as primary and basal. It is only, Adler claims, the will for power, or self-assertion (or, eventually, self-preservation) that should be looked upon as a basal motive, the sexual impulse being classifiable as secondary, or, in Adler's own words, only as a *form of speech*, in which another and deeper influence reveals itself.

This view is interesting, but as a criticism of Freud's position it can not, I think, maintain its ground.

In the first place, Freud was making,¹⁵ not a biologic, but a clinical argument when he asserted the fundamentality of the sex-motive. It was a question solely of fundamentality in the patient's mind; and surely patients are not torn and thrilled by their desire for supremacy (regarded as freed—if one can so regard it—from the sex-feelings that attend it) at all as they are torn and thrilled by their (unrecognized and unacknowledged) sex-passions. Neither is the repression discoverable in the one case at all comparable to that met with in the other. And as patients cannot be expected to abandon the sex-conceptions and terminology in describing their ideas and feelings, it would be a forced and artificial demand to make of the clinical observer that he should do so.

But, to go further, it cannot, in my estimation, be claimed, on any ground, that the category of "self assertion" is more fundamental than that of "sexuality." Neither, on the other hand, is anything to be gained by asserting (true though it is, as a rule, from the patient's standpoint) that

¹⁴Cf. "Ueber den nervösen Charakter." (Now to be had in English.) Every one who cares about the truth of these matters should read Adler's own words and note their animus, which is one of very unscientific virulence.

¹⁵See his admirable statements in "Zur Geschichte der psychoanalytischen Bewegung."

the reverse should be maintained. In fact, both of these exceedingly important categories or modes of classification imply that a man is to be thought of, first of all, as a social animal, a virtual member of a virtual community.

But, in theory and in an ideal sense, the members of a community meet, not as rivals but as equals and in cooperation; and where rivalry or misunderstanding arises among the members of human societies, men, sooner or later, come to recognize the need for an intermediary, or "interpreter" in Royce's sense.¹⁶ Indeed, it is possible that this function is foreshadowed even in the animal kingdom—as, pre-eminently, by the appearance of the offspring, who requires the joint care of the father and mother, and serves as a pledge of fellowship and cooperation. It is true, of course (and this has long been recognized by Freud), that the lust for power, whether for its own sake or (as urged by Adler) in a compensatory sense, is relatively primitive and fundamental enough, in all conscience. But no good reasons exist, I think, for looking on it otherwise than as secondary to the cooperative, gregarious or "herd" instinct, or as more fundamental than the sex-instinct. To live—even to think—is to strive to reproduce oneself: that amount and form of creation at least is necessary and universal. But the conditions essential for the ideal community do not imply, as theoretically necessary, a *sex-problem* (in a "morbid" sense); nor does the bare existence of a community theoretically require a *supremacy-problem*.¹⁷

It will, I trust, be believed that I have no desire to belittle the value of Alfred Adler's contributions to the working out of the principles of compensation (as for organ-inferiority), or to deny the significance of the principle of self assertion and the "fictitious goal" of the neurotic patients—amongst whom all men are to be reckoned. Freud has always recognized these principles.

¹⁶Cf. Royce: *War and Insurance; The Hope of the Great Community*, and other publications.

¹⁷I will call attention, in passing, to the fact that just as men slip or drift easily into rivalry, in Adler's sense (*i. e.*, into a relationship which is a sort of mockery of co-operation), so Royce's community of interpretation (a triadic relationship of good sort) is mocked in the form described by Freud in which a man and a woman are unable to love each other to the full extent except in the virtual presence of a rival.

It is also true that philosophy began, practically, with the demands for solution of the problem of evil, and that the sex-problem and the supremacy problem, arising side by side, had much to do with the modern doctrines of sociology and characterology. But it was a serious wrong, on Adler's part, to attempt to destroy where his obvious function was to emphasize and to consolidate.

As regards the criticisms brought by Jung against Freud's formulations, I see in them the suggestion of a mode of looking at the subject which the former found congenial while to the latter it was not so, combined with what seems to me a needless denial of some of Freud's most important claims.

Jung strives for a broader formulation of the whole situation than Freud, with his primarily clinical, or empirical, interests, had adopted; and somewhat as Freud sees the infant behind the adult, so Jung sees nature, striving to organize itself, behind man. The "mother," conceived of concretely, disappears, therefore, in the creative instinct, and in the instincts of dependence, from which man must free himself. These are justifiable and interesting views, and the data used in illustration of them are very rich.

It is easy for me to understand and sympathize with Jung's desire for this broader formulation, and easy, too, to understand his wish to be of more service to the patient with reference to the "present issue." On the other hand, I can sympathize very strongly, also, with the feeling of Freud and his friends, that to go far in this latter course would often be to impose one's own personality upon the patient, and would lead inexperienced students of psychoanalysis to abandon methods in the use of which more rigid studies might have made them competent. Furthermore, I cannot in the least sympathize with the rejection by Jung of Freud's theories of regression, infantile sexuality, and fixation. Jung carries out his analyses, so he says, in the old fashion, and it is difficult to see how he can fail to recognize the value of the principles which he formerly used so extensively and with such good effect. The theory of fixation can, indeed, be stated in such technical fashion that it seems repellent to the novice; but it can also be stated in terms that make it accept-

able to every person of intelligence, even if untrained.

As regards the philosophic problem, I have but one word more to add. Freud has pointed out, with eminent justice, that the mind of the philosopher, if subjected to analytic study, reveals itself as under two influences, one of which is a craving, of infantile origin. The scientific mind is free, he thinks, from this doubleness of motive. This is true, if the proposition be taken in Freud's sense. But to my thinking, the scientific mind is from another standpoint eminently narrow, and subject to modes of reasoning that do not satisfy all the requirements of the situation.

If a "*unit of composition*" must be adopted, in order to satisfy the need for a monistic scheme, which we all feel, this cannot be such a unit as would be available solely for the arbitrarily chosen portion of existence which alone can be studied by scientific methods. We are men, with all that that implies, before we decide to limit our researches or to begin them, and should not let ourselves be contented with modes of defining what we are that cannot, if carried out logically, be considered as otherwise than cramping.

The feeling would not have been so intense, on the part of Freud and his adherents, with regard to the change of front by Dr. Jung toward some of the most fundamental of the psychoanalytic doctrines—especially the doctrine of infantile sexuality and its bearings, and that which affirms the therapeutic significance of tracing out, through careful analysis, the complete history of the patient's fixations and regressions—unless these men had felt that the success of a very difficult enterprise was at stake. It is proper that the grounds of this feeling should be understood, not only because the doctrines in question are so important that one cannot give them up and yet fairly call oneself a psychoanalyst, in Freud's sense, but also because the pressure to give them up, or modify them, is still so strong and subtle.

The fact is, there are a great many persons who would gladly avail themselves of Freud's doctrines to the extent of making a partial, relatively superficial analysis of thoughts and memories, yet who would strongly shrink—the physicians from urging, the patients from being urged—to make

this process thoroughgoing. Certain though it is that many changes will creep gradually into psychoanalytic procedures, it is exceedingly desirable that these should be made by physicians who have not only been thoroughly trained in what might be called orthodox method and beliefs, but who still accept as sound the principles upon which these are based. Otherwise, the method will degenerate, and, more and more, the old reliance on the mentor- and adviser-types of psychotherapist will gradually be reverted to, not alone with reference to the class of cases where their services suffice, but for all cases.

Fortunately, however, this result is not likely to happen to the degree that one might fear. The teachings of Freud and his colleagues as to the benefits to be gained through a thorough searching-out of his unacknowledged experiences, on the patient's part, have become so far ingrained in psychotherapeutics that the lesson is never likely to be entirely unlearned. What is more to be feared is that therapeutic traditions may arise that, while considered of the best, will be, in fact, less good than they might otherwise have been, and that the scientific outcome of the psychoanalytic movement may suffer correspondingly.