



UNIVERSITY OF  
ILLINOIS PRESS

---

Phrenology versus Psychoanalysis

Author(s): Karl M. Dallenbach

Source: *The American Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 68, No. 4 (Dec., 1955), pp. 511-525

Published by: University of Illinois Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1418781>

Accessed: 25-01-2020 02:12 UTC

## REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

[https://www.jstor.org/stable/1418781?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references\\_tab\\_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/1418781?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents)

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

*University of Illinois Press* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Psychology*

# THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PSYCHOLOGY

Founded in 1887 by G. STANLEY HALL

Vol. LXVIII

DECEMBER, 1955

No. 4

## PHRENOLOGY VERSUS PSYCHOANALYSIS

By KARL M. DALLENBACH, University of Texas

As I have pointed out on another, similar occasion,<sup>1</sup> controversy over theory is futile. It advertises and calls attention to the theory criticized and it is not effective against the will to believe. Besides relieving the critic's pent-up emotion, a polemical article probably accomplishes nothing; and the time, thought, and effort given to its writing are wasted. This is true because theories do not succumb to abstract argument. Criticisms are not read or, if read, are not assimilated or heeded by those wedded to the theory attacked—and they are not needed by those who are not. Theories are not killed by criticism; they do not die, they just fade away—and poor indeed is the theory of yesterday that does not find some adherents today! I have searched long through the history of our science without finding a single instance in which I could with any assurance say that criticism was the *coup de mort* of theory. Theories pass from the scientific stage not because they have been disproved but because they have been superseded—pushed off and replaced by others that are new.<sup>2</sup>

\* Accepted for publication April 18, 1954. Presidential address of The Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology, given at Atlanta, Georgia, April 16, 1954.

<sup>1</sup>K. M. Dallenbach, The place of theory in science, *Psychol Rev.*, 60, 1953, 34 f.

<sup>2</sup>A similar observation was made by John Dewey who wrote: "It would be difficult to find a single problem during the whole record of reflective thought which has been pursued consistently until some definite result was reached. It generally happens that just as the problem becomes defined, and the order of battle is drawn, with contestants determined on each side, the whole scene changes; interest is transferred to another phase of the question and the old problem is left apparently suspended in mid air. It is left, not because any satisfactory solution has been reached, but because interest is exhausted. Another question which seems more important has claimed attention. If one, after a generation or a century, reviews the controversy and finds that some consensus of judgment has finally been reached, he discovers that this has come about, not so much through exhaustive logical discussion as through a change in men's point of view." (John Dewey, *Evolution and ethics*, *Monist*, 8, 1898, 321.)

When a theory becomes the basis of a school, a *Fach*, or cult that is vigorously promoted, in which its author assumes a messianic rôle and its adherents the cloaks of disciples, in which there is an infallible pope and a hierarchy of votaries, then the critic's lot is not only futile but it is apt to be grievous as well. If his criticism is effective, if it strikes home, he is subjected to the slings and arrows of outraged disciples—seldom if ever does the pope himself deign to answer—who rise fervently to the defense of their dogma and doctrine and hide their logical lapses and *non sequiturs* in the fury of their replies. The critic may find the vehemence unpleasant but he should not be surprised by it. It is understandable; the defenders believe that their livelihood and very existence are threatened—as, indeed, would be the case if logic and experimental results alone prevailed—hence a distraction of any kind, the mere rumble of a drum, were better than the acquiescence of silence.

These sobering reflections—the futility and grief of the critic's rôle—came to mind when I considered discussing Phrenology and Psychoanalysis with you, for both are schools of the kind just mentioned. Though one is old and has, as I am sure, no defenders among you, the other is now at its zenith, with champions galore. It has more followers today than ever before and I doubt not, that, if put to the vote of the members of the American Psychological Association it would be the system chosen by the plurality if not by the majority. Though I am still vigorous enough to enjoy a good fight and am not afraid of controversy, I have no desire to play a futile rôle, hence I shall avoid criticizing the doctrines of either school. I shall restrict myself to the rôle of historian and in my review of these two schools I shall hold myself strictly to statements of fact—every one of which is well documented.

I have no thesis to defend. I merely wish to review with you the striking similarities of Phrenology and Psychoanalysis; of their invention, their development and modification, their basic philosophy and psychology, and even the actions and behavior of their *dramatis personae*.

Despite their separation in time of 100 years, they are so similar that Psychoanalysis is almost a case of history repeating itself, of new wine in old bottles; for though the voice and the words are new—the structure, form, and development of the refrain are those of Phrenology. I was struck by the similarity of these two schools some years ago when I was forced, in my search for the origin of the word 'function' as a systematic term in psychology, to make an extensive study of Phrenology,<sup>3</sup> and nothing

---

<sup>3</sup> Dallenbach, The history and derivation of the word 'function' as a systematic term in psychology, this JOURNAL, 26, 1915, 473-484.

has occurred since then in the development of Psychoanalysis which leads me to reject that view. Indeed, quite to the contrary, some of the most striking similarities have appeared since the first were noted.

Few of you have any interest in Phrenology and still fewer have spent any precious time in its study. Probably the only accounts of it that many of you have seen are the shabby caricatures that appear in many elementary textbooks of psychology as examples of a pseudoscience—of the kind of thing that psychology is not. Yet, in point of fact, Phrenology played an important rôle in the history of our science; it is the bridge between the empirical and experimental eras that is crossed by many historians who (because of the disrepute of the bridge) pay no proper recognition in toll.<sup>4</sup>

That my review may be easily followed, I outline it for you. I shall first give a brief résumé of the education and training of the founders (Gall and Freud) of these two schools—you will find that they are very similar; and then I shall trace in turn the development of their doctrines—you will see that history, even in minute detail, seems to be repeating itself.

(1) *Founders: (a) Gall.* Franz Joseph Gall, the founder-promoter of organology, the discipline now known as Phrenology, was born on March 9, 1758, at Tiefenbrunn, Baden, Germany. He was educated at Baden, at Strassburg, and at Vienna. Upon the completion of his medical training, he specialized in neural anatomy, giving special attention to the head and brain—an interest acquired in his youth from the observation that his schoolmates with prominent eyes possessed good memories. After several years of post-graduate study, he entered upon the private practice of medicine in 1785, when 27 yr. of age. While waiting for patients to come, he devoted himself during his free time to the pursuit of his hobby. He first studied the heads of people in jails and lunatic asylums, choosing these heads because their mental characteristics could be determined without question from the predicaments into which their possessors were found. He later studied the heads of friends and casts of heads of other people whose mental characteristics were known to him. In 1796, after 11 yr. of investigation and preparation, during which time he published one book,<sup>5</sup> he began his lectures upon organology at Vienna. They proved to be very popular; students flocked to him; he had embarked upon his career.

(b) *Freud.* About one hundred years after Gall's birth, Sigmund Freud, the founder-promoter of Psychoanalysis, was born on May 6, 1856, at Freiberg, Moravia, a province of Austria. When he was 4 yr. old his family moved to Vienna. He received his early training at home and in private schools. After completing his

<sup>4</sup> Boring is one historian who pays, but he pays with a tainted phrase for he writes that "scientific psychology was born of phrenology, out of wedlock with science" (*A History of Experimental Psychology*, 1929, 55). The kind of science this makes psychology is certainly unacceptable in a reputable family. Boring's love of turning a neat phrase trapped him as he is not the kind of man to devote a life-time at the altar of such a science.

<sup>5</sup> F. J. Gall, *Untersuchungen über Natur und Kunst im kranken und gesunden Zustande des Menschen*, 1791.

studies at the Wiener Gymnasium, from which he was graduated at the age of 17 yr., he decided to study medicine. It was, as he thought, the surest among the means open to him of achieving his boyhood dreams of power.<sup>6</sup> He entered the University of Vienna in 1873 and was graduated eight years later in 1881, his training having been prolonged by service as research assistant in the Zoölogical Experimental Station at Trieste, and also in Brücke's Biological Laboratory at the University and by a year of compulsory service in the Austrian Army as a physician. After his graduation he continued his work in neural anatomy in Brücke's laboratory for one year and then, because of his restricted material circumstances and his desire to marry, he decided to leave his beloved laboratory and to prepare himself for the practice of medicine. To that end he accepted a position in 1882 as junior physician in the Vienna General Hospital which permitted rotation among the different departments. He served two months in surgery—acquiring, as he said, "an intense dislike for it"; about seven months in internal medicine—during which he found that he had "no more interest in treating the sick patients in the wards than in studying their diseases"; five months in the psychiatric clinic—which "were highly interesting and satisfactory"; three months in dermatology—which "were welcome" because he came into contact there with syphilis, "The basis of many diseases of the nervous system," and the balance of his service, about 18 mo., in the department of nervous diseases.<sup>7</sup> Soon after entering this department he found himself the senior physician in charge due to the fact that all the doctors above him had volunteered to combat an epidemic of cholera that was threatening to cross the border into Austria. He enjoyed the service and the responsibility but deplored the fact that, because of the lack of knowledge concerning the cause and treatment of these diseases, so little could be done for the patients. His neurological training, which was the best his time afforded, was utterly helpless against nervous diseases. Freud resolved to do something to rectify that condition.

Hearing that Charcot, in the Salpêtrière Hospital in Paris, was successfully treating hysteria by hypnosis, Freud decided to go to him for instruction in the new therapy. He applied for and won a travelling fellowship and in the fall of 1885 when 29 yr. old he went to Paris. Charcot worked by way of post-hypnotic suggestion. He hypnotized the patients, suggested relief, and then awakened them. Though he also held the belief that there was some trouble in the sexual life of every neurotic patient, he made no reference to sex in his treatment. The idea was, however, implanted in Freud's mind and, as you all know, it germinated and later bore fruit.

Having learned the hypnotic technique, Freud returned to Vienna and started private practice as a specialist in nervous diseases. Though he continued his strictly scientific investigations and writing, more and more of his time and energy were given to clinical pursuits. He used hypnosis as his chief method of treatment. He soon ran into difficulties, however, as he found that he was not always able to induce

<sup>6</sup> Ernest Jones, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, 1, 1953, 27 f., 30, 78.

<sup>7</sup> It was during this period that Freud studied the physiological effect of cocaine, examples of which the Merck Company supplied him for experimental purposes. He might have discovered its anesthetic effect, which was discovered by Carl Koller, a colleague in the Hospital to whom he had demonstrated it as a "wonderful drug" that "calmed agitation and dispelled depression," but he left it slip through his fingers. (Jones, *op. cit.*, 84.)

hypnosis in his patients and, furthermore, that he could not always effect a cure by suggestion when hypnosis had been induced. To perfect his hypnotic technique, he went to Nancy, France, during the summer of 1889 to visit Bernheim, who claimed to be able to hypnotize any one. He learned there, however, that hypnosis was not necessary in therapy; that suggestion without hypnosis accomplished the same results, though perhaps more slowly.

When he returned to Vienna after the Nancy pilgrimage, he joined forces with Breuer, an old friend, and tried the 'talking out' method that Breuer had used in a case of hysteria, the famous case of Anna O., during the early 1880s. They obtained, as they thought, excellent results and jointly published a 14-page paper in 1893 on "The psychic mechanisms of hysterical phenomena" and, in 1895, a 269-page book entitled *Studies on Hysteria*. With the publication of this book, Psychoanalysis was launched.

The founder-promoters of our two systems, Gall and Freud, were both medically educated—they received the best training that their different generations afforded. They both specialized in neurology and each made outstanding contributions in that field. Their training was not hurried—they both served long apprenticeships. They were able, brilliant, and talented; men possessed of great zeal, determination, and imagination; destined to carve their niches in history! Now let us see what niches they carved.

*Systems: (a) Phrenology.* Gall based his system upon the most advanced physiology and psychology of his day.<sup>8</sup> He held that the brain was the organ of mind—a doctrine advanced by the Greeks and repeated with variations by many authors since then but never stated by anyone before him with such clarity and finality. Not some but *all* the various aspects of mind were located by Gall in the brain. His psychology was also the most modern of his time. Of the schools then in existence, associationism and faculty psychology were the most prominent. Of these Gall chose faculty psychology. That it was soon to receive its death blow at the hands of Herbart, Gall could not know, but had he chosen associationism he would not have fared any better. Faculty psychology, however, suited his system; it was respectable during his time and he had no reason to question his choice. Indeed, his adoption of faculty psychology and not Herbart's criticisms may have hastened its passing.

Gall correlated the various faculties, into which he divided mind, with parts or organs of the brain—the amount of a given faculty being related to the size

<sup>8</sup> For an excellent account of Gall's intellectual antecedents see Madison Bentley, *The psychological antecedents of phrenology*, *Psychol. Monog.*, 21, 1916 (No. 92), 102-115.

of its corresponding cerebral organ. Assuming that the skull is molded in its shape by the growing brain, he believed that the outer surface of the skull and the contour of the brain were sufficiently close that knowledge of the relative sizes of the organs of the brain and the corresponding faculties could be obtained by examining the surface of the head. Specifically, an enlargement at a spot on the skull was taken to mean a corresponding enlargement of the brain and an excess of the faculty located there; contrariwise, a recess or indentation in the skull meant a deficiency in the brain and a lack of the corresponding faculty.

Gall's method of investigation was empirical. The experimental method was still unknown in psychology. It was years away in the future—about 40 before Weber reported his experiments upon touch, 60 before Fechner published his psychophysical investigations, and 80 before Wundt presented his program. Gall used the only method that was then at hand—a rigorous search for instances illustrating his doctrine. He labored assiduously to multiply the number of his observations. He examined the heads of people in every station and rank of society—of men of talent and of genius, of the mighty and of the humble, of criminals, imbeciles, and insane, and even of animals. He compared successive generations for common traits. For all his pains and labors, his system was, however, an invention, not a discovery. Instead of deducing the faculties from the organs and generalizing both from specific observations, Gall selected the faculties and searched for positions on the skull at which to assign them. His localizations were frequently based upon striking instances. For example, he placed *cautiousness* in the parietal area because an ecclesiastic with a hesitating mien had large protuberances there, and he placed the *love of approbation* at the top and toward the rear of the head because a lunatic claiming to be the Queen of France had large bulges there. He sought to substantiate the localizations made from striking cases but his search was always directed toward obtaining confirmatory evidence.

Gall did not hesitate, however, to modify his localization in the light of new observations (when made by him) or criticisms (when he deemed them pertinent—which he seldom did). The first edition of his craniology, published in 1800, contained 22 duplicated organs which were arranged at different levels of the two halves of the brain: some at the base, some about the center, and others on the surface. The organ of *vitality*, the desire to live, was, for example, localized in the medulla oblongata and measured by the size of the foramen magnum and the thickness of the neck. When asked: "How do you know that the prominence of an outer organ indicates its real size? May it not merely be pressed out, though itself of inferior volume, by the development of a lower organ?"—Gall had no answer; or rather his answer was immediately to withdraw the separate organs at the base and about the center of the brain and to extend them all the way up from the base to the cortex—thus avoiding that criticism. In successive editions of his charts, the number, names, locations, sizes, and shapes of the organs were changed, but in all of them the organs were represented as round or oval enclosures with vacant interspaces. By 1807 the number of organs had been increased from 22 to 27.

Though Gall's doctrines were rejected by his colleagues in Vienna, they were of a kind to find ready converts among the laity. His lectures had tremendous popular appeal. Here was a short cut, a key to the mystery of personality and the self for which the world was looking—and for that matter still is! In 1802, at the height of his popularity in Vienna, his lectures were interdicted by the Government as

being dangerous to religion. This apparent calamity proved a boon, for he and Spurzheim, who was now associated with him as a collaborator, carried their investigations and lectures throughout Europe, exchanging the audience of a city for that of a continent. They settled in Paris in 1807 where their lectures and researches were well received by the public and, in contradistinction to their treatment in Vienna, were respectfully considered by their scientific colleagues. In 1808 they were invited to present a *mémoire* upon their work to the Institut de France. Though such invitations were usually tantamount to election, this did not follow in their case. The Committee, to which their *mémoire* was referred for consideration, reported (at the suggestion of Napoleon, it is believed) that the thesis presented did not fall within the scope of its field (mathematics and physics), which it certainly did not. Napoleon, as the apocryphal story goes, was displeased by the recent election of an Englishman and decided against the election of other foreigners. As founder and patron of the Institute, Napoleon's recommendations would, of course, have been decisive.

Undaunted by this rejection but still pleased by the recognition they had received, Gall and Spurzheim continued their researches and published the first two volumes, in 1810 and 1812, respectively, of an anticipated four-volume work. By this time, however, their relations were beginning to be strained. Spurzheim—student, assistant, disciple—was beginning to feel his maturity. His co-authorship of the *magnum opus* of the new system, in particular, led him to believe that he was of equal stature with the master—which he was as a lecturer and promoter—and he pressed for changes that Gall thought were radical. He wished to add to the number of faculties and organs, which had remained static for many years; to systematize the terminology, which was badly in need of it; and so to change the shapes of the organs on their charts that there should be no vacant interspaces. Gall, the founder and master, would have none of this, with the inevitable result that the long and close association was broken. In 1813 they went their separate ways. Gall remained in Paris to continue his research, writing, lecturing, and practicing, while Spurzheim fared forth to spread the gospel. Soon after the break, whether to make it complete or to differentiate his teachings from those of Gall, Spurzheim adopted the term 'Phrenology,' which was coined by Thomas Foster in 1815 from the Greek word meaning 'mind.' Though Gall adhered to his term 'organology' and wrote and spoke of its different aspects as 'physiognomy' and 'craniology,' Foster's term prevailed, due probably to the greater, world-wide publicity given it by Spurzheim.

Spurzheim traveled extensively through Germany, Switzerland, England, Scotland, and Ireland, and he died in Boston in 1832 while presenting the doctrines of phrenology in America. He was a fluent lecturer, a convincing demonstrator, but withal a promoter, a protagonist, rather than a scientist. He was too busy disseminating the doctrines of phrenology to engage in research. For the scientific and theoretical support of his doctrines he continued to draw upon Gall even after their break. His skill in controversy and his engaging personality won Phrenology many converts. For example, in 1815, arriving in Edinburgh, Scotland, after an article on phrenology in the *Edinburgh Review* had been roundly denounced, he gave a series of lectures and demonstrations, which so convincingly refuted the critics that for many years this city was a phrenological stronghold. He made many friends and adherents for phrenology during this visit, foremost among whom were the Combe brothers, George and Andrew.

George Combe, a strong candidate for the then vacant chair in logic at the University of Edinburgh, had derided and strongly opposed phrenology. After Spurzheim's visit, however, he took up the cause and made it his own until his death in 1858. His conversion was complete; he was the Scottish Paul of the phrenological gospel. Combe published his first article on phrenology in 1817, his first book in 1819, he founded the Phrenological Society of Edinburgh in 1820, and *The British Phrenological Journal* in 1823. He wrote and lectured extensively on phrenology and, like Spurzheim, he carried the word to America.

Phrenology spread rapidly in America, the land of the free and, according to Barnum, the home of people who like being humbugged. The Fowler brothers were the first and chief supporters of the cause. They wrote many books and articles on phrenology and founded the New York Institute of Phrenology and *The American Phrenological Journal* in 1838. Institutes at which the science and art of phrenology could be learned were established in all the larger cities and soon small indeed was the city or town that did not have its own practicing phrenologist.

The spread in conservative England was as phenomenal. By 1832 there were 29 phrenological societies there and numerous phrenological journals, the first of which, *The British Phrenological Journal*, as already mentioned, was established in 1823.

During this period of rapid territorial expansion, the number of powers and organs also increased. Before his death, Spurzheim had raised the number to 37, all being located upon the skull in contiguous patches. Later phrenologists extended the number to 39 and to 41, and a few to 43. How right Gall was! Once the process of multiplying was begun there was no stopping it within the ingenuity of man to devise powers and to find places on the skull and brain for the correlated organs.

The doctrines of phrenology were never generally accepted by men of science. Most of them, after a cursory examination, which sufficed to disclose the inadequacies, ignored phrenology and went about their own proper business. A few however, like Sir William Hamilton, for example, unwisely decided to criticize phrenology and to point out its pitfalls—I say “unwisely,” because, as previously remarked, a doctrine does not yield to criticism and their efforts were poorly rewarded; they lost precious time from their own work and did not save others with the will to believe from the pitfalls they had so well and carefully marked. Phrenology endured as a controversial doctrine nearly 40 yr. after Hamilton had written his last critical paper. It was the growth of knowledge, not criticism, that pushed phrenology from the scientific stage. In addition to large numbers of the general public, a small group of scientists accepted phrenology's doctrines, and some members of this small group—Herbert Spencer and August Comte, for example—were men of first importance. They were the jewels in phrenology's crown but Spencer retracted in 1855,<sup>9</sup> hence his luster, if not that of Comte, was only temporarily dimmed.

Gall was grieved and bitterly disappointed by the reception of his doctrines, in particular by his confrères of the medical profession who either completely ignored or roundly condemned them. When he realized that hope for their approval was vain, he retaliated by divorcing medicine from his house—maintaining that a phrenologist did not need a medical education and that the proper way of becoming a phrenologist was to study phrenology. With this pronouncement, phrenology passed

---

<sup>9</sup> Herbert Spencer, *The Principles of Psychology*, 1855; American ed., 1, 1870, (§248), 572-576.

into the hands of the laity—at first men of good training and education: teachers, lawyers, ministers; but as the practice of the phrenologist became more lucrative and institutes of phrenology more numerous, the caliber of the students and of the practitioners fell.

Phrenology enjoyed its greatest popularity about one hundred years ago in the 1850s. From then it began to wane, slowly at first, then more and more rapidly. Its decline was not caused by criticism but by the development of new interests, of a *new phrenology*, of the experimental results of the brain physiologists: Broca, Fritch, Hitzig, Ferrier, Goltz, Munk, and a host of lesser lights.

Phrenology, however, lingered on. Its advocates struggled against the inevitable. The department of psychology in one of our large eastern universities was founded in the late 1880s by a wealthy devotee of phrenology in the hope and expectation that the studies and writings of its staff would advance the doctrines of phrenology. In 1908 it was still profitable to reprint Spurzheim's book on *Phrenology or the Doctrine of the Mental Phenomena*, which was first published in 1825. *The American Phrenological Journal* ceased publication in its 124th volume in 1911, and the American Institute of Phrenology was in existence as late as 1925. In many of our larger cities today, especially on the West Coast, phrenological practitioners may still be found. The invention, rise, and decline of phrenology occupied a little over a century. Gall's niche in history, never very large, is now but a roost for charlatans.

(b) *Psychoanalysis*. Now let us return to psychoanalysis, which we left at its launching in 1895, and follow its course until the present. Except for a shift in dates of 100 years, a change in the names of the actors and their parts, the drama of psychoanalysis is similar enough to be a plagiarism of the one just told.

*Studies on Hysteria*, published in 1895, as earlier noted, was nothing more than an account of a new therapy—"a new method of treating and curing hysteria." The theoretical assumptions behind the studies were two in number: (1) hysterical behavior is a substitute for normal psychic acts and it possesses, therefore, meaning and significance; (2) when this meaning stands revealed to the patient, the troublesome symptoms disappear. The *Studies* gave a certain amount of plausibility to these assumptions, but more proof was needed. Freud was left alone to supply it when Breuer withdrew from collaboration with the publication of this book.

Various explanations are given for Breuer's withdrawal. Probably the true reason was his unwillingness to undergo the embarrassment of the phenomenon known as 'transference' that is frequently encountered in the therapy, *i.e.*, an emotional involvement of the patient with the physician. Breuer's famous case of Anna O. did not, it seems, end so happily, as the account given in the *Studies* indicated. On the basis of

information received years later from Freud by word of mouth, Jones reveals that after Anna O. had been pronounced cured, she had a relapse (a pseudocyesis) and that Breuer then had considerable embarrassment in terminating the treatment.<sup>10</sup> To quiet his patient at her last visit, he "hypnotized her, fled the house in a cold sweat, and the next day he and his wife left for Venice" for a long vacation. Confirmation of this story appears in one of Freud's letters to his wife in which he wrote (in reply to her anxiety that he too might find himself in a similar embarrassing situation) that she need have no fear, "for that to happen one has to be a Breuer."<sup>11</sup>

Whatever the reason for Breuer's defection, he withdrew and Freud was left alone. The book, *Studies on Hysteria*, was not well received by the medical world. The reviews were few and all were unfavorable. Of the 800 copies printed, not many were sold. Except for the popular appeal of Phrenology, which the *Studies* did not have, Freud's situation was the same as Gall's 100 yr. before. Freud, however, did not at that time have a system to defend—he had merely a therapy to save. To accomplish this end he sought to accumulate cases, as Gall had done. Since the method was long and tedious, he sought ways of improving and of shortening it. He dropped hypnosis but continued to place his patients in a reclining and comfortable position. He tried various procedures: he sat where they could see him, or at their heads where they could not; he gently stroked their foreheads, or refrained from touching them. He encouraged them to talk, talk, talk; now directing their monologues, now permitting free association. He seized upon complex indicators: hesitation, avoidance, reports of trivialities, evidence of embarrassment; and directed the 'talk' upon these. It was still slow work, requiring daily sessions for months. He hunted therefore for a short cut—for some means of catching the 'unconscious' off guard—that would disclose the repressed emotion and reduce the expenditure of time.

He turned first to the dream, upon which he published two books: a large one of 510 pages called *The Interpretation of Dreams* in 1899, and a short one of 110 pages entitled *On Dreams* in 1901. He turned, secondly, to the slips of the pen, tongue, and memory which led to the publication in 1904 of *The Psychopathology of Every Day Life*; and, 'since many a true word is spoken in jest,' he turned, thirdly, to the play of wit and humor which resulted in the publication of *Wit and Its Relation to the Unconscious* in 1905. In the same year he published *Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex* in which Charcot's suggestion that there "was some trouble in the sexual life of every neurotic patient" came to its full fruition. While producing and publishing these books, Freud continued to write numerous short articles and case histories illustrating the method and efficacy of his therapy.

Until the appearance of these books, Psychoanalysis was only a technique for treating neuroses; but now, by some strange magic, difficult to comprehend, the books, by their mere existence, transformed the therapy, in Freud's mind at least, into a system of psychology which stood in opposition to all others. This Gargantuan step was taken despite the fact, be it remembered, that these books were merely the results of attempts to find short cuts in the therapy, and that the conclusion—that the short cuts worked—was a matter of opinion and not a result of experimentation! Freud failed to see, as Gall failed before him, that examples merely illustrate but never prove; that opinions set problems but never solve them.

<sup>10</sup> Jones, *op. cit.*, 224.

<sup>11</sup> *Idem*, 225.

Freud's method of demonstrating his propositions was, like Gall's, empirical. Though the experimental method was at hand, as it was *not* in Gall's day, Freud made no use of it. He disliked its "tedious exactitude."<sup>12</sup> Jones writes in his biography of Freud, that Freud essayed the experimental method three times and each time unsuccessfully,<sup>13</sup> and that the only experimental study that Freud ever published is of interest because "its rather dilettante presentation shows that this was not his real field."<sup>14</sup> He never undertook a study in which the tenets of scientific procedure—repetition, variation, isolation—were observed. He had no contact with the psychology of his day and generation. Regarding his knowledge of psychology, Jones has this to say: "Freud was . . . ill-informed in the field of contemporary psychology and seems to have derived only from hearsay any knowledge he had of it. He often admitted his ignorance of it, and even when he tried to remedy it later did not find anything very useful for his purpose in it."<sup>15</sup> Not being schooled in psychology, he used its terms carelessly and inaccurately—for instance, 'perception,' 'sensation,' and 'idea' were used interchangeably. He coined his own psychological terminology.

Like Gall, he never subjected the data of any of his studies to statistical treatment. Though the statistical methods were at hand, as they were *not* in Gall's day, and their use was commonplace, Freud was completely uninformed in regard to them. This is not strange as his scientific training and competency were in the field of neurology in which the statistical treatment of data was of little or no importance. In tracing neural pathways, one microscopic slide showing a connection was sufficient, more were not needed. He was, furthermore, like Gall, interested in improving the lot of man. He was not a 'pure' scientist; he was an artist, a technician, his aim was to devise a method for treating neuroses.

With the appearance of his books, Freud began to gather followers. Not being a member of the Vienna faculty, he met and instructed them in his home. From a small local group of inquirers, the circle widened; students came from other countries, chiefly Switzerland, and by 1908 the number was sufficiently large to dignify the 'new' discipline by the convocation of an International Congress of Psychoanalysis.

In 1909, G. Stanley Hall, innovator, eclectic, and a man of catholic interests, invited Freud to speak upon his doctrines at the celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the founding of Clark University. This was an accolade to Freud—similar to the invitation extended Gall and Spurzheim in 1808 to present a *mémoire* to the Institut de France. Freud said in regard to this invitation, the first public recognition he had received, that it "encouraged my self-respect in every way. In Europe I felt as though I were despised; but over there [in America] I found myself received by the foremost men as an equal."<sup>16</sup> The papers read by Freud at the Clark Symposium were published in *The American Journal of Psychology*<sup>17</sup> and the doctrines which had been ignored by academic psychology as unclear and untouchable were introduced to the psychological world and given the cloak of respectability.

When Freud returned home, he set about organizing the International Psychoanalytic Association and, at its first meeting in Vienna in 1910, he put "the leadership . . . into the hands of the Swiss" and moved Jung's election as the first presi-

<sup>12</sup> Jones, *op. cit.*, 40.

<sup>13</sup> Jones, *op. cit.*, 54.

<sup>14</sup> *Idem*, 92.

<sup>15</sup> *Idem*, 371.

<sup>16</sup> H. A. Murray, Sigmund Freud: 1856–1939, this JOURNAL, 53, 1940, 135.

<sup>17</sup> Vol. 21, 1910, 181–218.

dent, because, foreseeing the future, he thought the Swiss might save the movement.<sup>18</sup> Freud, however, remained its supreme arbiter.

The Association was a strange organization. It was more like a militant, religious cult than a scientific society, and in that respect it was very like the Phrenological Societies promoted by Spurzheim. The International Association established branches in various countries and publishing houses and periodicals for the promulgation of its doctrines; it arranged for the translation of Freud's books; it determined its membership upon the basis of orthodoxy; and it extended the psychoanalytic method and principles into every phase of human life—into religion, law, literature, anthropology, myth, and custom. Nothing human was foreign to its probing.

So enthusiastic were the members of the new organization that some of them surpassed Freud in his extension of the doctrines. This could not, however, be tolerated by Freud, hence the International organization had hardly been formed before it began to break up. Adler, Jung, Rank, Stekel, and others were unable to accept pan-sexualism as the central doctrine of psychoanalysis and they argued against it and brought facts of observation to bear in its disproof, with the consequence that Freud, in 1912, moved their expulsion from the Association. A break between master and disciples, such as occurred in 1813 in Phrenology! Freud offered no apology for his actions. He simply said, in reference to them, that "Psychoanalysis is my creation and I feel myself justified in assuming that nobody knows better than I what psychoanalysis is."<sup>19</sup> He explained his dogmatism upon the grounds that it was necessary to preserve his doctrines from disintegration and dilution. "To permit heresy within the ranks of the newly established school would be to invite disaster. Since no university had dedicated a chair to the newly created science and there were no legal formalities . . . to prevent any charlatan from setting up an office and practicing psychoanalysis, it was the duty and obligation of the International Psychoanalytic Association to perform the dual function of instruction and certification." Freud's aversion to 'scientific' polemics went so far that he later "urged that psychoanalytical congresses should be confined to the reading of papers—followed by reflection, testing, and perhaps private discussion."<sup>20</sup>

The war years of 1914–1918, with their shell shock, fear, and neurosis, accelerated the spread of the psychoanalytical doctrines. To meet the need for information regarding the subject, Freud published, in 1916, *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis* which he intended to serve as a textbook. It was the best single source regarding Freud's teaching published up to that time.

The postwar years were fruitful ones for Freud. In addition to numerous articles, he published a book a year for the next five years. In 1923 he published *The Ego and the Id* in which he explained the super-ego. Freud added here three faculties to those already in his system, with the same aplomb that Spurzheim exhibited when he added other faculties to Phrenology.

Though Freud's followers were to quote an enthusiastic disciple, "as grasses of the earth . . . who held his books as scripture and him in idolatrous regard," his doctrines by 1925 had not received the attention and recognition that he thought they deserved. Despite their introduction to the psychological world through *The*

<sup>18</sup> Fritz Wittels, Revision of a biography, this JOURNAL, 45, 1933, 748.

<sup>19</sup> Murray, *op. cit.*, 135.

<sup>20</sup> Jones, *op. cit.*, 257.

*American Journal of Psychology*, the doctrines were, for the most part, completely ignored by the academicians. Wundt, Müller, Titchener, Külpe—call the roll and you will find that the large majority of the great in psychology during the first quarter of this century ignored Freud, and that the few who did not were highly critical of his doctrines.<sup>21</sup> Though Meumann,<sup>22</sup> in 1907, and Köhler,<sup>23</sup> in 1912, wrote on dreams (Köhler extensively), neither referred to any of Freud's writings upon that subject. Külpe, writing on *Psychology and Medicine* in 1912, did not mention Freud's therapy or even his name.<sup>24</sup> Freud's doctrines were anathemas to the academicians during this period, even as Gall's were to the academicians of his day. I well recall the first time Freud's name was mentioned in a meeting of the American Psychological Association. It occurred during the Christmas meetings in 1923 at the University of Wisconsin. During the discussion following the reading of a paper—the kind of thing that Freud had forbidden in his meetings—a member of the audience started to tell how Freud would explain the results obtained. Before he had proceeded far, J. McKeen Cattell arose and, after expressing astonishment and painful surprise that a member of the Association should be so wanting in wisdom as to introduce Freud's name at a scientific meeting, castigated him for his folly, as only Cattell could do.

Freud did not, however, much mind being ignored by the psychologists for he had in his turn ignored them, but he was sorely grieved by the neglect of the medical profession. In 1923 he developed cancer of the jaw. Expecting an early death and despairing of gaining the support of his confrères during his lifetime, he turned his back upon the medical profession, as Gall did one hundred years before him. In 1926 he published his book upon *The Problem of the Lay-Analyses* in which he asserted that a medical education was not only unnecessary for an analyst but that it was positively detrimental. It was unnecessary because it included many subjects that the analyst did not need—chemistry, anatomy, physiology—and it was detrimental because it predisposed the student to a materialistic therapy and blinded him to the psychical method of treatment. A medical education was, more-

---

<sup>21</sup> Among his critics from American psychology are: Knight Dunlap, *Mysticism, Freudianism, and Scientific Psychology*, 1920, 1-173; *Old and New Viewpoints in Psychology*, 1923, 62-67; Joseph Jastrow, *The House That Freud Built*, 1932, 1-295; William McDougall, Professor Freud's group psychology and his theory of suggestion, *Brit. J. Med. Psychol.*, 5, 1925, 14-28; A great advance of the Freudian Psychology, *J. Abn. Psychol. & Soc. Psychol.*, 20, 1925, 43-47; *Psychoanalysis and Social Psychology*, 1935, 1-325; R. S. Woodworth, Some criticisms of the Freudian psychology, *J. Abnor. Psychol.*, 12, 1917, 174-194. E. L. Thorndike, in a review of Freud's *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, wrote that "Freudianism is like phrenology, productive of facts which would have been discovered in any case and to put to better use without it." (*New York Times, Book Review Section*, November 26, 1933, 4.) William Stern, in Germany (*Die Anwendung der Psychoanalyse auf Kindheit und Jugend: Ein Protest, Zsch. f. angew. Psychol.*, 8, 1914, 71-101), and F. H. Bartlett, in England (*The limitations of Freud, Sci. & Soc.*, 3, 1939, 64-105), gave serious consideration to Freud's system and found it wanting.

<sup>22</sup> Ernst Meumann, Ueber Organempfindungssträume und eine merkwürdige Traumerinnerung, *Arch. f. d. ges. Psychol.* 9, 1907, 63-70.

<sup>23</sup> Paul Köhler, Beiträge zur systematischen Traumbeobachtung, *ibid.*, 23, 1912, 415-486.

<sup>24</sup> Oswald Külpe, Psychologie und Medizin. *Zsch. f. Pathopsychol., Monog. Suppl.*, 1, 1912, 1-81.

over, inadequate, because it omitted many subjects from the curriculum that were essential to the training of an analyst—ethnology, mythology, religion, folk-lore, and the psychology of the unconscious. What was needed most of all, however, was for the student himself to be psychoanalyzed that he might be freed from his own repressions before he undertook to free his patients from theirs.

In the year following the appearance of this book (1927), the International Psychoanalytic Association debated the question: Should the Association approve and train non-medical analysts? Freud argued the affirmative and closed with the statement that he was not certain whether the wish of the doctors to possess psychoanalysis as a monopoly was due to a desire to preserve or to destroy it. In any case, such a monopoly was, as he said, impractical and equivalent to repression. The affirmative was sustained and psychoanalysis, freed from the restrictions of medical training, entered upon a lusty period of growth. Despite his cancer—which fortunately yielded to surgical treatment—Freud continued at the helm of his system for 12 more busy, productive, and dramatic years. He died in London, a refugee from Nazi-Germany, on September 23, 1939, at the age of 83 yr.

Despite his misgivings, Freud lived to see his doctrines accepted by a large proportion of the medical profession concerned with the treatment of nervous and mental diseases. At his death, with his guiding hand removed, Psychoanalysis began to splinter—even as Phrenology did after Gall's death. We have in consequence almost as many analytic schools now as there are teachers. Students are now discouraged from reading Freud. They are assigned more recent texts, written by their teachers, which bring Psychoanalysis up to date. Since knowledge is not static, this would be a healthy situation if only there were a way of determining whether the changes of doctrine were advances; but Psychoanalysis has no better method of demonstrating improvements than Phrenology had. Yet, despite disagreements, which arose among Freud's disciples as soon as the master was removed, the popularity of the analytic school continued to grow. Interest, as you all know, mushroomed during the traumatic years of World War II and it is probably greater now among psychiatrists and clinical psychologists than at any other time in history. Phrenology, as you will recall, enjoyed its greatest popularity in the 50s of the last century and then faded away. Will the same fate befall Psychoanalysis? Will our intellectual descendants a hundred years hence look back upon the followers of Freud with the same amused feelings of superiority that we enjoy as we look back upon those of Gall?

How can psychoanalysis be wrong when so many people, some of whom rank high in our science, accept it? Numbers are of no weight, and even men of prominence may be wrong, which Phrenology so well attests. As many, proportionately, 'believed' in Phrenology in its day as believe in Psychoanalysis today, and the prominence of the 'believers' is similar in

both cases. Why should clinical psychologists today accept what their confrères of 30 years ago either ignored or denied? I do not know, I wish I did; my guess, however, is that it is due to their lack of training in philosophy. The older psychologists usually studied philosophy; either elected it as a minor or took several courses in it during their graduate or undergraduate training. The psychologists of today have little acquaintance with any theory of knowledge. The older generation argued the mind-body problem; it knew the logical consequences of the assumption of powers and faculties; the present generation does not worry over such obtuse problems. A paper as long as this one could be written upon the topic, "The value of the study of philosophy to the psychologist." I suggest this as a topic to our next president who is to be a philosopher.

Now for one more question: What does the future hold for Psychoanalysis? In the light of our knowledge of the past, I could make a prediction but I prefer to let Freud speak for his own therapy. He said, according to Ernest Jones, his biographer, "that in time to come it should be possible to cure hysteria and nervous diseases by administering a chemical drug without any psychological treatment."<sup>25</sup> If that should come to pass, as many believe it will (and as we have some evidence today), what will that do to Psychoanalysis? What then will be Freud's niche in history? Will it, like Gall's, become a roost for charlatans? Is it not already occupied by some? I leave these questions with you.

---

<sup>25</sup> Jones, *op. cit.*, 259.