

The Founder of Common Factors: A Conversation With Saul Rosenzweig

Barry L. Duncan

Nova Southeastern University

In preparation for a commentary on Saul Rosenzweig's classic 1936 paper, "Some Implicit Common Methods in Diverse Forms of Psychotherapy," an amazing discovery was made: Saul Rosenzweig is not only alive but also still contributing to science and society at age 93. This article sets the stage for a conversation with the incredibly prolific Dr. Rosenzweig by tracing the impact of his seminal contribution on early common factors theorists. This review reveals Rosenzweig's unrecognized but profound influence on leading figures of not only common factors but also of psychotherapy itself. A conversation with Rosenzweig, the founder of common factors, is presented. This noted scholar and wise elder of psychology reflects on the evolution of his thinking from common factors to idiodynamics, and on topics ranging from his passion for literature to his 1965 Buick Skylark, from the history of psychotherapy to falling in love with ideas.

There is no new thing under the sun.—Eccles. 1:9

A literature search in preparation for a commentary (Duncan, 2002) on Saul Rosenzweig's 1936 classic article, "Some Implicit Common Factors in Diverse Methods of Psychotherapy," uncovered puzzling findings. After the 1936 article, there seemed to be a great void—nothing from Rosenzweig in follow-up to his incredibly prophetic article and not much of anything else about common factors until the middle 1950s. Trying to make sense of the nearly 20-year hiatus as well as the surprising lack of reference to Rosenzweig's contribution by early common factor theorists, I pursued information about Rosenzweig's career to find some explanation.

Barry L. Duncan, School of Social and Systemic Studies, Nova Southeastern University.

I am indebted to Saul Rosenzweig for his cheerful participation and hospitality. I also thank Jacqueline Sparks for her invaluable comments on this article and Tracy Mullendore and Roberto Quiroz for transcription and library assistance.

Barry L. Duncan is now at the Institute for the Study of Therapeutic Change, Tamarac, Florida.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Barry L. Duncan, P.O. Box 26231, Tamarac, Florida 33320. E-mail: barryduncan@cs.com

A search on the Internet revealed a shocking discovery: a Saul Rosenzweig Web site depicting not only a distinguished career but also an address and phone number! Could he still be alive some 65 years later? I hurriedly called the number and amidst my fumbling and excitement, Saul Rosenzweig, the founder of the common factors movement, answered the phone. He is alive, vibrant, and still contributing to science and society at age 93. Although delighted, imagine my embarrassment. My colleagues and I dedicated our edited text about common factors to him (Hubble, Duncan, & Miller, 1999) to honor his status as the original common factors theorist. We, of course, assumed him dead. How wrong one can be.

He wrote the first known proposal for common factors at the ripe old age of 29 (see the Appendix for a brief biography). This 1932 Harvard PhD and schoolmate of B. F. Skinner and Jerome Frank did indeed follow up on common factors: A 1938 article and 1940 panel presentation elaborated and further disseminated his common factors argument; a related 1937 article, building on the commonality among approaches, cogently addressed their inherent complementarity. Thereafter, the idea of complementarity evolved into his life's work and greatest passion, idiodynamics, creativity, and personality theory. Rosenzweig's prolific and meaningful career, some 223 publications and counting, spanned many other areas as well: empirical psychodynamics, projective assessment, frustration and aggression, and historical psychology, to mention a few (visit <http://artsci.wustl.edu/~srosenzw/SRBIB.html> for a comprehensive list of Rosenzweig's publications). Rosenzweig is well known to many in surprisingly varied contexts within psychology: for his correspondence with Freud, for his contributions to projective assessment (the Picture-Frustration Study), for his oft-cited response to Hans Eysenck's (1952) critique of psychotherapy (Rosenzweig, 1954), and for his *New York Times*-acclaimed analysis of Freud's visit to the United States (Rosenzweig, 1992). But there is much more.

Although the 1936 article was honored by reprinting in Goldfried (1982), it seemed only recently that Rosenzweig's path-cutting perspective has begun to be appreciated (see Weinberger, 1993). Luborsky (1995) honored Rosenzweig, saying that the 1936 paper "deserves a laurel in recognition of its being the first systematic presentation of the idea that common factors across diverse forms of psychotherapy are so omnipresent that comparative treatment studies should show nonsignificant differences in outcomes" (p. 106). On closer inspection, however, Rosenzweig's influence regarding common factors can be found in many places, most notably on those who are often credited by later common factors theorists.

This article briefly compares Rosenzweig's seminal contribution with early common factors publications so that the reader may appreciate its powerful impact. With that context set, a conversation with Saul Rosen-

weig, the founder of common factors, is presented. This noted scholar and wise elder of psychology reflects on the evolution of his thinking from common factors to idiodynamics, and on topics ranging from his passion for literature to his 1965 Buick Skylark, from the history of psychotherapy to falling in love with ideas.

IN THE BEGINNING: THE BIRTH OF COMMON FACTORS

In 1936, writing in the *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, Rosenzweig observed that no form of psychotherapy or healing is without cures to its credit. Concluding that success is therefore not a reliable guide to the validity of a theory, he suggested that some potent implicit common factors, perhaps more important than the methods purposely used, explained the uniformity of success of seemingly diverse methods. Rosenzweig summarized these common factors:

- (1) the operation of implicit, unverbalized factors, such as catharsis, and the as yet undefined effect of the personality of the good therapist; (2) the formal consistency of the therapeutic ideology as a basis for reintegration; (3) the alternative formulation of psychological events and the interdependence of personality organization. (p. 415)

The following review traces these original ideas in arguably the most influential of the common factors theorists. Comments concerning whether Rosenzweig's 1936 proposal was referenced by different authors are offered only for reader reflection on the historical significance of that classic article. These comments are in no way meant as a criticism of scholarship nor intended to imply in any way whatsoever that Rosenzweig's ideas were used without proper credit.

COMMON FACTORS: A BRIEF REVIEW

An altogether forgotten panel (for notable exceptions, see Goldfried & Newman, 1992; Sollod, 1981; Weinberger, 1993) assembled several prominent theorists at the 1940 conference of the American Orthopsychiatric Society. This presentation, the "Areas of Agreement in Psychotherapy," was later published in the *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* (Watson, 1940). The panelists agreed that more similarities existed between approaches than differences and articulated four areas of agreement (objectives are similar, the relationship is central, keeping the responsibility for choice on the client, and enlarging the client's understanding of self). Watson (1940), in his conclusion, also said:

if we were to apply to our colleagues the distinction, so important with patients, between what they tell us and what they do, we might find that agreement is greater in practice than in theory. . . . We have agreed further . . . that our techniques cannot be uniform and rigid, but vary with the age, problems and potentialities of the individual client and with the unique personality of the therapist. . . . A therapist has nothing to offer but himself. (p. 29)

Although these points alone make the article well worth the read for integrationists, *who* participated in that presentation is even more compelling. Saul Rosenzweig outlined his implicit common factors with some further elaboration, and Carl Rogers, yes, Carl Rogers, presented about areas of agreement in working with children. Rogers (1942) highlights this panel as recommended reading in his first book, *Counseling and Psychotherapy*, and also references Rosenzweig's 1936 paper. It is difficult to say how much Rosenzweig's ideas regarding the qualities of a good therapist influenced Rogers, but Rogers did often cite Rosenzweig's work. Sollod (1981) noted that the 1940 panel significantly influenced Rogers, especially the ideas offered by Watson. Rosenzweig was later invited by Rogers to present to Rogers' colleagues in Chicago (see later).

Not much else was said about common factors until an interesting study by Heine (1953) foreshadowed later comparative investigations. Heine credited the questions raised by Rosenzweig as providing the impetus to conduct a study that compared several of the prevailing methods of the day. Given comparable results, Heine supported Rosenzweig's analysis by concluding that a common factor was operating in the different forms of psychotherapy investigated. Heine suggested that theory and technique are less important than the characteristics of the individual applying them—a conclusion that reiterates the 1940 panel's assertions and has since gained much empirical support. He recommended that the field devote itself to developing *a psychotherapy* rather than a variety of psychotherapies. Heine's influential study was often referenced by later scholars, as noted below. Heine was also acknowledged in Fiedler's (1950) classic investigation of the ideal therapeutic relationship.

Nineteen years after the original article, Paul Hoch echoed Rosenzweig's words, without reference, in a 1955 article:

if we have the opportunity to watch many patients treated by many different therapists using different techniques, we are struck by the divergencies in theory and in practical application and similarity in therapeutic results. . . . There are only two logical conclusions . . . first that the different methods regardless of their theoretical background are equally effective, and that theoretical formulations are not as important as some unclear common factors present in all such therapies. (p. 323)

Rosenzweig (1936) said:

What . . . accounts for the result that *apparently* diverse forms of psychotherapy prove successful in similar cases? Or if they are only apparently diverse, what do

these therapies actually have in common that makes them equally successful? . . . it is justifiable to wonder . . . whether the factors that actually are operating in several different therapies may not have much more in common than have the factors alleged to be operating. (pp. 412–413)

Hoch (1955) posited two common factors: the establishment of rapport and trying to influence the patient. He articulated five methods of influence (reassurance, catharsis, interpretation, manipulating interpersonal relationships, and altering environmental forces).

In 1957, Sol Garfield, noted common factors theorist and significant contributor to the advancement of a common factors perspective, included a 10-page discussion of common factors in his book, *Introductory Clinical Psychology*. He identified a number of features common to psychotherapy, including a sympathetic nonmoralizing healer, the emotional and supporting relationship, catharsis, and the opportunity to gain some understanding of one's problems. Several of Rosenzweig's articles are referenced in this text, but his common factors article is not. Garfield (1992) referenced Rosenzweig's 1936 article in a discussion of his own evolution to a common factors perspective but credited Heine (1953) and Rogers (1942) for the inspiration of his ideas. Heine and Rogers, as noted, were significantly influenced by Rosenzweig.

The same year, 1957, Rogers published the profoundly influential paper, "The Necessary and Sufficient Conditions of Therapeutic Personality Change," in the *Journal of Consulting Psychology*. That article did not reference Rosenzweig. Given the impact of Rogers's 1957 article, his participation on the 1940 panel and association with Rosenzweig loom large as an unnoticed, but perhaps dramatic event in the development of psychotherapy. Speaking of the relationship, Rosenzweig makes an interesting comment in his 1936 paper regarding "the indefinable effect of the therapist's personality":

observers seem intuitively to sense the characteristics of the good therapist time and again . . . sometimes being so impressed as almost to believe that the personality of the therapist could be *sufficient* [italics added] in itself, apart everything else, to account for the cure of many a patient by a sort of catalytic effect. (p. 413)

Although the recognition of the importance of the therapeutic relationship was widespread as early as 1940 (see Watson, 1940), this may be the first report of the "sufficient" nature of the therapist-provided variables as popularized by Rogers's groundbreaking 1957 article.

If Rosenzweig wrote the first notes of the call to the common factors, Johns Hopkins University's Jerome Frank composed an entire symphony. Frank's (1961) book, *Persuasion and Healing*, was the first entirely devoted to the commonalities cutting across approaches. He incorporated much of Rosenzweig's brief proposal but articulated a far more expanded theoret-

ical and empirical context, especially regarding the profound effects of expectation and placebo in healing endeavors. In this and later editions (Frank, 1973; Frank & Frank, 1991), Frank placed therapy within the larger family of projects designed to bring about healing. He (joined by his daughter, Julia, in the last edition) looked for the threads linking such different activities as traditional psychotherapy, group and family therapies, inpatient treatment, drug therapy, medicine, religiomagical healing in nonindustrialized societies, cults, and revivals. Interestingly, Rosenzweig noted (see below) that his historical research of healing in religious and supernatural contexts as a precursor to psychotherapy also fueled his ideas about common factors.

In his analysis, Frank (1973) concluded that therapy in its various forms should be thought of as “a single entity.” He proposed:

two apparently very different psychotherapies, such as psychoanalysis and systematic desensitization, might be analogous to penicillin and digitalis—totally different pharmacological agents suitable for totally different conditions. On the other hand, the active ingredient of both may be the same, analogous to two compounds marketed under different names, both of which contain aspirin. I believe the second alternative is closer to the mark. (pp. 313–314)

Frank also identified four features shared by all effective therapies: (a) an emotionally charged, confiding relationship with a helping person; (b) a healing setting; (c) a rationale, conceptual scheme, or myth that provides a plausible explanation for the patient’s symptoms and prescribes a ritual or procedure for resolving them; and (d) a ritual or procedure that requires the active participation of both patient and therapist and that is believed by both to be the means of restoring the patient’s health.

Although Frank’s common factors bear a resemblance to Rosenzweig’s original formulations, especially the notions of a conceptual scheme and alternative explanation, and the therapeutic relationship, Rosenzweig was not referenced until the 1991 edition. Frank did reference both Rogers (1942) and Heine (1953) in the 1961 edition. Frank’s “single entity” notion seems akin to Heine’s idea of developing “a psychotherapy.” Curiously, both Garfield (1982) and Frank (1982) contributed to Goldfried’s (1982) excellent book on common factors, *Converging Themes in Psychotherapy*, which reprints Rosenzweig’s 1936 paper, but neither referenced him in that volume.

Picking up on Frank’s far-reaching discussion of placebo, the 1970s included related works from theorists who conceptualized the common factors in terms of placebo effects (e.g., Shapiro, 1971; Shapiro & Morris, 1978). The 1970s also ushered a more refined definition of the basic ingredients of psychotherapy (e.g., Garfield, 1973; Strupp, 1973), an increased empirical argument for the common factors (e.g., Strupp & Hadley, 1979),

and the empirical confirmation of yet another Rosenzweig brainchild, the dodo bird verdict (Luborsky, Singer, & Luborsky, 1975).

A CONVERSATION WITH SAUL ROSENZWEIG

The following conversation occurred at Dr. Rosenzweig's office in St. Louis on October 12, 2000. Segments of some of his papers are intertwined in the conversation to provide the reader additional context to understand our discussion. Our conversation began in the living room of his office, migrated to the study, continued in a 1965 Buick Skylark, unfolded over lunch at the faculty restaurant at Washington University, and concluded back in his study over wine and nuts in the delightful company of his wife Louise and assistant Amy Hackney, a PhD candidate in social psychology at St. Louis University. It is my hope that this conversation will allow the reader to discover and appreciate, as I did, the many contributions of Saul Rosenzweig to modern psychotherapy and integration.

Barry Duncan (BD): I am very pleased you consented to having me come out here and talk with you. I must have sounded wacky when I called you. Here I am working on this article about your work, and it was just incredible to find out that . . .

Saul Rosenzweig (SR): You thought I might have been in the other world, huh?

BD: Yes, yes.

SR: Then you would have to get a soothsayer or something to communicate with me.

BD: That's right. (laughing) Well I have to admit something else to you. I was writing the article as if I was interviewing you.

SR: You were interviewing me? Oh, I see.

BD: Yes.

SR: Well that's very interesting.

BD: So here I was using you as a literary device and all along I could have asked you these questions.

SR: How did you discover that I was still alive and going?

BD: I did a search on the Web and found your Web site.

SR: Oh yes, I was on there, I have that Web site.

BD: Well I am so glad that you did, because I would have been forever embarrassed about writing about you and not talking to you. So you saved me from great academic embarrassment.

SR: That's good. (laughing) Where do you want to start?

BD: There's so much of interest about your career, and of course, my interests are around common factors, so I would like to start there. Who

or what inspired you to think about or write about implicit common factors? Did you have a professor, or someone whom you had discussed the ideas with?

SR: That's a good place to start. Did you notice the wall hanging there? I knew that I was going to show you that, but I didn't realize it was so relevant until now. I call it "the panorama of psychotherapy" and I did that as a graduate student at Harvard Psychological Clinic in approximately 1932, when I got my PhD degree, and thereafter when I became a research associate at the clinic with Dr. Henry Murray. You know that name?

BD: Oh, yes.

SR: Well, he was my mentor at that time, my sponsor for my dissertation. So, have you heard of Christiana Morgan?

BD: Yes.

SR: She was the one who really created the TAT [thematic apperception test]. And, of course, it was there that I became interested in the projective techniques, and I studied frustration as part of my dissertation. And that interest evolved into the Picture-Frustration Study, which is now used worldwide. Most people know me by that test. I actually don't like the term *test*. I call it *study* because I think *test* implies right and wrong answers. *Study* is much more the way in which the projective techniques work. They emphasize the experience of the individual. That's why I called it the Picture-Frustration Study. Part of my inspiration for that came from Galton, who introduced word association. Galton was one of the pioneers of psychology who I greatly admired. I have all of the first editions of all of his books. Anyway, at the Harvard Psychological Clinic, which started in 1927, I joined the faculty, the staff there, as a research associate. Christiana Morgan was an associate of the clinic, and as revealed later, she was really Henry Murray's mistress.

BD: Oh really?

SR: There's a book about that. Do you know about that book?

BD: No.

SR: It's called *Love's Story Told* by [Forrest G.] Robinson, and that is really the biography of Henry Murray and tells about their relationship. Then there's another book about her and that's called *Translate This Darkness* [by Claire Douglas], which refers to her being brunette. That's the story of Christiana Morgan. She was a colleague of mine at the clinic, and she had a hand in this wall hanging. There are some red places in between the pictures, red vermillion. She painted those vermillion red spots. I had an interest in history and psychotherapy from the very beginning of my career, and so that's why I did it. It begins at the left of the top row and goes this way, starting with the Hindu god of the mind, Indra, resurrecting a young boy. And then there are symbols of the

elements: air, fire, water, and earth. That's in between that picture and the next one, which is the Zodiac man, painted by Brown in 1470, taken from [Fielding H.] Garrison's famous *History of Medicine*. I gathered all of these at the library at Harvard, from the rare book room. Then I had the border, which is redwood, imported from California. The carvings were put on there by a wood-burning set by an art student whom I knew. At the clinic, there was a patient in occupational therapy. His name was John. He was the one who did the framing of those pictures in the glass. It was really a collaborative work.

BD: Yes.

SR: I was architect, the designer of it, John did the framing of the pictures and I did all the research of course, and Christiana Morgan did the vermilions, and this young man whose name I have forgotten did the carvings. So as they say, the whole story is here and it goes on from the Zodiac Man, which, of course, was used as a way of guiding medical people. They weren't really medicine doctors, they were astrologers, and so the Zodiac Man was important to them. The third one is the confessional, which is a form of therapy, but in the church. Next is the temple of Aesculapius and the scene in Epidaurus. Aesculapius was the god of health and medicine. People used to sleep in this temple in Greece and they had dreams. And the priests would stay in this temple while they would sleep and when they would wake, he would ask them about their dreams—a predecessor to Freud's interpretation of dreams. Then King Louis X, the fourth picture, of France, applying the royal touch for the cure of diseases. The royal touch was a very famous method, used not only by King Louis X of France but by others as well. And then there's Jesus, the fifth one, casting out devils. Keep in mind that I am interpreting all these methods of healing as predecessors of psychotherapy. And then the next one is the Egyptian goddess Isis and her son Horus. Isis restored her son to health from a fatal disease. That one is from a book called, *Evil Eye*. And then the last one at the top is of an American Indian, a medicine man, in action. And that is from [Charles] *Whitebread's Medical Collection*. Then as you continue, down at the bottom, at the left, that's a picture of Antoine Mesmer, the discoverer of hypnosis, or animal magnetism. And that shows him with a subject at a séance, who had been hypnotized or mesmerized. The people would sit around holding hands, as well as objects that had been soaked in that magnetized water, and were cured of illnesses, including, of course, hysteria. Next comes Pinel, the famous man of France, removing the chains from the insane at the Bicetre. And the next one is the revolving chair for treating the insane. Darwin and Cox invented this in the early 19th century. Erasmus Darwin was the grandfather of Charles Darwin. This comes from a book by [Emil] Krepelin, called *A Hundred Years of*

Psychiatry. Darwin's grandfather was a famous physiologist-poet, and in my own library I have his book, *Botanical Garden*, which is a book about medicine. And then the next is an amulet, for overcoming the evil eye, and then a reproduction of Rembrandt's painting of David playing before Saul. The biblical story is that Saul was a man of moods and melancholia and David played music, which soothed him. That was the beginning of music therapy, which was used quite a bit in mental hospitals. And then the last one is, of course, the etching by Max Pollock of Freud from the *Menorah Journal*. Finally, there is the symbolic serpent of the medical profession. So it's very nice that I can show this "panorama of psychotherapy" to you because it is relevant to our discussion today.

BD: How so?

SR: History is relevant to my interest in common factors. It was also relevant that I actually did psychotherapy in the psychological clinic, with Murray and Morgan. I had an office between Murray and Morgan. I don't know why they gave me such a special location. But the common factors came out of my awareness that there was such a variety of methods trying to reach the mind and doing mental tricks of various kinds—like the evil eye, the royal touch, the revolving chair, and so on and so forth. All seemed to have more in common, implicitly, than not. All those precursors to psychotherapy from the panorama bear a resemblance to each other and later forms of healing like psychotherapy. And I don't know of anyone who suggested that to me, maybe I'll remember later, I don't at this point.

BD: But largely it arose from your interest in history. Through your historical analysis of psychotherapy, you realized the common elements of all forms of influence and healing. That's interesting because Frank used a similar cross-cultural perspective of healing in his discussion of common factors.

SR: Yes, if I wasn't interested in history, I wouldn't have arrived at this. That certainly had a lot to do with it. That combined with my own psychotherapy experiences of what seemed to matter.

BD: I am very curious about how you came up with the quote from *Alice in Wonderland*. Everybody thinks that either Frank or Luborsky originally invoked the dodo bird judgment, even though Luborsky says in his article in the second line that you did. I hope this interview finally clears this misconception.

SR: Yes, well, Luborsky called it the "dodo verdict." That's what he said, what he did invent. But it was taken from "Some Implicit Common Factors" (Rosenzweig, 1936).

BD: How did you come up with that?

SR: Well, I used to read all sorts of literature. I am very interested in

literature and creativity, which we will get to a bit later. One of the people I studied was Lewis Carroll.

BD: Oh.

SR: And Edward Lear. In fact, I have a very special collection of Edward Lear's first editions. Edward Lear and Lewis Carroll are the two founders of children's literature in England and, Lewis Carroll, of course, wrote the famous *Alice in Wonderland*. He was actually a professor of mathematics at Oxford and his real name was Charles Dodgson. And he also wrote *The Looking Glass and Hunting of the Snark*. I was very interested in that literature. As a matter of fact, I have first editions of those books. I have a very special collection of children's literature. So that's how I knew that material inside and out, and the race is one of the famous incidents in that story which seemed to perfectly fit the state of affairs I was discussing in that article.

BD: Yes, it sure did. So the dodo bird came from your avid interest in literature.

SR: Yes, oh yes. And specifically, my interest in literature evolved from the psychology of creativity. I studied literature in terms of creativity. In fact, the foundation which I started a few years ago, the Foundation of Idiodynamics, Personality Theory, and Literary Creativity, has grown from that interest. I have analyzed, via my idiodynamics, the work of the Henry James Sr. family, Dodgson, and even Freud. Because Freud was a better writer than he was a psychologist.

BD: He was persuasive.

SR: Very persuasive and very ingenious, and not understood. I don't mean that he's misunderstood, but that he's just not understood. . . . Well, it's time for lunch, but it is too late to call a cab, so I will drive. I still drive, you know.

BD: I would be happy to drive, if you like.

SR: No one drives my car but me.

BD: Okay, sure. . . . (Arriving at the car) Wow, this is a quite a car. My son Jesse has a '69 Ford Falcon—he would love this. What year is it?

SR: It is a 1965 Buick Skylark. As clichéd as it sounds, they don't make them like this anymore.

BD: Indeed they don't. . . . (Continuing interview) So, what I would like to do at this point is start with the 1936 paper and follow the trail of your thinking from there. I thought at first that the common factors article just stood by itself, that you did nothing else with that paper. But the more I investigated, the more I saw that was a misconception I had formed from only seeing the 1936 article referenced in the common factors literature. That misconception is conveyed in our common factors book and I will be sure to correct it in the second edition.

SR: Oh sure, that's natural, with a first edition. Happens all the time. You

always find new things after you have gone to print. I want to emphasize that my thinking evolved from there—that 1936 article was a start of a process that never stopped for me, that took me to many different places.

BD: I will do my best to do so and you can look at this and make sure I conveyed your process appropriately. So after the '36 paper, what was the reaction?

SR: Well, I'll tell you a story that characterizes a lot of the reaction: There was a psychiatrist whom I worked with at Worcester Hospital, Jacob Kasanin, and he walked in my office holding the issue of the journal in his hand, and said only "Fools rush in where angels fear to tread." (Both laugh) I think he meant that it was controversial to challenge the special validity that each psychotherapy believed it held.

BD: It still is, if you can believe that.

SR: Not surprising, really.

BD: Next came the 1937 paper "Schools of Psychology: A Complementary Pattern." You seem to take a different angle but in the same direction.

SR: That's right. "Implicit Common Factors" spoke to the commonalities that all approaches shared, and "Schools" spoke to the complementarities that existed among approaches. "Implicit Common Factors" also spoke to complementarities in some ways, especially in the discussion of the many different types of interpretations from differing orientations that can be "correct."

BD: In the "Schools" paper, you make a strong case for a relatively simple underlying pattern of complementarity, based on each approach's specific representation of a problem, special methodology, and preferential alliance with other sciences. You argue to "unite the warring factions" of psychology through their complementarity and render the disagreements among them as "arbitrary and unnecessary." Not one to avoid controversy, you also said, "schools have been committing a 'fallacy of arrogation,' i.e., exploiting their concepts by unduly subordinating to them phenomena for which they were not originally intended and for which they are not really adequate." You sound like an integrationist! Those words could be in the mission statement of the journal that this interview will appear in. That article has great relevance to much of what is being said today. You picked up on some of those ideas in the 1940 presentation, which we will get to a minute.

SR: Yes, exactly, all of my early articles stressed different types of complementarity.

BD: Different types. Okay.

SR: Can we stay on this line of thought for a while?

BD: Sure.

SR: Those early articles were important and lead me to idiodynamics, but

I didn't use that term until '51. Actually the first form of complementarity that I discussed was between experimenter and experimentee (Rosenzweig, 1933). The 1936 paper was the second type, and the "Schools" (Rosenzweig, 1937) paper was yet another. The "Schools" paper showed that the division of labor among the five then-current schools represented a complementary pattern in which a certain type of problem achieved acceptable resolution by methods and concepts appropriate to the problem emphasized. When I wrote that paper, Neals Bohr, the Scandinavian physicist, was an inspiration regarding complementarity. He introduced a similar way to solve seemingly irreconcilable theories in physics. In 1927, the principle of complementarity was formulated as an alternative to [Werner Karl] Heisenberg's "indeterminacy," and as a new way of reconciling the conflicting conceptions of light as consisting of waves, on one hand, or particles, on the other. To Bohr, both formulations were justified and were equally correct once it was recognized that each was served by a different observational approach. When my 1937 paper appeared, interestingly, Bohr was recommending that complementarity be extended beyond the physical to the natural sciences, including biology and psychology. So that notion of complementarity was at the heart of my own thinking. That paper of Bohr's appeared not only in the same year but also in the same journal as mine did (*The Journal of Philosophy*)! And probably for that reason, I got a letter from Tolman, not the famous psychologist Edward Tolman, but his brother, who was a physicist and dean of the California Institute of Technology. And out of the blue one day, while I was still at Worcester Hospital, I got a letter from him. In fact, I want to show you that letter. (Shows BD the letter.) He wrote that to me in '37. Richard was the brother of the famous Edward Tolman, and he makes that joke there in the very beginning, you see? I just prize this letter. . . . Okay, back to common factors.

BD: Okay, how did the 1940 panel come together?

SR: Goodwin Watson organized it. I didn't feel that it was a highly successful meeting. I don't know why I believe that, maybe because of how it was presented or how I presented, but it certainly was on the common factors topic.

BD: Watson was the chairperson, he wrote the summary at the end. That panel is all but forgotten. You know that in two of the three references I found to it, Carl Rogers is not even mentioned, and in one of the references, you are not mentioned. So how could that get by?

SR: Yes, yes. Things fall through the cracks often, only to resurface later.

BD: So Alexandra Adler was one of the people.

SR: Oh yes, I remember her. She was, I think, the wife of, or at least some relative, of Alfred Adler.

BD: Let's see who else was on this. Frederick Allen.

SR: Frederick Allen was a Rankian. [Otto] Rank was an important figure. Allen was the director of the Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic.

BD: You elaborated on some things that I found very interesting: the importance of the faith of the client in the therapist and the method, and the notion of fitness. You actually said in that outline that the content of the interpretation or approach was secondary to the common factors and that it actually had more to do with the fitness for a specific patient. The idea of fitness is a very important idea in integration.

SR: Yes, yes, and that actually was one of the conclusions of the panel, about the uniqueness of the individual. I am very interested in the uniqueness of the individual. Allport's idea of uniqueness referred mostly to traits. Idiodynamics stresses that it was not just a matter of traits but also of the unique history, and the dynamic development of the individual. So the fitness of the interpretation or method is obviously of great importance, more so than its correctness.

BD: Do you recall your interactions with Carl Rogers? Rogers gives a fair amount of emphasis to the impact of that panel on his thinking.

SR: Yes, I remember one time when I visited at his invitation, he was in Chicago at the time and I gave a talk. I think at that time I was at the Psychiatric Institute at the University of Pittsburgh. That must have been like 1945. And he had a seminar group and he invited me to talk on what I called "Understanding the Individual."

BD: Rogers referenced you and the panel in his 1942 book, his first book, and then he referenced you in later works as well, so I think that your view of common factors was an influence on him, and perhaps your interest in the individual reinforced his ideas as well.

SR: Oh yeah, he was interested in those ideas and really kept up with the literature.

BD: I was wondering if there were any conversations that you remember having with him about common factors.

SR: Well, I don't remember any specifically, but when I visited him in Chicago there must have been. I can't imagine that we didn't talk about that because of his interest in the '36 paper and our collaboration in the 1940 panel. That had a lot to do with my having been invited.

BD: Another interesting thing you said in that panel presentation was about a "rapid course of treatment." Do you remember what was behind that? No one ever talked about . . .

SR: That was before brief psychotherapy.

BD: Yes, quite a bit! It was like 1946, Alexander is the . . .

SR: Franz Alexander.

BD: Yes. So you moved on from there and laid more groundwork for idiodynamics through your analysis of Murray, [Gordon] Allport, and

[Kurt] Lewin, and again with an emphasis on complementarity. You were always moving on to new projects, taking your ideas to the next level, and expanding into new areas, but continually weaving in complementarity, history, and literature.

SR: Yes, that's accurate. There actually was a couple of other common factors works. A 1938 paper, "A Dynamic Interpretation of Psychotherapy Oriented Towards Research," published in *Psychiatry: Journal of the Biology and Pathology of Interpersonal Relations*.

BD: (BD has since read that paper.) In that paper you say, "When one is thus prodded it requires but little reflection to realize that the effective factors in any form of psychotherapy are not necessarily those upon which its proponents insist. Unrecognized factors play a part and among these there may be more that is common than different" (Rosenzweig, 1938, p. 522). You elaborate, like your 1940 panel presentation, more on the faith of the client in the therapist and emphasize the importance of not only recognizing common factors but also researching them. Prophetic words indeed.

SR: The other one is a book I put together called *Facets of Psychotherapy*, which brought my collected papers about common factors together, as well as other ideas I had about psychotherapy (Rosenzweig, 1951). And I actually have in my files, the manuscript that I submitted to Grune and Stratton, the publisher. They had published my book *Psychodiagnosis* in 1949, and that's why they were interested in another book. I sent it in and a few months later I decided that it wasn't good enough and I wanted to rewrite some portions. It went through various revisions and title changes, but it ultimately died in committee so to speak.

BD: Well, you went on to the next thing and didn't want to go back.

SR: That's it, that's exactly it. To me, by the time I got to the next thing, I saw the other as being over with.

BD: That book, *Facets of Psychotherapy* (Rosenzweig, 1951), would have predated all the famous books about common factors, like Jerome Frank's, which came out in '61. Your ideas got picked up a couple of decades later, and then people became very famous for picking up on them.

SR: Yes, yes. Well, that is the way it works. And I became very interested in history and literature as a basis for idiodynamics. Let me tell you about that. In this approach, the individual is considered to be a universe of psychological events, what I call the *idioverse*. The basic notion is that these events when viewed in their entirety provide new insights at the phenomenological level that can later be subjected to verification as actual historical or biographical facts. I haven't finished my publications on that. I am currently working on the James family. I told you, upstairs, about the book I am working on about Henry James. In his story, "The Death of the Lion," he mentions the larger latitude of the lion, which he

never defines. It's sort of a special phrase, but unquestionably he means bisexuality. And so, that is one way that I got out of the common factors, I became interested in the creativity of these people. I have made an in-depth study of Henry James in particular, but have also studied the whole family and have published a couple of papers on them. I have a special library on the James family, all the first editions of Henry James, as well as William James, the father, which are really pretty rare. Idiodynamics was developed largely in terms of these literary figures, as well as Freud himself. I reread all of Freud and studied his dreams. There were about 24 in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, and each of those dreams is analyzed on the basis of his own associations, but then carrying on from where he left off. Freud refers to the same dream in a number of places in the book. So I put together all of these in one section. Each of these dreams I studied as a project by itself, using idiodynamics. And so he was one of the figures. But I also did this with the Jameses, Henry James especially, a [Nathaniel] Hawthorne, and [Herman] Melville. I made a number of new, call them "discoveries" if you will, but a new understanding.

A relationship between Hawthorne and Melville grew out of their meeting in the Berkshires in 1850–51, where they were together for about a year. And at that time, each one wrote their masterpiece. *Moby-Dick* was written at that time by Melville, and Hawthorne was working on *The House of Seven Gables*, which was his favorite book. And both of those books grew out of the same sources which I have traced. So I am working on a book about their association, when they were at "the zenith," which I call it—the height of their creativity and when they produced their best work. Later Hawthorne got involved, because of a need to make a living, with Franklin Pierce, the president. He was a very unpopular president but he gave Hawthorne a well-paying job that Hawthorne needed badly. Melville died in obscurity, he was a customs officer in the port of New York, and he died there completely unknown and unrecognized. He is buried in the Bronx. In my studies, I visited that grave by the way, as well as Hawthorne's grave at Sleepy Hollow in Concord, and Freud's at Golders Green Crematorium in London. At any rate I have studied these authors, including Freud himself, from the point of view of idiodynamics . . . (Break for wine and nuts with Louise Rosenzweig and Amy Hackney)

BD: So one thing that I am painting here, and I realize that it's me doing the painting, is that all the common factors roads lead back to you in some way or another. I don't know if you are familiar with the trivia game about Kevin Bacon, the actor. This is kind of silly, so bear with me. The game is called "Six Degrees of Kevin Bacon." The theme of the game is to trace any actor to a movie with Kevin Bacon within six

connections. For example, the actress Joan Allen, in the movie, *The Contender*. Also in the same movie is Christian Slater, who was in *Murder in the First* with Kevin Bacon. The theory is that Kevin Bacon is the center of the universe and all stretches out from that. (Laughs) So one thing that I am getting from my investigation of the literature and my discussion with you is that many of the people we typically associate with common factors have some connection to you. Like Jerome Frank.

SR: Yes, I went to Harvard with him and had associations with him.

BD: Carl Rogers.

SR: I presented with Carl Rogers in 1940 and spoke to his group in 1945.

BD: Sol Garfield

SR: He was here at Washington University. He is Professor Emeritus also.

BD: And you knew Paul Hoch as well.

SR: Yes, well actually those things, I mean people interacted but that doesn't mean that they read everything that I published.

BD: True. So the fact that there is a gap in referencing you is not really a problem for you.

SR: No, because that is the way that it works. I don't think that the citation of my work is that important. A lot of the same influences that influenced me influenced them, except, perhaps, that they didn't have the same interest in history and literature, which brought me to many different places. That was different. But I don't like to stress that because I don't know that it's that important and these people wound up publishing a lot more on the common factors topic than me. And a lot of times, people read things and take things in and forget where ideas come from. That's okay, that's natural.

BD: Okay, but historically it's important because it seems that after a lull in discussion about common factors, a whole new generation of common factors theorists started writing, and saying many things that you said.

SR: I see. That was true even more so about my first paper, the 1933 paper. That paper was published in *The Psychological Review* and delineated the influences between the experimenter and the experimentee. I pointed out the biases of the experimental relationship, which were later explored and developed by [Martin] Orne and [Robert] Rosenthal regarding demand characteristics and experimental bias. Yes, those were discovered separately by Rosenthal, Orne, and by other people, and they didn't cite my paper either.

BD: Okay.

SR: But Rosenthal was very aware of that and called me up about 2 years ago on the phone. He said that he was just going to give a speech to accept an award from the Society of Experimental Social Psychology. He said that he wanted me to know that at the beginning of the speech he was going to give me credit, that I should really be getting the award.

BD: Well, he could send you the award. (Both laugh)

SR: Well, like I said, it has never really been that important to me, never has been. Because I had been interested in something else by that time. By the time someone was not referencing me, I was on to the next thing. This isn't about citations to me.

BD: That's very interesting, you're interested in something else, so the fact that it's not cited is not a problem for you. Actually, the way it seemed to work out is that later theorists referenced those who had been impacted by your work, missing the connection with your ideas. It's fascinating that you wrote two papers in the '30s that were very influential, but initially unrecognized, and then people take the ball and run with it, get credit, and then the field finally starts recognizing you.

SR: Well, often people read something that interests them and then they forget the source. That's natural, that's the way things go. And then sometimes people don't cite what came before because it lessens their own contribution.

BD: They think it does.

SR: To me that's not true. It's important to some people to shine. What is that "15 minutes of fame"? Who said that, [Andy] Warhol? That's the sort of thing that many people are just dying to have.

BD: Yes, that's true.

SR: Actually, the way the universe evolves and so on, in the end, what is it about? What will it matter anyway, who said what and when, when I am dead and buried? Ashes to ashes and dust to dust. My passion lies in my current work. The joy is in the moment of discovery and so on—that's it. It's like falling in love, it doesn't last for 20 years, or maybe it does. But it goes through an evolution. And maybe, somewhere down the line, someone will pick up on it—if they reference me fine, if not, that is the way it goes. I doubt if I'll notice when it is all said and done. And so on.

A PERSONAL NOTE

It was a crisp, gorgeous autumn day in St. Louis. The leaves were just starting to turn. The city was all a flutter because the St. Louis Cardinals were hosting the New York Mets in the National League Championship Series. The beauty of day, the majesty of the mature trees just tinged with color, and the background of playoff excitement forecast an enjoyable adventure, perhaps even one that could approach my anticipations. It was not only a delightful experience that I will always cherish, but it also far exceeded all my expectations. I was impressed by Dr. Rosenzweig in so many ways and at so many levels that I am still sorting it all out.

Roediger (2000) perhaps best summarized Rosenzweig's career:

He was friends with B. F. Skinner and he corresponded with Freud. He helped usher in experimental studies of psychoanalytic concepts, discussed implicit common factors in all therapies, and his influence still resonates in theoretical and applied areas, as well as in the careers of countless distinguished researchers. When you talk about Saul Rosenzweig, you're talking about the history of psychology. (p. 1)

Indeed, talking to him was like reading a novel about the history of psychology; the textured and personal stories he told breathed life into long-forgotten names in long-forgotten textbooks. Discussing his contributions, traveling to lunch in his beloved Buick Skylark, meeting his charming wife, Louise, and hearing about his current projects all weave together in a way that was both educational and inspirational. Dr. Rosenzweig not only taught me about the history of common factors but also taught me about scholarship, the ownership of ideas, and life.

His refreshing attitude toward his work and his lack of resentment toward others achieving far more credit for similar ideas were astounding. It stimulated a reevaluation of my own reactions to whether or not my colleagues and I are referenced, and an enhanced appreciation of the privileges inherent to the intellectual pursuit of ideas and their sharing with others. Saul Rosenzweig demonstrated the joy of that privilege in his descriptions of the Rosenzweig Jubilee held in his honor at Washington University. Many whose lives and work had been touched by him came together to chronicle his contributions and express their gratitude. I was taken by his pleasure of that event—not in the credit given for his significant contributions to the many different fields he has impacted, but rather in his pride in teaching and inspiring others with his ideas. His work, his life, and his amazing vitality and productivity offer not only hope of a positive aging process but also a glimpse of the rewards of the unselfish and humble pursuit of ideas.

REFERENCES

- Duncan, B. L. (2002). The legacy of Saul Rosenzweig: The profundity of the dodo bird. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration, 12*, 32–57.
- Eysenck, H. (1952). The effects of psychotherapy: An evaluation. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 16*, 319–324.
- Fielder, F. E. (1950). The concept of an ideal therapeutic relationship. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 14*, 239–245.
- Frank, J. D. (1961). *Persuasion and healing*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Frank, J. D. (1973). *Persuasion and healing* (2nd ed.). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Frank, J. D. (1982). Psychotherapy in America today. In M. R. Goldfried (Ed.), *Converging themes in psychotherapy* (pp. 78–94). New York: Springer.
- Frank, J. D., & Frank, J. B. (1991). *Persuasion and healing* (3rd ed.). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Garfield, S. L. (1957). *Introductory clinical psychology*. New York: Macmillan.
- Garfield, S. L. (1973). Basic ingredients or common factors in psychotherapy? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 41, 9–12.
- Garfield, S. L. (1982). What are the therapeutic variables in psychotherapy? In M. R. Goldfried (Ed.), *Converging themes in psychotherapy* (pp. 135–142). New York: Springer.
- Garfield, S. L. (1992). Eclectic psychotherapy: A common factors approach. In J. C. Norcross & M. R. Goldfried (Eds.), *Handbook of psychotherapy integration* (pp. 168–201). New York: Basic Books.
- Goldfried, M. R. (1982). *Converging themes in psychotherapy*. New York: Springer.
- Goldfried, M. R., & Newman, C. F. (1992). A history of psychotherapy integration. In J. C. Norcross & M. R. Goldfried (Eds.), *Handbook of psychotherapy integration* (pp. 46–93). New York: Basic Books.
- Heine, R. W. (1953). A comparison of patients' reports on psychotherapeutic experience with psychoanalytic, nondirective and Adlerian therapists. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 7, 16–23.
- Hoch, P. (1955). Aims and limitations of psychotherapy. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 112, 321–327.
- Hubble, M. A., Duncan, B. L., & Miller, S. D. (1999). *The heart and soul of change: What works in therapy*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Luborsky, L. (1995). Are common factors across different psychotherapies the main explanation for the dodo bird verdict that "everyone has won so all must have prizes"? *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 2, 106–109.
- Luborsky, L., Singer, B., & Luborsky, L. (1975). Comparative studies of psychotherapies: Is it true that "everyone has won and all must have prizes"? *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 32, 995–1008.
- Roediger, H. (2000). Honoring Rosenzweig. *Observer*, 13(1), 28–29.
- Rogers, C. (1942). *Counseling and psychotherapy*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rogers, C. (1957). The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 21, 95–103.
- Rosenzweig, S. (1933). The experimental situation as a psychological problem. *Psychological Review*, 40, 337–354.
- Rosenzweig, S. (1936). Some implicit common factors in diverse methods of psychotherapy. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 6, 412–415.
- Rosenzweig, S. (1937). Schools of psychology: A complementary pattern. *Philosophy of Science*, 4, 96–106.
- Rosenzweig, S. (1938). A dynamic interpretation of psychotherapy oriented towards research. *Psychiatry*, 1, 521–526.
- Rosenzweig, S. (1940). Areas of agreement in psychotherapy. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 10, 703–704.
- Rosenzweig, S. (1949). *Psychodiagnostics: An introduction to the integration of tests in dynamic clinical practice*. New York: Grune & Stratton.
- Rosenzweig, S. (1951). *Facets of psychotherapy*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Rosenzweig, S. (1954). A transvaluation of psychotherapy: A reply to Hans Eysenck. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 49, 298–304.
- Rosenzweig, S. (1978). *Aggressive behavior and the Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration Study*. New York: Praeger.
- Rosenzweig, S. (1986). *Freud and experimental psychology: The emergence of idiodynamics* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rosenzweig, S. (1987). Sally Beauchamp's career: A psychoarchaeological key to Morton Prince's classic case of multiple personality. *Genetic, Social, & General Psychology Monographs*, 113, 5–60.
- Rosenzweig, S. (1992). *Freud, Jung, and Hall the king-maker: The expedition to America (1909)*. Seattle, WA: Hogrefe & Huber.
- Shapiro, A. K. (1971). Placebo effects in medicine, psychotherapy, and psychoanalysis. In A. E. Bergin & S. L. Garfield (Eds.), *Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change* (pp. 439–473). New York: Wiley.
- Shapiro, A. K., & Morris, L. A. (1978). Placebo effects in medical and psychological therapies.

- In S. L. Garfield & A. E. Bergin (Eds.), *Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change* (2nd ed., pp. 369–410). New York: Wiley.
- Sollod, B. (1981). Goodwin Watson's 1940 conference. *American Psychologist*, 36, 1546–1547.
- Strupp, H. H. (1973). On the basic ingredients of psychotherapy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 41, 1–9.
- Strupp, H. H., & Hadley, S. W. (1979). Specific vs non-specific factors in psychotherapy: A controlled study of outcome. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 36, 1125–1136.
- Watson, G. (1940). Areas of agreement in psychotherapy. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 10, 698–709.
- Weinberger (1993). Common factors in psychotherapy. In J. R. Gold & G. Stricker (Eds.), *Comprehensive handbook of psychotherapy integration* (pp. 43–56). New York: Plenum.

APPENDIX

ABOUT SAUL ROSENZWEIG

Saul Rosenzweig, born in Boston in 1907, received from Harvard University in 1929 his bachelor of arts degree, summa cum laude, in philosophy; in 1930, his master of arts degree; and in 1932, his doctoral degree in clinical psychology. At the newly established Harvard Psychological Clinic, he worked as research associate from 1929 to 1934. There, using laboratory methods, he investigated the clinically derived concepts of psychoanalysis, for example, repression. His first publication appeared in 1933 under the title "The Experimental Situation as a Psychological Problem." It anticipated the flurry of research in the 1950s on experimenter bias and related problems in experimental social psychology.

In 1934, Rosenzweig joined the staff of the Research Service of the Worcester State Hospital, Worcester, Massachusetts, where, until 1943, he participated in a multidisciplinary investigation of schizophrenia, sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation. He conducted psychotherapy with schizophrenic patients and, in that context, developed concepts geared to the diverse problems and levels of behavior. It was here that Rosenzweig (1936) wrote his classic paper on common factors and participated on the prophetic panel of Goodwin Watson with Carl Rogers.

From 1938 to 1943, Rosenzweig was affiliate professor of psychology at Clark University in Worcester. During this period, he developed the Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration Study, based on a theory of aggression in relation to frustration. This psychological instrument is now used worldwide. The book, *Aggressive Behavior and the Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration Study*, appeared in 1978.

From 1943 to 1949, Rosenzweig was chief psychologist at the Western State Psychiatric Institute, Pittsburgh, and lecturer at the University of Pittsburgh. *Psychodiagnosis: An Introduction to the Integration of Tests in Dynamic Clinical Practice* was published in 1949.

Since 1949, Rosenzweig has been professor in the Departments of Psychology and Psychiatry at Washington University, St. Louis. In 1975 he was appointed Professor Emeritus. Significant events of this period include the following: appointment to the Study Panel of the History of the Life Sciences, National Institute of Health; establishment of the International Society for Research on Aggression, of which Rosenzweig was the founder and first president; the publication of the much-cited response to Hans Eysenck's controversial paper (Rosenzweig, 1954); and establishment of the Foundation for Idiodynamics and the Creative Process in 1972, of which he is the managing director.

In 1950 Rosenzweig introduced the approach of *idiodynamics*, which focuses on the dynamics of the life history by studying the blending of the biogenic and cultural milieus in the matrix of the idioverse (the individual world of events), with stress on the creative process. In 1986, Rosenzweig published *Freud and Experimental Psychology: The Emergence of Idiodynamics*, and in 1987, "Sally Beauchamp's Career: A Psychoarchaeological Key to Morton Prince's Classic Case of Multiple Personality." By idiodynamic methods, the real-life identity of this patient was discovered and the etiology and development of her mental disorder demonstrated. Rosenzweig is the author of 200 other scientific, historical, and biographical articles, including *Freud, Jung, and Hall the King-Maker* (1992), a *New York Times* acclaimed book. This book applies the methods of idiodynamics to the interactions of Freud, Jung, Hall, and James in connection with the psychoanalytic expedition to America in 1909.