

INTRODUCTION: JUNG, NEW YORK, 1912

Sonu Shamdasani

September 28, 1912. The *New York Times* featured a full-page interview with Jung on the problems confronting America, with a portrait photo entitled “America Facing Its Most Tragic Moment”—the first prominent feature of psychoanalysis in the *Times*. It was Jung, the *Times* correctly reported, who “brought Dr. Freud to the recognition of the older school of psychology.” The *Times* went on to say, “[H]is classrooms are crowded with students eager to understand what seems to many to be an almost miraculous treatment. His clinics are crowded with medical cases which have baffled other doctors, and he is here in America to lecture on his subject.” Jung was the man of the hour. Aged thirty-seven, he had just completed a five-hundred-page magnum opus, *Transformations and Symbols of the Libido*, the second installment of which had just appeared in print. Following his first visit to America in 1909, it was he, and not Freud, who had been invited back by Smith Ely Jelliffe to lecture on psychoanalysis in the new international extension course in medicine at Fordham University, where he would also be awarded his second honorary degree (others invited included the psychiatrist William Alanson White and the neurologist Henry Head).

Jung’s initial title for his lectures was “Mental Mechanisms in Health and Disease.” By the time he got to composing them, the title had become simply “The Theory of Psychoanalysis.” Jung commenced his introduction to the lectures by indicating that he intended to outline his attitude to Freud’s guiding principles, noting that a reader would likely react with astonishment that it had taken him ten years to do so. The explanation lay in the fact that when he first encountered Freud’s work, he did not feel in a position to exercise criticism. To understand this more fully, we need to look back at Jung’s initial engagement with psychoanalysis.

ENGAGING WITH FREUD

After his medical studies, Jung took up a post as an assistant physician at Burghölzli hospital at the end of 1900. The Burghölzli was a progressive university clinic under the directorship of Eugen Bleuler. Thanks to Bleuler and his predecessor, Auguste Forel, psychological research and hypnosis played prominent roles at the Burghölzli. One of Jung's first assignments was to present a report on Freud's recently published short digest of *The Interpretation of Dreams, On Dreams*. In his report, Jung concluded that Freud's approach to dreams was somewhat one-sided, as the cause of a dream could equally be an undisguised repressed fear, as well as a wish.¹

In 1902, Jung left his post at the Burghölzli and went to Paris to study with the leading French psychologist Pierre Janet, who was lecturing at the Collège de France. After his return, he took up a recently vacated post at the Burghölzli and devoted his research to the analysis of linguistic associations, in collaboration with Franz Riklin. With coworkers, they conducted an extensive series of experiments. Jung and Riklin utilized the association experiment, devised by Francis Galton and developed in psychology and psychiatry by Wilhelm Wundt, Emil Kraepelin, and Gustav Aschaffenburg. The aim of the research project, instigated by Bleuler, was to provide a quick and reliable means for differential diagnosis. The Burghölzli team failed to come up with this, but they were struck by the significance of disturbances of reaction and prolonged response times. Jung and Riklin argued that these disturbed reactions were due to the presence of emotionally stressed complexes, and they used their experiments to develop a general psychology of complexes.²

This work established Jung's reputation as one of the rising stars of psychiatry. The conceptual basis of his early work lay in the work of Théodore Flournoy and Janet, which he attempted to fuse with the research methodology of Wilhelm Wundt and Emil Kraepelin. In such a manner, he was attempting to develop a clinico-experi-

¹ C. G. Jung, "Sigmund Freud: *On Dreams* (1901)," in *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung* (hereafter *CW*), ed. Sir Herbert Read, Michael Fordham, and Gerhard Adler; William McGuire, Executive Editor; tr. R.F.C. Hull; Bollingen Series XX (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1953–1983), vol. 18, § 869.

² "Experimental Researches on the Associations of the Healthy (1904)," *CW* 2.

INTRODUCTION

mental method, which he termed experimental psychopathology. The appearance this gave of being able to conduct psychotherapy in a scientific manner, through adopting some of the procedures of the experimental laboratory, did much to ensure the popularity of Jung's associations research, particularly in America.³ The leading psychiatrist Adolf Meyer hailed Jung and Riklin's first paper in laudatory terms: "This remarkable piece of work and its continuation are no doubt the best single contribution to psychopathology during the past year."⁴

In 1904, Bleuler introduced psychoanalysis into the Burghölzli, and entered into a correspondence with Freud.⁵ Jung noted the proximity of his work on the association experiment to Freud's concept of repression.⁶ In 1906, Jung expanded on this connection in a paper on "Psychoanalysis and the Association Experiment." He noted that while psychoanalysis remained a difficult art, the association experiment offered a secure framework for finding essential data, which removed haphazardness in therapy.⁷

Jung's proposition astutely caught the mood of the psychiatric world, and his version of the association experiment spread like wildfire, particularly in America. A steady stream of American visitors, including George Amden, Abraham Brill, Trigant Burrow, August Hoch, Charles Ricksher, Frederick Peterson, and E. W. Scripture, came to work with Bleuler and Jung at the Burghölzli,

³ See Eugene Taylor, "Jung before Freud, not Freud before Jung: The Reception of Jung's Work in American Psychotherapeutic Circles between 1904 and 1909," *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 43, 1998, pp. 97–114.

⁴ *Psychological Bulletin*, 1905, p. 242. On Meyer and Jung, see Ruth Leys, "Meyer, Jung and the Limits of Association," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 59, 1985, pp. 345–60.

⁵ Freud archives, Library of Congress. See Ernst Falzeder, "The Story of an Ambivalent Relationship: Sigmund Freud and Eugen Bleuler," *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 52, 2007, pp. 343–68.

⁶ See C. G. Jung, *Introduction to Jungian Psychology: Notes of the Seminar on Analytical Psychology Given in 1925*, revised edition, ed. Sonu Shamdasani, original ed. William McGuire (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2012), p. 14.

⁷ *CW* 2, § 663. In retrospect, Jung stressed the significant differences between Freud's concept of repression and his dissociative model—Richard Evans (1957), "Interview with C. G. Jung," in William McGuire and R.F.C. Hull, eds., *C. G. Jung Speaking: Interviews and Encounters*, Bollingen Series (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1977), p. 283. On this question, see John Haule, "From Somnambulism to Archetypes: The French Roots of Jung's Split from Freud," *Psychoanalytic Review* 71, 1984, pp. 95–107; and my "From Geneva to Zurich: Jung and French Switzerland," *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 43, 1, 1998, pp. 115–26.

JUNG CONTRA FREUD

and to study their psychological approach to psychopathology. For American psychiatrists, the interest in the psychogenesis of symptomatology seemed a notable advance over the descriptive and classificatory approach of Kraepelin. In 1907, after studying with Kraepelin in Munich, Frederick Peterson went to Zurich, and wrote his impressions to Adolf Meyer: "I have met Von Monakow here and of course see a great deal of Bleuler and Jung. I am delighted with everything in Zürich and am sorry that I spent so long a time at Munich. Jung is in every way charming and I think he has genius."⁸ Together with his coworkers, Jung published a series of articles in American journals.⁹

In 1906, Jung entered into communication with Freud. This relationship has been much mythologized. A Freudocentric legend arose, which viewed Freud and psychoanalysis as the principal source for Jung's work. This has led to the complete mislocation of his work in the intellectual history of the twentieth century. On numerous occasions, Jung protested. For instance, in an unpublished article written in the 1930s, "The Schism in the Freudian School," he wrote: "I in no way exclusively stem from Freud. I had my scientific attitude and the theory of complexes before I met Freud. The teachers that influenced me above all are Bleuler, Pierre Janet, and Theodore Flournoy."¹⁰ Freud and Jung clearly came from quite different intellectual traditions, and were drawn together by shared interests in the psychogenesis of mental disorders and psychotherapy. Their intention was to form a scientific psychotherapy based on the new psychology and, in turn, to ground psychology on the in-depth clinical investigation of individual lives. Jung described his initial attitude toward Freud in a letter he wrote to his colleague Dumeng Bezzola shortly after meeting Freud for the first time in 1907:

⁸ Frederick Peterson to Adolf Meyer, 21 January 1907, Adolf Meyer Papers, Johns Hopkins archive.

⁹ C. G. Jung, "On the Psychophysical Relations of the Associative Experiment," *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 1, 1907, pp. 247–55; with Frederick Peterson, "Psycho-Physical Investigations with the Galvanometer and Pneumograph in Normal and Insane Individuals," *Brain* 30, 1908, pp. 153–218; with Charles Ricksher, "Further Investigations on the Galvanic Phenomenon and Respiration in Normal and Insane Individuals," *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 2, 1908, pp. 189–217.

¹⁰ Jung papers, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich.

INTRODUCTION

We can still not correct [Freud], since we still know far too little; I have experienced this to my deepest shame. . . . I have therefore decided no longer to correct or to oppose Freud; I simply leave what I still do not understand to one side, and perhaps mark it with a question mark.¹¹

From 1906 until 1913, a series of debates about psychoanalysis took place in psychiatric congresses. It is striking that despite invitations, Freud himself did not take part. Instead, it was Jung who took up the task of publicly defending psychoanalysis in open debate. Jung later recalled to Kurt Eissler, “[Freud] never risked himself in a congress and never defended his cause in public! . . . This always made him afraid! America was the first and only time! . . . He was too touchy!”¹² Within the German psychiatric community, Freud, as a neurologist in private practice, did not have a strong reputation. However, when his views were defended by respectable psychiatrists such as Bleuler and Jung, they had to be taken seriously. In reply to Gustav Aschaffenburg in 1906, Jung argued that the only way to disprove this was to use Freud’s method: “As soon as Aschaffenburg meets these requirements, that is to say, publishes psychanalyses with totally different results, we will have faith in his criticism, and then the discussion of Freud’s theory can be opened.”¹³ This became one of the key rejoinders to Freud’s critics.

In 1907, Jung applied his new theory of complexes to study the psychogenesis of dementia praecox (later called schizophrenia), and to demonstrate the intelligibility of delusional formations.¹⁴ In his preface, he noted,

Even a superficial glance at the pages of my work will show how much I have to thank the ingenious conceptions of Freud. . . . I can affirm that in the beginning I naturally made all the objections that are customarily made against Freud in the literature. But I said to myself, Freud could be refuted

¹¹ Jung to Bezzola, 23 April 1907, Bezzola papers, courtesy of Angela Graf-Nold.

¹² Transcription of Eissler’s interview with Jung, 29 August 1953 (original in German); Sigmund Freud Collection, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., p. 33.

¹³ “Freud’s Theory of Hysteria: A Reply to Aschaffenburg,” *CW* 4, § 16, tr. mod.

¹⁴ “On the Psychology of Dementia Praecox: An Attempt,” *CW* 3.

only by one who had applied the psychoanalytic method many times and who really investigates as Freud investigates. . . . He who does not or cannot do this should not pronounce judgement on Freud, else he acts like those famous men of science who disdained to look through Galileo's telescope. Fairness to Freud does not mean, as many fear, an unqualified submission to a dogma; one can very well maintain an independent judgement. If I, for instance, acknowledge the complex mechanisms of dreams and hysteria, this does not mean that I attribute to the infantile sexual trauma the exclusive importance that Freud apparently does. Still less does it mean that I place sexuality so predominantly in the foreground or even grant it the psychological universality which Freud, it seems, postulates under the impression of the certainly powerful role which sexuality plays in the psyche. Concerning Freudian therapy, it is in the best case one of the possible, and perhaps does not always offer what one theoretically expects.¹⁵

In 1909, before any book of Freud's, the work was translated, the first 'psychoanalytic' book in English. In their preface, Abraham Brill and Frederick Peterson wrote that Bleuler and Jung had "inaugurated a new epoch in psychiatry by attempting to penetrate into the mysteries of the individual influence of the symptoms."¹⁶

With the lead of Bleuler and Jung, the Burghölzli became the center of the psychoanalytic movement. In 1908, the *Jahrbuch für psychoanalytische und psychopathologische Forschungen* [Yearbook for Psychoanalytic and Psychopathological Researches] was established, with Bleuler and Jung as the editors. Due to their advocacy, psychoanalysis gained a hearing in the German psychiatric world. It is important to note that at this stage, psychoanalytic theory had not yet acquired the doctrinal fixity that it soon would. In correspondence with Freud, Jung set out his reservations on a number of points in Freud's theories, such as the sexual theory of the libido and the attempt to view the etiology of the psychoses purely psychogenically, and tried (unsuccessfully) to convince Freud to bring psychoanalytic theory into closer alignment with biology. At

¹⁵ "On the Psychology of Dementia Praecox," *CW* 3, pp. 3-4, tr. mod.

¹⁶ Brill and Peterson, "Translators' Preface," in Jung, *The Psychology of Dementia Praecox*, pp. v-vi.

INTRODUCTION

this stage, Jung's divergences were tolerated within the framework of the wider political alliance.¹⁷

In 1909, on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of Clark University, Jung was invited, along with Freud, to present some lectures at the university and receive an honorary degree. For American psychiatrists and psychologists, it would have been Jung, rather than Freud, who was the main draw.¹⁸

The following year, an international psychoanalytic association was formed, with Jung as the president. The movement was riven by dissensions and acrimonious disagreements.¹⁹ Freud and his followers had been able to dismiss the views of his critics by arguing that they had never practiced his method. However, Freud was now faced with the situation that the most senior representatives of the movement were voicing views that were close to those of his critics, and their views could not be so easily dismissed. Toward the end of 1910, a conflict broke out between Freud and Alfred Adler, his most prominent follower in Vienna and president of the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society.²⁰ On 3 December 1910, Freud wrote to Jung: "The crux of the matter—and that is what really alarms me—is that [Adler] minimizes the sexual drive and our opponents will soon be able to speak of an experienced psychoanalyst whose conclusions are radically different from ours."²¹ Freud's response was one of pathologization.²² Adler was forced to resign, and in June 1911, he and his colleagues established a society for free psychoanalytic research. Later that autumn, the psychiatrist Hans Maier, who had succeeded Jung at the Burghölzli, was excluded from attending the Zurich Psychoanalytic Society. Follow-

¹⁷ See Paul Stepansky, "The Empiricist as Rebel: Jung, Freud, and the Burdens of Discipleship," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 12, pp. 216–39.

¹⁸ See Richard Skues, "Clark Revisited: Reappraising Freud in America," in John Burnham, ed., *After Freud Left: Centennial Reflections on His 1909 Visit to the United States* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012).

¹⁹ On this period, see Mikkel Borch-Jacobsen and Sonu Shamdasani, *The Freud Files: An Inquiry into the History of Psychoanalysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); and George Makari, *Revolution in Mind: The Creation of Psychoanalysis* (New York: Harper Collins, 2008), chapter 7, "Integration/Disintegration."

²⁰ See Bernhard Handlbauer, *The Freud-Adler Controversy* (Oxford: Oneworld, 1998).

²¹ William McGuire, ed., *The Freud/Jung Letters*, tr. R. Mannheim and R.F.C. Hull (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1974), p. 376.

²² See Marina Leitner, "Pathologizing as a Way of Dealing with Conflicts and Dissent in the Psychoanalytic Movement," *Free Associations* 7, 3, 1999, pp. 459–83.

ing this episode, Bleuler resigned from the International Psychoanalytical Association.

In 1909, Jung resigned from the Burghölzli to devote himself to his growing private practice and his research interests. His retirement from the Burghölzli coincided with a shift in his research interests to the study of mythology, folklore, and religion, and he assembled a vast private library of scholarly works. These researches culminated in *Transformations and Symbols of the Libido*,²³ published in two installments in 1911 and 1912. In this work, Jung differentiated two kinds of thinking. Taking his cue from William James, among others, Jung contrasted directed thinking and fantasy thinking. The former was verbal and logical. The latter was passive, associative, and imagistic. The former was exemplified by science and the latter by mythology. Jung claimed that the ancients lacked a capacity for directed thinking, which was a modern acquisition. Fantasy thinking took place when directed thinking ceased. *Transformations and Symbols of the Libido* was an extended study of fantasy thinking, and of the continued presence of mythological themes in the dreams and fantasies of contemporary individuals. Jung reiterated the anthropological equation between the prehistoric, the primitive, and the child. He held that the elucidation of current-day fantasy thinking in adults would concurrently shed light on the thought of children, savages, and prehistoric peoples.²⁴

In this work, Jung synthesized nineteenth-century theories of memory, heredity, and the unconscious and posited a phylogenetic layer to the unconscious that was still present in everyone, consisting of mythological images. For Jung, myths were symbols of the libido, and they depicted its typical movements. He used the comparative method of anthropology to draw together a vast panoply of myths, and then subjected them to analytic interpretation. He later termed his use of the comparative method ‘amplification.’ He claimed that there had to be typical myths that corresponded to the ethnopsychological development of complexes. Following Jacob Burckhardt, Jung termed such typical myths ‘primordial images’ (‘Urbilder’). One particular myth was given a central role: that of the hero. For Jung, this represented the life of

²³ CWB.

²⁴ “The Psychology of the Unconscious,” CWB, § 36. In his 1952 revision of this text, Jung qualified this (“Symbols of Transformation,” CW5, § 29).

INTRODUCTION

the individual, attempting to become independent and to free himself from the mother. He interpreted the incest motif as an attempt to return to the mother to be reborn. He was later to herald this work as marking the discovery of the collective unconscious, though the term itself was of a later date.²⁵ It was in the second installment of the book that Jung explicitly set out his divergence with Freud's theory of the sexual libido and presented his own account of the development of the individual. The substance of Jung's critique is presented in detail in his New York lectures.

During the course of 1912, the personal relationship between Freud and Jung seriously deteriorated. On 20 August 1912, Freud wrote to James Jackson Putnam, "After the disgraceful defection of Adler, a gifted thinker but a malicious paranoiac, I am now in trouble with our friend, Jung, who apparently has not outgrown his own neurosis."²⁶ That summer, Ernest Jones proposed the formation of a secret committee to defend the cause of psychoanalysis "like the Paladins of Charlemagne."²⁷ Notably absent from this committee was Jung, then president of the International Psychoanalytical Association.

AUTUMN IN NEW YORK

At the beginning of 1912, Smith Ely Jelliffe had invited Jung to lecture in the new international extension course in medicine at Fordham University.²⁸ Jung's trip led to the postponement of the

²⁵ "Address on the Occasion of the Founding of the C. G. Jung Institute, Zurich, 24 April 1948," CW18, § 1131.

²⁶ Nathan Hale, ed., *James Jackson Putnam and Psychoanalysis: Letters between Putnam and Sigmund Freud, Ernest Jones, William James, Sándor Ferenczi, and Morton Prince, 1877-1917* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971), p. 146.

²⁷ Jones to Freud, 7 August 1912, in Andrew Paskauskas, ed., *The Complete Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Ernest Jones, 1908-1939* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993), p. 149. See Andrew Paskauskas, "Freud's Break with Jung: The Crucial Role of Ernest Jones," *Free Associations* 11, 1988, pp. 7-34. On the secret committee, see Gerhard Wittenberger, *Das "Geheime Komitee" Sigmund Freuds: Institutionalisierungsprozesse in der Psychoanalytischen Bewegung zwischen 1912 und 1927* (Tübingen: Editions Diskord, 1995).

²⁸ Freud to Brill, 14 February 1912, Library of Congress, courtesy of Ernst Falzeder. To Ferenczi, Freud wrote on 23 June 1912: "Jung's 'summons to America' shouldn't be anything good. A little, unknown Catholic university run by Jesuits, which Jones had

JUNG CONTRA FREUD

congress of the International Psychoanalytical Association, which had been due to be held in the autumn.

On 13 May, Jung wrote to Jelliffe:

I accept your kind invitation to stay in your house during the time of my lectures. I am very grateful for this arrangement, because life in hotels in New York is somewhat disagreeable.

As I already told you, I hope to be in N. Y. on September 18 (Kaiser Wilhelm II).²⁹

On 2 August, Jung informed Freud, "My American lectures are now finished and will contain various proposals for the modification of certain theoretical formulations. This step was difficult. I shall not however overcome my father following Adler's recipe, as you seem to suppose. This doesn't apply to me."³⁰ The lectures were translated into English by David Eder and Maria Moltzer.³¹

On 7 September, Jung left for New York, just as the second installment of *Transformations and Symbols of the Libido* appeared in the *Jahrbuch*. The period of suspension of criticism that he had indicated in his 1907 letter to Bezzola had now come to an end. Strikingly, in contrast to the convoluted arguments of *Transformations and Symbols of the Libido*, Jung then gave a very clear and lucid account of the development of psychoanalysis, together with his criticisms and reformulations of it. The ninth lecture presented an account of analysis of a child by Maria Moltzer, who was working as Jung's assistant. The lectures were attended by around ninety teachers and practitioners.

On 8 October, Jung gave a talk at the New York Academy of Medicine on "Psychoanalysis and Neurosis," which presented a summary of some of his revisions of psychoanalysis, and ended by

turned down." Eva Brabant, Ernst Falzeder, and Patrizia Giampieri-Deutsch, eds., *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi: Volume 1, 1908–1914*, tr. Peter Hofner, with an introduction by André Haynal (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000), p. 387.

²⁹ John Burnham, *Jelliffe: American Psychoanalyst and Physician and His Correspondence with Sigmund Freud and C. G. Jung*, ed. William McGuire (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), p. 190.

³⁰ McGuire, *The Freud/Jung Letters*, p. 512, tr. mod. Hull omitted the second sentence in his translation.

³¹ On Moltzer, see my *Cult Fictions: Jung and the Founding of Analytical Psychology* (London: Routledge, 1998); and my introduction to *The Red Book: Liber Novus* (New York: Norton, 2009) pp. 204–5.

INTRODUCTION

noting that the views he was presenting concerning the etiology of the neuroses reconciled Freud's views with those of his great rival Pierre Janet, which would have been an anathema to the former.³² He also gave two clinical lectures on dementia praecox at Bellevue Hospital in New York and at the New York State Psychiatric Institute at Ward's Island. James Jackson Putnam heard one of Jung's lectures and conveyed his impressions to Ernest Jones on 24 October:

He seems to me a strong but egotistical man (if I may say this in complete confidence), and to be under the necessity of accentuating any peculiarity of his own position for his own personal satisfaction. I cannot think that any serious breach would be occasioned by this present movement on his part. . . . The point which seemed to me to indicate most strongly the idea of a breaking off on his part was that he said, if I understood him rightly, that he thought the significance of the whole conception of infantile sexual tendencies in Freud's sense had been overrated; that all persons, sick or well, have about the same fantasies, and that for example, he did not any longer believe that the sensations which a nursing child has could be classified as sexual in any sense, but only as related to nutritional necessities.³³

After delivering the lectures, Jung went to St. Elizabeth's hospital at the invitation of William Alanson White. While there, he conducted some clinical investigations of 'Negroes' that convinced him that collective patterns were not only racially inherited, but universal.³⁴ He also visited Trigant Burrow in Baltimore and went to Chicago, and presented lectures in both cities. After returning to Switzerland, Jung was awarded an honorary degree in absentia. The *Fordham Monthly* noted:

The degree of Doctor of Laws is conferred, in absentia, on Dr. Karl Jung, of the University of Zurich, Switzerland. Dr. Jung, though not yet in his forties, has attracted the attention of the world by his contributions to psycho-analysis, and

³² "Psychoanalysis and Neurosis," *CW* 4, § 574.

³³ Hale, *James Jackson Putnam and Psychoanalysis*, p. 277.

³⁴ See my *Jung and the Making of Modern Psychology: The Dream of a Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 311–12.

above all by his demonstrations in word association, time reactions and the measurement of emotional stress. The value of these discoveries in criminology are just coming to be properly appreciated and their further significance is but a matter of natural development. His studies in *Dementia Praecox* attracted worldwide attention, and his monograph on the subject published originally in German, but now available also in English and French, is one of the best known of recent publications, particularly among the specialists in neurology and psychiatry.³⁵

On his return, Jung gave Freud an account of his lectures:

I gave 9 lectures at the Jesuit (!) University of Fordham, New York—a critical account of the development of the theory of ΨA . I had an audience of ca. 90 psychiatrists and neurologists. The lectures were in English. Besides that, I held a 2-hour seminar every day for a fortnight for ca. 8 professors. Naturally I also made room for those of my views which deviate in places from the hitherto existing conceptions, particularly in regard to the libido theory. I found that my version of ΨA won over many friends, who until now had been helplessly at a loss with the problem of the sexuality of the neurosis.³⁶

Jung's lectures were published in English in installments between 1913 and 1915 in the first volumes of the *Psychoanalytic Review*, which had been founded by Jelliffe and White. They appeared as a monograph in 1915 in the *Nervous and Mental Disease Monograph Series*, his second book in English. Jung's revision of psychoanalysis was taken on board by Jelliffe and White, and it can be argued that it contributed to the rapid expansion of psychoanalysis in America that took place at this time. In 1913, the lectures appeared in German in the *Jahrbuch* (of which Jung was shortly to resign as editor), with some revisions, and then as a separate monograph.

Given Jung's status as president of the International Psychoanalytical Association and his international standing, the Freudians were fearful concerning the impact of Jung's theoretical revisions,

³⁵ *The Fordham Monthly*, November 1912, p. 4.

³⁶ McGuire, *The Freud/Jung Letters*, p. 515, tr. mod.

INTRODUCTION

as they moved so much closer to positions held by critics of psychoanalysis. On 25 April 1913, Jones wrote to Freud, "I am deeply impressed by the success of Jung's campaign, for he appeals to formidable prejudices. It is, in my opinion, the most critical period that $\Psi\alpha$ will have to go through."³⁷

Jung was under no illusions as to how his work would be received in the Freudian camp. On 15 November 1912, he wrote to Jones:

Freud is convinced that I am thinking under the domination of a father complex against him and then all is complex-nonsense. . . . Against this insinuation I am completely helpless. . . . If Freud understands each attempt to think in a new way about the problems of psychoanalysis as a personal resistance, things become impossible.³⁸

In the winter of 1912, Jung's communications with Freud broke down, and on 3 January 1913, Freud wrote to Jung ending their personal relationship.³⁹ It wasn't till the summer that Freud read Jung's New York lectures, and his private reaction was less critical than he himself had expected. He wrote to Ferenczi on 5 August:

I have now read Jung's paper myself and find it good and innocuous, beyond my expectation. Jones is quite right with his criticism; the errors are palpable, the comparisons slanted; much that he presents in his aggressive tone as discovery is, moreover, congruent with our intellectual property; but the contradictions remain entirely on ΨA 's ground. Much toward the end about therapy, transference, etc. is even excellent. What is stupid is his insistence on inertia as an etiological fac-

³⁷ Paskauskas, *The Complete Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Ernest Jones, 1908–1939*, p. 199. On 14 November 1912, Jones reported to Freud a statement by Pierce Clark to James Jackson Putnam that "I think that $\Psi\alpha$ in the light in which Jung formulates it is bound to have a very wide and rapid expansion from now on. It certainly removes some of the disagreeable barriers hitherto impeding the progress of the movement" (*ibid.*, p. 176).

³⁸ Sigmund Freud Copyrights, Wivenhoe. On 14 April 1912, Freud had written to Binswanger apropos Jung, "Probably what is behind this is that he is playing out his father complex against me, for which I have certainly provided no cause, and if one pursued the matter one would probably find the influence of a woman, not his wife" (p. 83).

³⁹ McGuire, *The Freud/Jung Letters*, p. 539.

JUNG CONTRA FREUD

tor, instead of the Oedipus complex. . . . On the whole, I have very much overestimated the danger from a distance.⁴⁰

It would be a mistake to consider Jung's theoretical differences with Freudian theory as leading to his break with Freud. Rather, the collapse of their personal relationship and the political alliance they had formed led to a situation where, in the public domain, theoretical differences were presented as rationalized justifications. Hence a concerted campaign of critical reviews against Jung's works was orchestrated by Freud; Karl Abraham and Ernest Jones wrote strident condemnations of Jung's New York lectures.⁴¹

THE AFTERMATH

In many respects, the fears of the Freudians concerning the success of Jung's reformulations proved to be well founded. In a comprehensive survey of the reception in the British press between 1912 and 1925, Dean Rapp showed that the works of Jung and his followers consistently received better reviews than the works of Freud and the psychoanalysts. Rapp states that the most frequent charge against Freud was that he had exaggerated the role of sexuality.⁴² In the period between 1912 and 1919, Rapp notes that reviewers stated their preference for Jung's wider conception of the libido.⁴³ The reception of Jung's work in America—where it has had its deepest impact—has yet to be written.⁴⁴ But my impression, based on a survey of reviews in American publications during this period, particularly with regard to the reception of the 1916 En-

⁴⁰ Brabant et al., *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi: Volume 1, 1908–1914*, p. 505.

⁴¹ Karl Abraham, in Hilda Abraham, ed., *Clinical Papers and Essays on Psychoanalysis*, tr. Hilda Abraham and D. R. Ellison (London: Hogarth Press, 1955), pp. 101–15; Ernest Jones, in *Internationale Zeitschrift für Ärztliche Psychoanalyse* 2, pp. 83–86.

⁴² Dean Rapp, "The Reception of Freud by the British Press: General Interest and Literary Magazines, 1920–1925," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 24, 1988, p. 195.

⁴³ Dean Rapp, "The Early Discovery of Freud by the British General Educated Public, 1912–1919," *Social History of Medicine* 3, p. 233.

⁴⁴ For some initial indications, see John Burnham, *Psychoanalysis and American Medicine, 1894–1918: Medicine, Science and Culture* (New York: International Universities Press, 1967), pp. 128–29.

INTRODUCTION

glish translation of Jung's *Transformations and Symbols of the Libido*, is that a similar trend also holds for his reception in America.⁴⁵ Many of the positions Jung articulated in these lectures became central tenets of later Jungian theory, and with the collapse of classical psychoanalytic theory, many in the psychoanalytic world today would have little problem with them. Jung's critique presented Freud with the need for a damage limitation exercise, which he performed through his own theoretical revisions.⁴⁶

After delivering the lectures, Jung had some dreams that made a great impression upon him, and which were to take his work in a radically different direction,⁴⁷ and in the autumn of 1913, he commenced an intense period of self-investigation, at the center of which was his work on *Liber Novus*, *The Red Book*, which formed the basis of his later work.

In 1955, the German edition of these lectures was republished. In his preface to the reissue, Jung noted:

It is a milestone on the long road of scientific endeavour, and so it shall remain. It may serve to call back to memory the constantly changing stages of the search in a newly discovered territory, whose boundaries are not marked out with any certainty even today, and thus to make its contribution to the story of an evolving science. I am therefore letting this book go to press again in its original form and with no essential alterations.⁴⁸

These lectures were included in volume 4 of Jung's *Collected Works*, but this is their first republication in English as a separate monograph since 1915.

⁴⁵ See Beatrice Hinkle's press cutting book, Kristine Mann Library, New York.

⁴⁶ On this question, see Mikkel Borch-Jacobsen, *The Freudian Subject*, tr. Catherine Porter (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1988); and Ernst Falzeder, "Freud and Jung, Freudians and Jungians," paper presented at the Library of Congress Jung Symposium, 19 June 2011.

⁴⁷ See Jung, *Introduction to Jungian Psychology*, p. 40.

⁴⁸ CW 4, p. 87.