

# ♣ ♣ FREUD'S FOLLIES ♣ ♣

## PSYCHOANALYSIS AS RELIGION, CULT, AND POLITICAL MOVEMENT

By Kevin MacDonald

*We begin to grasp that the deviser of psychoanalysis was at bottom a visionary but endlessly calculating artist, engaged in casting himself as the hero of a multivolume fictional opus that is part epic, part detective story, and part satire on human selfinterestedness and animality. This scientifically deflating realization... is what the Freudian community needs to challenge if it can.*

—Frederick Crews, *The Memory Wars*, pp. 12-13

In *The Ghost in the Machine*, Arthur Koestler describes the closed cognitive matrix that defines paranoid Conspiracy Theories: (1) they claim to represent a universal truth, capable of explaining all phenomena; (2) they cannot be logically or empirically refuted because all potentially damaging information must be interpreted in terms of the theory; and (3) any criticism is met by a counter-offensive that shifts the argument to the subjective motivations of the critic. Koestler concludes that such theories employ “sophisticated methods of casuistry, centered on axioms of great emotive power, ... indifferent to the rules of common logic” and become “a kind of Wonderland croquet, played with mobile hoops” (p. 263).

One usually thinks of conspiracy theories as being held by people who are poorly educated, downwardly socially mobile, and/or mentally maladjusted. A good example describing these processes is Richard Hofstadter's *The Paranoid Style in American Politics*, which details the history of Heartland America's off-again on-again love affair with xenophobia and Conspiracy Theory. However, my purpose here is to examine the moral and intellectual legacy of psychoanalysis and show how well it fits Koestler's definition and therefore constitutes a very long-lived and influential Conspiracy Theory—but one tailored to the prejudices of elites and cosmopolitans rather than those of the “plain folks down home.”

### Cult Characteristics

In 1911 Freud disciple and psychoanalyst Eugen Bleuler left the movement, concluding “this ‘who is not for us is against us,’ this ‘all or nothing,’ is necessary for religious communities and useful for

political parties. I can therefore understand the principle as such, but for science I consider it harmful” (in Gay 1987, pp. 144-145). This observation by an insider says a lot about what psychoanalysis had become—a cult-like religion.

The apex of the authoritarian, anti-scientific institutional structure of psychoanalysis was the secret committee of handpicked loyalists sworn to uphold psychoanalytic orthodoxy described by Phyllis Grosskurth in *The Secret Ring: Freud's Inner Circle and the Politics of Psychoanalysis* (1991, p. 15):

By insisting the Committee must be absolutely secret, Freud enshrined the principle of confidentiality. The various psychoanalytic societies that emerged from the Committee were like Communist cells, in which the members vowed eternal obedience to their leader. Psychoanalysis became institutionalized by the founding of journals and the training of candidates; in short an extraordinarily effective political entity.

There were repeated admonitions for the Committee to present a “united front” against all opposition, for “maintaining control over the whole organization,” for “keeping the troops in line,” and “reporting to the commander” (Grosskurth, p. 97). Consider Otto Rank's astonishing letter of 1924 in which he attributes his heretical behavior in questioning the Oedipal complex to his own neurotic unconscious conflicts, he promises to see things “more objectively after the removal of my affective resistance,” and is thankful that Freud “found my explanations satisfactory and has forgiven me personally.” Grosskurth notes how “Freud seems to have acted as the Grand Inquisitor, and Rank's groveling

‘confession’ could have served as a model for the Russian show trials of the 1930s.” Freud viewed the entire episode as a success; Rank had been cured of his neurosis “just as if he had gone through a proper analysis” (Grosskurth, 1991, pp. 167-168).

The staunch Freud disciple Fritz Wittels (1924) decried the “suppression of free criticism within the Society ... Freud is treated as a demigod, or even as a god. No criticism of his utterances is permitted.” He tells us that Freud's *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie* is “the psychoanalyst's Bible.” This is no mere figure of speech. The faithful disciples regard one another's books as of no account. They recognize no authority but Freud's; they rarely read or quote one another. When they quote it is from the Master, that they may give the pure milk of the word” (p. 142-143). Freud “had little desire that [his] associates should be persons of strong individuality, and that they should be critical and ambitious collaborators. The realm of psychoanalysis was his idea and his will, and he welcomed anyone who accepted his views” (p. 134). The others were simply expelled.

All of the major figures around Freud appear to have been extremely submissive personalities who absolutely revered Freud as father figure. Indeed, the members appear to have self-consciously viewed themselves as loyal sons to Freud the father-figure (complete with sibling rivalry as the “brothers” jockeyed for position as the “father's” favorite), while Freud viewed his close followers as his children, with power to interfere in their personal lives (Hale, 1995, p. 29).

Ernest Jones, Freud's worshipful biographer and the official head of the movement after Jung's defection,



continue to be standard texts in psychoanalytic training programs. They also describe "the recurrent appearance in the analytic literature of articles redounding, extending, deepening, and modifying Freud's early case histories" (p. 5). Indeed, it is remarkable to scan psychoanalytic journal articles and find how many of those references are to Freud's work written well over 60 years ago. In examining six issues of *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* from 1988-1989, I found 92 references to Freud in 33 articles. Only four had no references to Freud, and of these, one had no references at all and one had only one reference.

The continued use of Freud's texts in instruction and the continuing references to Freud's work would not be conceivable in real science. While Darwin is venerated for his scientific work as the founder of the modern science of evolutionary biology, studies in evolutionary biology only infrequently refer to his writings because the field has moved so far beyond his work. *The Origin of Species* and *The Descent of Man* are important texts in the history of science, but are not used for current instruction. Moreover, central features of Darwin's account, such as his views on inheritance, have been completely rejected by modern science. With Freud, however, there is continuing fidelity to the master, at least within an important subset of the movement.

Besides Rank, other deviators—Fleiss, Adler, Jung, Ferenczi—were also diagnosed as suffering from a variety of psychiatric disorders and as needing further psychoanalysis in order to see the light. Freud "never tired of repeating the now notorious contention that stemmed from 'resistant' arising from emotional sources (Esterson, 1993, 216). He attributed Jung's defecation to "strong neurotic and egotistic motives" (in Gay, 1988, 481). Even Peter Gay, the psychoanalytic loyalist and historian of the movement, writes that "These ventures into character assassination are instances of the kind of aggressive analysis that psychoanalysts, Freud in the vanguard, at once deplored and practiced. This... was the way that analysts thought about others, and about themselves." The practice was "endemic among analysts, a common professional deformation" (1988, p. 481).

This practice continues to this day. A common thread of the letters sent by the

"grasped the fact that to be a friend of Freud's meant being a sycophant. It meant opening oneself completely to him, to be willing to pour out all one's confidences to him" (Grosskurth, p. 48). Masson (1990, p. 152) suggests that "Jones believed that to disagree with Freud (the father) was tantamount to patricide (father murder)." When Sandor Ferenczi, a central figure in the inner circle of psychoanalysis during the 1920s, disagreed with Freud on the reality of childhood sexual abuse, Jones called him a "homicidal maniac" (p. 152).

Regarding Ferenczi, Grosskurth notes that "(1) the thought of a disagreement with Freud was unbearable..."; "There were occasions when he rebelled against his dependency, but always he returned repentant and submissive" (pp. 54-55). Similarly, Masson (1990) describes Kurt Eissler, the closest confidant of Anna Freud's inner circle in the 1960s, by saying that "What he felt for Freud seemed to border on worship." He held one thing sacred, and hence beyond criticism: Freud" (pp. 121-122). It was common among the disciples to imitate Freud's personal mannerisms, and even among analysts who did not know Freud personally, there were "intense feelings, fantasies, transfers—ences, identifications" (Hale, 1995, 30).

Evidence for the essentially cult-like character of psychoanalysis is the unique role of disciples who are able to trace themselves back to Freud in a direct line of descent. "The idea of being a chosen disciple, privileged to have direct contact with the master, has survived and is continued in the procedures of many of the training programs of the institutes" (Arlow & Brenner, 1990, p. 5). "The intensely filial relationships to Freud of the first generation were gradually replaced by a highly emotional relationship to a fantasized Freud, still the primal founder, but also to organizations, to peers, to superiors in the institute hierarchy—above all—to the training analyst, the training analyst's analyst, and, if possible, back to Freud and his circle became a determinant of psychoanalytic prestige" (Hale, 1995, 32).

Unlike most sciences, there is a reverence for what one might term the sacred texts of the movement—Freud's writings—both in teaching and in the current psychoanalytic literature. Arlow and Brenner (1988) note that *Studies of Hysteria* and *The Interpretation of Dreams* are almost 100 years old, but

many aggrieved psychoanalysts in response to Frederick Crews's critical articles in the *New York Review of Books* was that they were "composed in a state of bitter anger by a malcontent with a vicious disposition" (p. 293). Crews' Freud bashing was typically explained in terms of botched transferences and Oedipal complexes gone awry. Another recent case is that of Jeffrey Masson (1990) who suffered similar questionings of his sanity for challenging the central Freudian dogma of the Oedipal complex.

Psychoanalysis, unlike scientific theory, but very much like certain religious or political movements, has essentially been immune from attacks leveled at it either from inside or outside the movement. Insiders who dissented from central doctrines were simply expelled and often went on to found their own psychoanalytically-oriented sects, typically with the same disregard for canons of scientific method as the parent religion. There is a long line of such expelled dissenters in the history of psychoanalysis, and the list continues to lengthen with the recent expulsion of Jeffrey Masson. Moreover, the central core of loyalists that has always existed in psychoanalysis functions to preserve the image of Freud as a heroic scientist to the point that many of Freud's papers have been locked away from the prying eyes of scholars for periods extending as far ahead as the 22nd century.

### Thought Control

The entire Freudian enterprise appears more and more like an authoritarian religious cult than a scientific movement. Indeed, several authors have pointed out that psychoanalysis has many features in common with brainwashing (Bailey, 1960, 1965; Salter, 1996). Frank Sulloway (1979b) describes the indoctrination characteristic of training analyses in which any objection by the analyst is viewed as a resistance to be overcome. And even Shelly Orgel (1990), who remains a defender of the psychoanalytic faith, writes of the feelings of many contemporary analysts that their analysts had behaved aggressively toward them, turning them into devoted and passive followers of their highly idealized analyst.

Jeffrey Masson (1990) provides fascinating insight into psychoanalysis as thought control and aggression. Mas-

son's training analysis involved a completely one-sided relationship in which the analyst had all of the power and in which the trainee was expected to put up with any and all indignities. Leaving the training analyst would have meant giving up psychoanalysis because the training analyst would claim that the trainee was unfit for a career as a psychoanalyst. The result of the analysis was an idealization of the training analyst and loyal support of the training analyst's writings. Masson was more or less blackmailed into agreeing to include his own training analyst's name on a paper he was writing or be forced to reenter analysis. Masson comments that "Being in such an analysis is like growing up with a despotic parent" (p. 86), since the qualities it requires in the prospective analysts are meekness and abject obedience.

I suggest that the inculcation of passive and devoted followers via the aggression and thought control represented by psychoanalysis has always been an important aspect of the entire belief system. At a deep level, the fundamentally pseudoscientific structure of psychoanalysis implies that disputes cannot be resolved in a scientific manner, with the result that, as John Kerr (1992) notes, the only means of resolving disputes involves the exercise of personal power. The result was that the movement was doomed to develop into a mainstream orthodoxy punctuated by numerous sectarian deviations originated by heretics who were expelled from the movement. These offshoots then replicated the fundamentally irrational pseudoscientific structure of all psychoanalysis inspired movements: "(E)ach major disagreement over theory or therapy seemed to require a new validating social group, a psychoanalytic tradition that recent splits within Freudian institutes seem only to confirm" (Hale 1995, 26). Perhaps the most bizarre such offshoot was the movement initiated by Wilhelm Reich, well-covered in Joel Carlinsky's *Skeptic* (2:3) article "Epigones of Orgonomy."

The problem continues. Crews (1995) describes recent scholarship on psychoanalysis that shows not only that psychoanalysis was never more than a pseudoscience but that Freud engaged in scientific fraud when developing his theories. Allen Esterson's (1992) *Seductive Mirage: An Exploration of the Work of Sigmund Freud*, demonstrates con-

vincingly that Freud's patients did not volunteer any information on seduction or primal scenes at all. The seduction stories which provide the empirical basis of the Oedipal complex were in fact a construction by Freud who then interpreted his patients' distress on hearing his constructions as proof of the theory. Freud then deceptively obscured the fact that his patients' stories were reconstructions and interpretations based on his a priori theory. He also retroactively changed the identity of the fancied seducers from nonfamily members (servants, etc.) to the fathers that his Oedipal story required.

Now 100 years after its inception, the theories of the Oedipal complex, childhood sexuality, and the sexual etiology of the neuroses remain without any independent empirical validation and play no role whatever in mainstream developmental psychology. From an evolutionary point of view the idea that children would have a specifically sexual attraction to their opposite sex parent is highly implausible, since such an incestuous relationship would result in inbreeding depression (MacDonald, 1986). The proposal that boys desire to kill their fathers conflicts with the general importance of paternal provisioning of resources in understanding the evolution of the family (MacDonald, 1988; 1992a,b): Boys who had succeeded in killing their fathers and having sex with their mothers would not only be left with genetically inferior offspring, they would also be deprived of paternal support and protection. Modern developmental studies indicate that many fathers and sons have very close, reciprocated affectional relationships beginning in infancy, and the normative pattern in Western societies is for mothers and sons to have very intimate and affectionate, but decidedly nonsexual relationships. Most domestic violence takes place between genetically related individuals (Daily and Wilson.)

The continued life of these concepts in psychoanalytic circles is testimony to the continuing unscientific, religious nature of the entire enterprise. Indeed, Kurzweil (1989, p. 89) notes that "In the beginning, the Freudians tried to 'prove' the universality of the Oedipus complex; later on, they took it for granted. Ultimately, they no longer spelled out the reasons for the pervasiveness of childhood sexuality and its consequences in the cul-

There is also increasing attention paid to the ethical dimensions of psychoanalysis as Freud himself practiced it. Freud seems to have been remarkably indifferent to his patients' suffering, but his ethical lapses extend far beyond a lack of empathy. Crews recounts the case of Horace Frink, an American psychoanalyst who was having an affair with a bank heiress. Freud diagnosed Frink as a latent homosexual and advised him to divorce his wife and marry the heiress, with the stated aim of tapping into the heiress' funds for a financial contribution to psychoanalysis. To make the plan work, the heiress had to divorce her husband as well. All of this came about, but the two abandoned spouses were devastated and soon died, Frink's new wife sued for divorce, and Frink himself sank into depression and repeated attempts at suicide.

Then there is the case of Dora Bauer. Freud diagnosed the teenaged Dora as suffering from hysteria for refusing to have a sexual relationship with a married man, Herr K., as a sort of quid pro quo so that her father would continue to have an affair with Herr K.'s wife. Crews comments that "In short, a sexually and morally uninhibited [Dora] rounded into psychic trim by Freud, would have been of service to both her father and Herr K., the two predatory males who, unlike any of the women in the story, basked in the glow of Freud's unwavering respect" (p. 52). The Dora case is typical also in that the patient's diagnosis was based entirely on preconceived ideas and circular reasoning in which the patient's negative emotional response to the psychoanalytic hypothesis was construed as evidence for the hypothesis.

### Recovered Memory Therapy

Another new wrinkle is that psychoanalysis has had a very pernicious effect on psychotherapeutic practice, in particular the phenomenon of the Recovered Memory Therapy (RMT). At the time when Crews's articles originally appeared in the *NYRB*, Crews was content to claim only a genealogical relationship between psychoanalysis and RMT. He now documents a much closer relationship between the two movements. A significant number of psychoanalysts are now rejecting the orthodox psychoanalytic theory that Freud developed in the same manner as actual sexual abuse—a theory which was conceptualized as the result of seduction theory of 1896 in which neurosis was conceptualized as the result of actual sexual abuse. Freud's earlier fact now adopting Freud's earlier theory manifested as Oedipal desires. These renegade psychoanalysts are in particular fascinating because Lipsker father was released from jail, is particularly fascinating because Lipsker has recently "remembered" several other crimes that could not have possibly occurred. Even before this turn of events, however, Lipsker had developed increasingly bizarre "memories" about her father, including a murder that no one else, including the police, had heard about, and a supposed rape by Eileen's godfather that was aided by the father. The "memories" were gradually elaborated as a result of the suggestions of a psychotherapist and their veracity attested to by Lenore Terr, a professor of psychiatry at the University of California-San Francisco. Terr used the aura of science surrounding her academic affiliation to convince the jury that an expert like herself could distinguish authentic from nonauthentic repressed memories.

Then there is the fantastic case of the Ingram family of Olympia, Washington, in which Paul Ingram confessed to a myriad of crimes whose memory he thought he had completely repressed, including repeatedly raping both his daughters and one son, getting his daughters to perform sexual favors for his friends, torturing the girls, getting his wife to have sex with animals, and murdering and cannibalizing babies at satanic rituals. The truly remarkable thing about this example is the willingness of people to be convinced of the bizarre and impossible.

A condition that greatly facilitates people's credulity is the belief among a significant number of professionals in psychology that such repressed memories are commonplace. No fewer than five psychologists and counselors encouraged Ingram in his hallucinations. However, a skeptical psychologist finally asked Ingram about a completely fictitious accusation that Ingram had encouraged his children to have sex while he watched. Sure enough, the next day Ingram came up with a highly detailed repressed memory of watching his children have sex. Ingram, who pleaded guilty to the crimes, after belatedly coming to believe in his innocence, is now serving 20 years in prison for six counts of child molestation.

Like psychoanalysis itself, RMT has become a political movement bent on enforcing an official orthodoxy. Indeed, given the history of psychoanalysis it is not in the least surprising that RMT would likewise be an authority

tarian political movement. Judith Lewis Herman, a leading proponent of RMT, claims that "Advances in the field occur only when [women] are supported by a political movement powerful enough to legitimate an alliance between investigators and patients and to counteract the ordinary social processes of silencing and denial" (Crews, p. 160). RMT has been behind lengthening the statutes of limitations in some states to periods of 30 years or more to provide enough time for repressed memories of crimes to surface. And, as with any such political movement, it seems superfluous to note that big money is involved, in the case of RMT ranging from fees for therapy, the publication industry, and the litigation industry spawned by this movement.

### The Connection to the Left

Much of Crews's recent work on psychoanalysis and RMT was originally published in the prestigious *New York Review of Books* (NYRB). The NYRB has long been a bastion of the intellectual left and, as Crews notes, publication of such material in such a publication is "almost like pet owners who had negligently or maliciously consigned their parakeet to the mercies of an ever-lurking cat" (Crews, 1995, p. 288). Publications like the NYRB have been instrumental in propagating psychoanalytic and similar doctrines as scientifically and intellectually reputable for decades, and there is the suggestion that had Crews published his articles in a less visible and less politicized medium they could have been safely ignored as has commonly been the practice over the long history of psychoanalysis.

There is a long and interesting association between psychoanalysis and the political and cultural left. Support of radical and Marxist ideals was common among Freud's early followers, and leftist attitudes have been common in later years among psychoanalysts (Hale, 1995, p. 31; Kurzweil, 1989, pp. 36, 284), as, e.g., among the groups in Berlin and Vienna during the post-World War I era (Kurzweil, 1989; pp. 46-47); in the post revolutionary Soviet Union where all of the top psychoanalysts were Bolsheviks and Trotsky supporters and were among the most powerful political figures in the country (Chamberlain, 1995); and in America from the 1920s to the present (Torrey, 1992, pp. 33, 93ff;

122-123). If Crews is correct in his analysis of the institutional structure of psychoanalysis as an authoritarian political movement—and he certainly is—one is left with the conclusion that one of the century's major intellectual and cultural forces was nothing more than a highly disciplined political movement masquerading as science.

Psychoanalysis has proved to be a veritable treasure trove of ideas for those intent on developing radical critiques of Western culture, beginning with Freud's own *Totem and Taboo and Civilization and Its Discontents*. Crews provides an excellent account of how Freud tended to make dogmatic claims about the source of his patients' unhappiness based on nothing more than his own suggestions. His failure to follow even the minimum standards of scientific or rational intellectual inquiry extended to his cultural writings as well. Freud's wider speculations on human culture rest on a number of extremely naive, prescientific conceptualizations of human sexual behavior and its relation to culture. Particularly outrageous was Freud's "primal horde" story of how over many generations sons had killed their fathers in order to mate with their mothers until Oedipal guilt had forced them to repress this activity. The theory is not only completely speculative as it attempts to explain a nonexistent phenomenon—the Oedipal complex—it also requires Lamarckian inheritance, a theory that, at least by the time of *Civilization and Its Discontents* (where the doctrine was reaffirmed), had been completely rejected by the scientific community.

### Freud's Armageddon

While Freud's was a self-consciously speculative theory, his speculations clearly had an agenda. Rather than provide speculations which reaffirmed the moral and intellectual basis of the culture of his day, his speculations were an integral part of his war on culture—so much so that he viewed *Totem and Taboo* as a victory over Rome and the Catholic Church (Rothman & Isenberg, 1974). In Freud's eyes he was the Carthaginian general Hannibal fighting the evil Romans that to him represented Western civilization. Peter Gay notes that Freud was proud of his enemies—the persecuting Roman Catholic Church, the hypocritical bourgeoisie,

the obtuse psychiatric establishment, the materialistic Americans—so proud, indeed, that they grew in his mind into potent specters far more malevolent and far less divided than they were in reality. He likened himself to Hannibal, to Ahasuerus, to Joseph, to Moses, all men with historic missions, potent adversaries, and difficult fates (Gay, 1988, p. 604). Freud described this "Hannibal fantasy" as "one of the driving forces of [my] mental life" (Sulloway 1979).

In this regard, it is interesting to note that *Totem and Taboo* and *Civilization and Its Discontents* present the view that the restrictions on sexual behavior, so apparent as an aspect of Western culture during Freud's life, are the source of art, love, and even civilization itself. Freud's conceptions of the origins and function of sexual repression in Western societies contain, as Peter Gay (p. 329) notes, some of Freud's "most subversive conjectures." Neurosis and unhappiness are the price to be paid for civilization because neurosis and unhappiness are the inevitable result of repressing sexual urges.

Freud appears to have been well aware that his conjectures were entirely speculative. Freud was "amused" when *Totem and Taboo* was termed a "just so" story by a British anthropologist in 1920, and stated only that his critic "was deficient in phantasy," apparently a concession that the work was indeed fanciful. Freud stated that "It would be nonsensical to strive for exactitude with this material, as it would be unreasonable to demand certainty." Similarly, Freud described *Civilization and Its Discontents* as "an essentially dilettantish foundation" on which "rises a thinly tapered analytic investigation." And Freud was well aware that his attack on religion in *The Future of an Illusion* was scientifically weak, describing it by noting that "the analytic content of the work is very thin" (Gay, pp. 330, 543, 524).

Freud's countercultural writings scarcely exhaust the mischief wreaked by psychoanalysis. The works of Herbert Marcuse, Norman Brown, Wilhelm Reich, Jaques Lacan, Erich Fromm, and a host of neoFreudians come to mind immediately, but this barely scratches the surface. Psychoanalysis influenced thought in a wide range of areas, including sociology, child rearing, criminology, anthropology, literary criticism, art, literature, and the popular media.

In fact Freud's ideas have often been labeled as subversive. Indeed,

Mannoni, Octave. 1971. Freud. R. Bellice (trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.

Masson, Jeffrey M. 1984. *The Assault on Truth: Freud's Suppression of the Seduction Theory*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1990. *Final Analysis: The Making and Unmaking of a Psychoanalyst*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

McGrath, W. J. 1974a. "Freud as Hannibal: The Politics of the Brother Band." *Central European History*, 7, 31-57.

Orgel, Shelly. 1990. "The Future of Psychoanalysis." *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, LIX, 1-20.

Rothman, Stanley, & Isenberg, P. 1974a. "Signs." *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, LIX, 1-20.

Salter, Frank. 1996. "A Comparative Analysis of Brainwashing Techniques." In Irenaus Eibl-Eibesfeldt and Frank Salter (Eds.), *Ideology, Warfare, and Indoctrinability. Proceedings of the Symposium on Ideology, Warfare, and Indoctrinability* sponsored by the Max Planck Society at Ringberg Castle, Germany, January 12, 1995; in press.

Sulloway, Frank. 1979. *Freud: Biologist of the Mind*. New York: Basic Books.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1979b. "Freud as Conquistador." *The New Republic* (August), 25-31.

Torrey, E. F. 1992. *Freudian Freud: The Malignant Effect of Freud's Theory on American Thought and Culture*. New York: Harper Collins.

Witels, F. 1924. *Sigmund Freud: His Personal-Ly. His Teaching, & His School*. trans. E. and C. Paul. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Grosskurth, Phyllis. 1991. *The Secret Ring: Freud's Inner Circle and the Politics of Psychoanalysis*. Boston: Addison-Wesley.

Günbaum, Adolf. 1984. *The Foundations of Psychoanalysis*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hofstadter, R. (1965). *The Paranoid Style in American Politics and other Essays*. New York: Knopf.

Kerr, John. 1992. *A Most Dangerous Method: The Story of Jung, Freud, and Sabina Spielrein*. New York: Knopf.

Koestler, A. (1967). *The Ghost in the Machine*. New York: Macmillan.

Kurzweil, E. 1989. *The Freudians: A Comparative Perspective*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

MacDonald, Kevin. 1986. "Civilization and Its Discontents Revisited: Freud as an Evolutionary Biologist." *Journal of Social and Biological Structures*, 9, 213-220.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1988. *Social and Personality Development: An Evolutionary Synthesis*. New York: Plenum.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1992a. "Warmth as a Developmental Construct: An Evolutionary Analysis." *Child Development*, 63, 753-773.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1992b. "A Time and a Place for Everything: A Discrete Systems Perspective on the Role of Children's Rough and Tumble Play in Educational Settings." *Early Education and Development*, 3, 334-355.

MacMillan, Malcolm. 1991. *Freud Evaluated: The Completed Arc*. The Hague: Elsevier North Holland.

Artow, J. A., & Brenner, C. 1988. "The Future of Psychoanalysis." *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, LVII, 1-14.

Bailey, P. 1960. "Rigged Radio Interview with Illustrations of Various 'Egoideals.'" *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* 4, 199-265.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1965. *Unseren: A Tragedy in Three Acts*. Springfield, IL: Charles Thomas.

Caton, Hiram. (Ed.) 1990. *The Samoa Reader: Anthropologists Take Stock*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Chamberlain, L. 1995. "Freud and the Eros of the Impossible." *Times Literary Supplement*, August 25, pp. 9-10.

Cioffi, Frank. 1969. "Wittgenstein's Freud." In August 25, pp. 9-10.

Winch (ed.). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1970. "Freud and the Idea of a Pseudoscience." In *Explanation in the Behavioral Sciences*. R. Borger & F. Cioffi (eds.). Cambridge University Press.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1972. "Wollheim on Freud." *Inquiry*, 15, 171-186.

Daly, Martin and Wilson, Margo. 1988. *Homicide*. New York: Aldine.

Ellenberger, Henri. 1970. *The Discovery of the Unconscious*. New York: Basic Books.

Esterson, Allen. 1992. *Seductive Mirage: An Exploration of the Work of Sigmund Freud*. Chicago: Open Court.

Gay, Peter. 1987. *A Godless Jew: Freud, Atheism, and the Making of Psychoanalysis*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1988. *Freud: A Life for Our Time*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Bibliography

tims of RMT and the long line of individual victims like Horace Frink and Dora Bauer are only a small part of its moral wreckage. The fact that NRYB published Crews's attacks on psychoanalysis may be a vital sign that the life of psychoanalysis as an underpinning of the intellectual left is weakening. The NRYB is only one of many elements of the vast media and intellectual network that has supported psychoanalysis throughout the century, but all signs are that psychoanalysis has become an intellectual and scientific embarrassment to all save the truest of true believers. The fact that its scientific stature has been utterly discredited in such a prestigious forum and by someone who is sympathetic to the cultural influences it has generated suggests that psychoanalysis may well have lost its political punch.

But don't expect either psychoanalysis or RMT to die soon. Because they are fundamentally religious and political rather than scientific, such movements have a life of their own, and will expire only when they are perceived as no longer serving the personal or political interests of their advocates. □

While Darwin was satisfied with revising his work after further reflection and absorbing palpable hits by rational critics, while he trusted the passage of time and the weight of his argumentation, Freud orchestrated his wooing of the public mind through a loyal cadre of adherents, founded periodicals and wrote popularizations that would spread the authorized word, dominated international congresses of analysts until he felt too frail to attend them and after that through surrogates like his daughter Anna.

Psychoanalysis has a lot to atone for. The contemporary upsurge of vic-

["Freud himself] was convinced that it was in the very nature of psychoanalytic doctrine to appear shocking and subversive. On board ship to America he did not feel that he was bringing that country a new panacea. With his typically dry wit he told his traveling companions, 'We are bringing them the plague'" (Mannoni, 1971, 168).

Peter Gay terms Freud's work generally "subversive" (1987, 140), his sexual ideology in particular "deeply subversive for his time" (p. 148); and his *Totem and Taboo* as containing "subversive conjectures" (p. 327) in its analysis of culture. Rothman and Isenberg (1974) convincingly argue that Freud actually viewed the *Interpretation of Dreams* as a victory against the Catholic Church and that he viewed *Totem and Taboo* as a successful attempt to analyze the Christian religion in terms of defense mechanisms, and neurotic symptoms. Gay notes that "while the implications of Darwin's views were threatening and unsettling, they were not quite so directly abrasive, not quite so unrespectable, as Freud's views on infantile sexuality, the ubiquity of per-