

“FREUD” AND BULLITT: AN UNKNOWN MANUSCRIPT

An English translation of a previously unknown manuscript by Freud is presented. The manuscript, originally prepared in 1931 for William Bullitt's psychobiography of Woodrow Wilson, provides a general theoretical introduction to psychoanalysis. It also includes an original interpretation of Christianity that postulates a deep-going continuity between Christ identification and latent homosexuality. An editorial introduction to the translation clarifies the nature and limits of Freud's involvement with Bullitt's controversial psychobiography.

Published here for the first time in English translation is a previously unknown manuscript by Freud that will be included in my forthcoming *Revised Standard Edition* of his works. (The German original was published earlier this year by Ilse Grubrich-Simitis [Freud 2006].) The manuscript lucidly summarizes some of Freud's most fundamental ideas on the workings of the mind. It also includes an original interpretation of Christianity—and a timely one, postulating a deep-going continuity between Christ identification (which presumably includes the priesthood) and latent homosexuality. The essay is a draft of a chapter for a much-criticized psychobiography—allegedly authored jointly by Freud and William C. Bullitt—that was first published in 1967, namely, *Woodrow Wilson: A Psychological Study* (Freud and Bullitt 1967).¹

Why does a draft of a chapter published almost forty years ago deserve our attention today? The reasons are, first, that there was—

¹Bullitt, an American journalist and diplomat during the interwar years, had befriended Freud in Vienna in the 1920s and later assisted in arranging his exile to London in 1938. The book was published by Houghton Mifflin in Boston and Weidenfeld and Nicolson in London. It was also serialized in the American and British periodicals *Look* and *Encounter* respectively (starting in the final issue of 1966 in the former case, and the first issue of 1967 (excluding Freud's introduction) in the latter case.

Director, Arnold Pfeffer Center for Neuro-Psychoanalysis, New York Psychoanalytic Institute; Chair of Neuropsychology, University of Cape Town, South Africa. Submitted for publication March 1, 2006.

before now—no good reason to believe that Freud actually wrote the chapter (all the preparatory manuscripts for the book were supposedly lost) and, second, that precisely the most interesting parts of it were edited out in the published version.

The recent discovery of this manuscript and related papers casts new light on a controversy that surrounded the publication of the Wilson biography from the start. This controversy revolved mainly around the fact that, despite being formally attributed by the publishers (and the surviving author) to Freud and Bullitt jointly, it was disowned by Freud's family—and subsequently by just about every Freud scholar qualified to express an opinion on the matter.

On what grounds was it attributed to Freud? According to the foreword of the book, signed by Bullitt, "Freud wrote the first draft of portions of the manuscript and I wrote the first draft of other portions. Each then criticized, amended or rewrote the other's draft until the whole became an amalgam for which we were both responsible" (Freud and Bullitt 1967, p. vii)

1264

The foreword is followed in the published work by an introduction signed by Freud, apparently written in 1931, which declares that "Bullitt, who knew the President personally, who worked for him during the period of his great prominence, and at that time was devoted to him with all the enthusiasm of youth, has prepared the [biographical part] on Wilson's childhood and youth. For the analytic part we are both responsible; it has been written by us working together" (pp. xiii–xiv). Accordingly, when a typescript of the book first surfaced in New York a quarter century later (in 1956), Ernest Jones, Freud's official biographer—"the only person privileged to read it," according to Jones (1957)—expressed the view that "although a joint work, it is not hard to distinguish the analytical contributions of the one author from the political contributions of the other" (p. 151). Nevertheless, Anna Freud, "after reading the manuscript, felt that only the Introduction showed unmistakably the character of Freud's style of writing and thinking" (Schur 1972, p. 497n). Max Schur "shared this opinion," as did Erik Erikson (1967), who said of the rest of this "disastrously bad" book that "it is easy to see that Freud could have 'written' almost nothing of what is now presented in print. . . . The text now printed must be ascribed to Bullitt, because he either transcribed or wrote, translated or caused to be translated, every word of it" (p. 462).

Likewise, James Strachey (1974), editor of the original *Standard Edition* of Freud's works in English translation, felt that the book "although quite clearly influenced by Freud's ideas, does not appear to contain any written contribution by Freud, with the exception of the Introduction of which the German original is extant" (p. 466). This opinion was expressed in a section of addenda and corrigenda to the *Standard Edition*, which had been published during the 1950s and 1960s. Presumably, in view of this opinion, Strachey would have included the introduction in the *Standard Edition* had he known of its existence in time, but not the remainder of the book. Angela Richards, editor of the 1987 *Nachträgsband* to Freud's *Gesammelte Werke*, took this latter course. She included only the introduction in her addendum to the German edition of Freud's complete psychological works. Her decision was based not only on internal evidence—i.e., the unlikely style and content of the book—but also on the lack of any original documents, apart from a German version of the introduction:

there is no external evidence for a cooperation, e.g., in the form of written texts, be they previous sketches or letters. It seems that Bullitt gave various, contradictory reasons for this lack of documents. Schur [1972] mentions that Bullitt had told him in 1964 that all the notes and letters had been burnt during the war due to the inattentiveness of a servant, after he, Bullitt, had had to leave Paris in a hurry. Melvin Lasky [1967] wrote in an editorial introductory note to the reprint in *Encounter* that he had recently spoken to Bullitt on the phone and been told that all letters, manuscripts, and sketches had been left in Vienna and had not been found ever since [Richards 1987, p. 683; translation by M.S.].

1265

The doubt arising out of this lack of documentary evidence was compounded by Bullitt's own explanation for the long latency between the completion of the manuscript in 1931 and its eventual publication in 1967. According to his foreword,

Both Freud and I were stubborn, and our beliefs were dissimilar. He was a Jew who had become an agnostic. I have always been a believing Christian. We often disagreed but we never quarrelled. On the contrary, the more we worked together, the closer friends we became. In the Spring of 1932, however, when our manuscript was ready to be typed in final form, Freud made textual changes and wrote a number of new passages to which I objected. After several arguments we decided to forget the book for three weeks, and to attempt then to agree. When we met, we continued to disagree. . . . Finally, I suggested that, since neither of us was impervious to reason, it was likely that some

day we would agree; meanwhile the book should not be published. Both of us, however, should sign each chapter, so that at least a signed unublishable manuscript would exist. We did so. . . . In 1938 the Nazis permitted Freud to leave Vienna. I met him at the railroad station in Paris, where I was then American Ambassador, and suggested that we might discuss our book once more after he was settled in London. I carried the manuscript to Freud and was delighted when he agreed to eliminate the additions he had written at the last minute, and we were both happy that he found no difficulty in agreeing on certain changes in the text. Once more I visited him in London and showed him the final text which we had both accepted. This is the text printed here. We then agreed that it would be courteous to refrain from publishing the book so long as the second Mrs Woodrow Wilson lived. [She died in 1961]. I did not see Freud again [Freud and Bullitt 1967, p. viii].

Unless Bullitt was simply confabulating, this account of the book's provenance appears to answer some of the obvious questions. The problem with the alternative view taken by Anna Freud and her followers has always been this: if they accept that Freud was indeed the author of the published introduction, but they also reject the book itself on internal grounds, and due to lack of external evidence (notwithstanding Bullitt's explanations), then what do they make of the fact that Freud stated, in the very introduction that they *do* accept, "For the analytic part we are both responsible; it has been written by us working together"? Is this testimony untrue?

These are the essentials of the two opposing views of Freud's involvement in "this distasteful essay in posthumous denigration," as Geoffrey Gorer (1967, p. 469) described the published biography.

NEW DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

We turn now to the light that is cast on this long-standing controversy by the discovery in 2004 by Paul Roazen of a bundle of original documents relating to the disputed collaboration, among papers deposited by Bullitt's daughter at the library of Yale University (his alma mater).² To assess this, it is necessary first of all to enumerate what the new material (as examined by me) consists of.³

²Despite Bullitt's recollections to the contrary, she evidently had them all along, at her home in Ireland.

³I am greatly indebted to the late Paul Roazen for making this material, which has not yet been catalogued by Yale's librarians, available to me.

1. A memorandum by Bullitt, on Hotel Bristol stationery, dated October 27, 1930, describing a meeting he had that evening with Freud, during which their collaboration on the Wilson study was evidently planned.

2. A second memorandum by Bullitt, on the same notepaper, but undated, summarizing what Freud had evidently just taught Bullitt about libido theory.

3. A third memorandum by Bullitt, dated December 12, 1930, starting with the lines: "Had a long argument with Freud tonight over his passage on the 'Todes Trieb' in our analysis of Wilson. He finally agreed to rewrite the passage but stuck to his point of view that the Todes Trieb existed." The remainder of the memorandum summarizes what Freud had evidently taught him that evening on the topic of the death drive.

4. A draft of the foreword to the book, in 11 pages of English typescript. (The foreword that appears as pp. v–viii of the published book is radically different.)

5. A draft of the introduction to the book, in six pages of English typescript, lightly corrected in Bullitt's handwriting, with the heading "Introduction by Sigmund Freud" in Bullitt's handwriting.

6. A slightly revised draft of this introduction, in eight pages of English typescript, again headed "Introduction by Sigmund Freud" (and again lightly corrected) in Bullitt's handwriting.

7. A translation of this version, in seven pages of German typescript. (This is the "original German" version mentioned by Strachey, which was included in the *Gesammelte Werke*.)

8. A slightly revised draft of the introduction, in eight pages of German manuscript, in Freud's handwriting.

9. A German typescript of the above revision, lightly corrected in Freud's handwriting, seven pages long.

10. A translation of the introduction, in 11 pages of English typescript, which excludes the revisions made in the above two German versions. (This is the version that was used for the published book, where it appears as pp. xi–xvii.)

11. A draft of the first two chapters of the "analytic" part of the published book, in 55 pages of English typescript, with handwritten corrections in English by Bullitt, and handwritten additions in German by Freud (and English translations of these additions in Bullitt's handwriting), some of them on separate, interleaved sheets. (A condensed

version of these chapters appears as pp. 35–63 of the published book).

12. A revised draft of the first of these two chapters in Freud's handwriting, with further amendments, in 24 pages of German manuscript. (This is the essay published below in English translation.)

13. A German typescript of the above version of the chapter, 17 pages long.

14. A list of amendments and additions by Freud, keyed to the first 106 pages of the remaining chapters (pp. 37–143) of the above English typescript (item 11), in German manuscript, in Freud's handwriting. (The relevant portion of the English typescript itself is missing. Some of these amendments are included in pp. 64–295 of the published book.)

15. A German typescript of the above amendments.

16. A note in six pages of manuscript, in Freud's handwriting, on the topic of "Wilson's breakdowns." (An extract from this note appears on p. 80 of the published book.)

17. An English translation of the above note, in four pages of typescript, lightly corrected (in English) in Freud's handwriting.

18. A revised English translation of the same, incorporating Freud's changes, in three pages of typescript.

19. An addendum to the English translation, on a single typescript page, with the heading: "The following paragraph, which is not in the German, appears as the conclusion of the translation that does not have Freud's handwritten corrections." (Extracts from this paragraph appear on p. 82 of the published book.)

20. An enumeration, in Bullitt's handwriting, of 35 English typescript pages that are said to have been signed jointly by Freud and himself—evidently the concluding manuscript page of each chapter—and a sample of one such page with the two signatures (MS p. 87, which, although radically altered, corresponds roughly to p. 81 of the published version).

21. Two book contracts, dated 1932: one between the two authors and one between them both and the Internationaler Psychoanalytische Verlag.

22. A small collection of letters between Freud and Bullitt, dating from 1927 to 1938.

RECONSTRUCTION OF THE COLLABORATION

An analysis of these documents reveals that Freud's daughter and followers did after all have good reason to doubt the veracity of the claim that Sigmund Freud was the senior author of *Woodrow Wilson: A Psychological Study*. Although the documents support the view that Freud collaborated closely with Bullitt in the preparation of at least one version of the book, this collaboration was close only in the sense that Lasky conceded in an editorial footnote to the February 1967 installment that appeared in *Encounter*: "I gather the impression that the book was indeed the product of a very close personal collaboration, although probably very little of the book was actually written in Freud's hand." This view was based on personal discussions with both Bullitt and Anna Freud.

I will now set out a reconstruction of the collaboration, as it emerges from the new documents. In doing so it will be necessary to refer occasionally to other primary source material.

The collaboration appears to have been preceded in 1927 by Bullitt's announcing to Freud that he was writing a play on Wilson, for Freud wrote to him (in English) on April 17, 1927: "No need to say I am looking eagerly forward to your play on Wilson, I am sure you still appreciate him more than I do." By August 1, 1929, Freud had clearly read the play, as on that date he wrote Bullitt (again in English) a complementary appraisal of it: "I enjoyed the thing immensely."

On April 12, 1930, Freud acceded to a request for a meeting with Bullitt. He agreed to "some talks" with him in Vienna before the end of April or in Berlin during the month of May, which he intended to spend at the sanatorium at Schloss Tegel. According to Bullitt's foreword (both versions), the proposed meetings took place in Berlin in May. According to the draft version of the foreword, he there told Freud that he "intended to analyze the characters of Lenin, Clemenceau, Lloyd George, Wilson and other statesmen" he had known:

To my surprise and delight Freud said that he would enjoy studying Wilson's character and suggested that we should write together a chapter on Wilson's character to be included in my book. I of course accepted the proposal at once; but it seemed to me that a book of mine on international relations was not an appropriate setting for Freud's opinion of Wilson. I suggested to him that future generations would be interested in a psychological study of Wilson by himself as much as a study of

Pericles by Aristotle, whereas interest in the remainder of my book, if indeed there were any, would be ephemeral.

By the time of Bullitt's Hotel Bristol memorandum of October 27, 1930, it appears that he was already supplying literature on Wilson to Freud. His account of this meeting provides the first direct evidence of Freud's collaboration in the project:

We discussed [this evening] how we should work, and decided tentatively that I should continue to completion the statement of facts in regard to Wilson's career, that if possible I should have it finished by the end of this week, that then we should go to work together on the analysis. We agreed that the book should be constructed as follows: An introduction to be signed by him: An introduction to be signed by me: A statement of the facts of Wilson's career to be signed by me: The analysis of Wilson to be signed by him and me jointly. He asked me for any facts I had as to Wilson's physical condition, saying "we must not attribute to psychological causes symptoms which may have a physical origin." I read him notes that I had made after conversations with Drs. Stengel, Dercum & Carey Grayson. He said: "I hope one result of the publication of this book will be your re-introduction to politics." I told him I hoped it might be. "That is really, I think, my chief reason for wanting to write it," he said, "my affection for you is very great." Then he laughed and added: "But my dislike of Wilson is almost as great as my liking of you."

1270

There is little reason to doubt the essential facts of this account, which was written at the time of the actual events, and which is consistent with everything that Freud himself said in this regard in his published introduction. (The middle part of Bullitt's account might also explain the origin of the short manuscript, in Freud's handwriting, on the topic of Wilson's "breakdowns" [item 16 above].) This manuscript begins with a consideration of the possibility that his psychological difficulties may have had a physical origin. About this, more below.)

It is important to recognize that Bullitt's account of Freud's envisaged role, namely the agreement that Freud would sign an introduction and cosign the analytic part, does not specify who would actually *write* the first drafts of these parts. It states only that "we should go to work together on the analysis" of Wilson. This is important because the documentary evidence discussed below suggests that Bullitt may well have been responsible for drafting the entire book, even the analytic part, and that Freud's role (already restricted to just this analytic part and the

introduction) may have been limited to educational "talks" about it, followed by corrections of Bullitt's written texts. This certainly seems to have been Freud's understanding of his role, according to all the primary evidence now available, starting with the next letter in the Freud/Bullitt correspondence. The letter is dated November 22, 1930. There Freud writes (again in English), "I am just through *your* manuscript. It is glorious. I am sure you are a great writer, but you are bound to develop into more. There is only one passage where you suddenly dive into deep analysis which I would like to see omitted. Now you ask for an appointment. My idea is you ought to have a short respite. . . . don't be impatient" (emphasis added).

This interpretation is also consistent with two surviving memoranda by Bullitt from this period on Hotel Bristol notepaper: the first, circa November 1930, summarizes what Freud had evidently just taught him about libido theory (item 2 above); the second, dated December 12, 1930, summarizes what Freud had evidently taught him that evening on the topic of the death drive (item 3).

Thus, on December 7, 1930, Freud could write to Stefan Zweig, "I am once again writing an Introduction for *something someone else is doing*. I must not say what it is, but it too is an analysis and at the same time very much a matter of contemporary interest, almost political. You will never guess what" (emphasis added).⁴

The next (very brief) letter in Freud's correspondence with Bullitt, dated February 9, 1931, says little more than that he has received the manuscript for the introduction and that he hopes to begin working on it (and to meet Bullitt again) soon. The manuscript referred to is presumably the typed German version of Freud's introduction (item 7 above), which seems to have been prepared for him from two earlier drafts of an English version (items 5 and 6, corrected in Bullitt's hand). These earlier versions were, in turn, presumably translations of a still earlier German version by Freud that has not survived. It is barely conceivable that Bullitt would have composed the first draft of Freud's introduction—although even that is not absolutely impossible.⁵

⁴In her commentary to the introduction included in the *Gesammelte Werke*, Angela Richards (1987) remarked of this letter: "One can assume with certainty that Freud refers to the present introduction, and it is fair to presume that his part in the finished book and his opinion of his own role in its making correspond exactly with his description of the latter" (p. 685).

⁵Anna Freud was under the impression at the time the manuscript was written that her father had composed the introduction himself. She wrote to Bullitt a few

The next letter in the correspondence, dated March 7, 1931, is written by Bullitt (in English). It states that he had finished his latest revision and was about to bring it to Freud when he became convinced that “the part about Wilson’s decision to become a statesman was bosh.” He therefore reread the sources, and had a new idea that he describes at length in the letter. This idea consisted in a complex psychoanalytic construction that later became a prominent part of the published book. He concluded: “If you accept this interpretation, I should say that Wilson’s choice of statesmanship would be one of the most interesting features of our work instead of one of the least interesting. Please go ahead as fast as you can on the interpretation of his illnesses.” He then asked for another “evening discussion.”

This letter clearly demonstrates that substantial sections (at least) of the *analysis* of Wilson were not only drafted by Bullitt, but also conceived by him. Freud’s role—even with respect to the analytic part of the book—again appears to have been limited to first educating Bullitt and then commenting on his written formulations, presumably arising (directly or indirectly) from their discussions.

1272

However, the letter quoted above also refers to one section that Bullitt asked *Freud* to compose, namely, the “interpretation of his illnesses.” This request, which probably arose out of Freud’s earlier reservations about the danger of a wild analysis of Wilson’s possibly organic “breakdowns,” apparently resulted in the note described in item 16 above. This is the only part of the analysis that we can be reasonably sure was actually conceived by Freud, as it is the only section for which the surviving draft is in Freud’s handwriting—although we know that even this section was prepared at Bullitt’s request. (The only other surviving draft in Freud’s handwriting [item 12], printed below in translation, was a *revision* in German of an earlier English typescript.)

A consideration of the content of this section of the analysis introduces the disagreements between Freud and Bullitt, which ultimately resulted in the suspension of their collaboration in 1932. We may assume that the section was composed sometime between the date of

weeks after her father’s death, saying that she remembered “that there is one more unpublished paper of his that he wrote as an addition to an MS of yours. The manuscript is not here; I seem to remember that my father sent it to you with some special messenger from Vienna when times were not very safe. . . . would there be any objection to including it in my father’s posthumous articles?” (cited in Roazen in press). Bullitt declined to cooperate. (The reader will notice that the rest of the book is again referred to as “an MS of yours.”)

the above request (March 7, 1931) and the next substantive letter from Freud, dated September 30. This letter, discussed below, begins with the sentence "I have finished my task sooner than expected."

It is clear from the content of this letter that Freud wrote it after he had edited a complete draft of Bullitt's book. This complete draft, an English typescript with handwritten corrections by Bullitt, corresponds to the manuscript described in items 11 and 14 above. The manuscript was approximately 389 pages long, but only the first 55 pages (item 11) have survived. Freud's handwritten changes and additions to these pages (which, in heavily condensed form, eventually became the first two chapters of the published book) and his suggestions for the following 86 pages have also survived (as item 14 above). Freud states in the letter that he did not feel it necessary to make any corrections to the remainder of the manuscript, from page 142 onward. We know the length of the manuscript from item 20, which enumerates the 35 pages (the final pages of each chapter) that Freud and Bullitt had jointly signed in 1932.

The letter (this time written in German, and signed "cordially" rather than "affectionately") reads:

I have finished my task sooner than expected. While I have changed some things in the general part, and written down the whole thing in German [as printed in translation below], I found there was little that needed my interference, particularly when you⁶ turn to W. himself, and nothing at all from p. 142 onward. In fact it is excellently done, and in reading it gives the strong impression as if it were also correct in its essence. Except my remarking that some analytic formulas are too often repeated, and my dislike of one paragraph (Greek and Jewish-English), whose statements I find "sweeping," I have nothing to object. I could now think of translating your whole text [i.e., with Freud's German revisions and additions] into English, but my time will not allow this as my full work will start in October again. When you come to Vienna we will engage a translator, whose work I control, while you help him understand some American peculiarities. By the end of the year everything could be done. I expect from this book a good effect on the public and for you yourself.

Shortly after this letter was written, according to Bullitt's published foreword (quoted above), the collaboration was suspended due to

⁶This choice of word and the phrase "your whole text" below confirm that it was Bullitt who composed the rest of the book, (at least everything after the first chapter).

disagreements about Freud's revisions and additions to the text. What might these disagreements have consisted in? The only reliable answer must be found in an analysis of the revisions and additions themselves.

The most substantial of them was the short manuscript (six pages long) on Wilson's "breakdowns," mentioned above, which Freud composed at Bullitt's request. The manuscript, which is devoted primarily to the diagnosis and etiology of Wilson's psychological difficulties (neurasthenia and excessive masturbation respectively), begins with the following paragraph:

To discuss those illnesses of Wilson which were known as his 'breakdowns', is not easy and will not necessarily lead us to definite conclusions. It is, of course, possible that those illnesses were organic affections—due to bodily weaknesses—and that psychic factors had no share or only a small share in them. An illness of this sort occurred during his seventeenth and eighteenth years, 1874–1875; but henceforth such illnesses recurred throughout his whole life and in the end flowed together with severe, undoubtedly physical diseases. From the beginning, therefore, they may have been of the same nature. One regrets deeply the lack of any material which might lead to an answer to this question which is not unimportant for an understanding of Wilson.⁷

1274

It is plausible that the opinions expressed here would have felt to Bullitt like cold water poured over his entire analysis of the president. This is supported by the fact that Freud's manuscript on Wilson's "breakdowns" was never included in the published book. Something equivalent to the small introductory portion quoted above does appear, heavily edited, on page 80 of the book; but it starts with the following pregnant alteration: "To discuss these 'breakdowns' is of course not easy. It is, of course, possible, *though improbable*, that they were organic affections . . ." (emphasis added).

It is plausible also that Bullitt considered Freud's cautionary nosological remarks too "medical" or "scientific" for his envisaged book. This is consistent with the fact that the following addition by Freud to the manuscript version (p. 95) was also excluded from the published version: "The bodily ailments of Wilson suggest, by the way, . . . the condition called enteroptosis, characterised by a flabby hanging of the abdominal viscera, and of which it is certain that it stands in connection to neurasthenia, though we do not yet understand in which relation."

⁷This previously unknown manuscript will be published in full in the forthcoming *Revised Standard Edition*.

In any event, it is noteworthy that almost all the other changes that Freud made to Bullitt's complete manuscript *were* incorporated in some form in the published version, with the exception of those that dealt with the topics discussed in Freud's short manuscript on the "break-downs."⁸ Bullitt evidently disagreed with or felt uncomfortable about Freud's view of the probable organic and neurasthenic-masturbatory basis of Wilson's psychological difficulties.

Far more significant, to be sure, were two other themes. These stand out sharply when one compares the manuscript as edited by Freud with the version that eventually appeared in print. Not only did Bullitt choose not to include some of Freud's suggested additions, he also deleted certain sections that were initially included in his complete draft manuscript. Almost all of these deleted sections (presumably based on his educational discussions with Freud) pertained to the two themes in question.

The first of them was castration anxiety. The reader will see from the editorial footnotes to the unadulterated version printed below⁹ that the topic of castration anxiety was systematically expunged from the first chapter of the published book. What must have made this all the more galling to Freud was the fact that this chapter, which he aptly described as the "general part," consisted primarily of a summary of his own ideas on the workings of the mind. It seems that Bullitt felt able to give an adequate account of these ideas—including an account of the oedipus complex—without having recourse to the concept of castration anxiety! We know from Bullitt's description of one of his educational meetings with Freud (quoted above) that he also considered himself qualified to dispute not only the content of a passage that Freud proposed regarding the death drive, but even the validity of that concept itself.

The second theme that was edited out in the transition from draft to published book was Freud's interpretation of the psychology of Christianity (or Christ identification) in relation to homosexuality (see footnote 21 below). It seems likely that Bullitt's disagreement or discomfort with this aspect of what he had learned from Freud arose from his own Christian beliefs. Bullitt himself alluded to this link (in his published foreword, quoted above). This too must have been particularly

⁸Freud's recommended changes are exhaustively described by Roazen (in press).

⁹My editorial footnotes aim only to identify Bullitt's major deletions. Almost every paragraph of the book version differs from the manuscript version in numerous more subtle respects.

difficult for Freud to accept, since this aspect of the “general part” was by far the most original and therefore important part of his contribution.

A further likely difference of opinion that led to the suspension of the collaboration between Bullitt and Freud in 1932 is alluded to in Freud’s tactfully understated remark, toward the end of his last letter, regarding the stylistic shortcomings of the remainder of the book: “some analytic formulas are too often repeated.” It is clear, from the widespread criticism that the book received in precisely this respect when it was published in 1967, that Bullitt did not recognize this shortcoming in his psychoanalytic writing. Lasky (1967) reported that Anna Freud too was “unhappy about certain awkward formulations and their mechanical repetition.” This presumably explains why, when the typescript surfaced in New York in 1956, Max Schur reported to Bullitt that Miss Freud “would be willing to help him in the final formulation of the psychoanalytic aspects of the book”; as for Bullitt, “he unfortunately did not see fit to accept any help” (Schur 1972, p. 497n). Paul Roazen (in press) remarks that Bullitt “justifiably thought, as he told me as well, that if Freud had wanted her to read and alter the manuscript he would have asked her to do so in 1930–31, when the draft was first completed, or in 1938–39 when it got retyped.” Ironically, the documentary evidence now reveals that Freud was well aware of the need for such alterations in 1931, but that then, as later, “Bullitt did not see fit” to accept help.

The last and certainly most significant point of difference between Freud and Bullitt can now be discussed. This is the only difference that seems likely to have arisen at the “last minute,” as Bullitt later recalled it, when he was ready to submit the completed text to the publisher.

The reader will recall that the most conclusive piece of evidence for Freud’s close collaboration in the biography was his own statement in the introduction, to the effect that “for the analytic part we are both equally responsible; it has been written by us working together.” What the recently discovered documents reveal is the startling fact that Freud had emphatically *crossed out* just this sentence in the only surviving handwritten version of the introduction (item 8). As explained above, this version seems to have been a slight revision of a typewritten German translation (item 7) of two earlier drafts in English (items 5 and 6, corrected in Bullitt’s hand). These earlier versions were, in turn, presumably translations of a still earlier German draft by Freud, which has not survived. The typewritten German version (item 7) is the one that

served as a basis for the general acceptance among Freud scholars that the German original is extant. This is also the version that was subsequently included in the *Gesammelte Werke*.

This was the cause of the serious problem, mentioned earlier, with the view taken by Anna Freud and her followers: if they accepted that Freud was indeed the author of the published introduction, *and* they rejected the book itself on internal grounds and due to the lack of external evidence, what did they make of the fact that Freud stated in the very introduction they accepted that “for the analytic part we are both responsible; it has been written by us working together”? This problem now dissolves. It is clear that Freud did not feel at all comfortable with the sentence in question, and it is even possible that it was not composed by him in the first place (it could have made its first appearance in one of the earlier English typescript versions that form items 5 and 6 in the recently discovered material). It is also possible that Freud had to make this change “at the last minute” for the reason that he could not get Bullitt to accept many of the textual changes he required. A retraction of this key sentence, then, would have been the only honorable way to proceed with publication. In either event, retract it Freud did, and in the revised German version that he sent to Bullitt (item 9) he proposed the following distinctly different alternative: “As far as the analytical part, too, is concerned, the main work and most of the conclusions are his, but I added so many additions and made so many changes that I may share the responsibility for the result.”

According to Roazen (in press), who apparently did not make available to me all the material he discovered,¹⁰ “this key sentence was clearly a subject of some discussion between Freud and Bullitt. Two typed German alternatives, slightly different, exist. ‘For the analytic part we are both equally responsible’ remains the same in each, but it is followed alternately by (1) ‘this part came into being by cooperation, and we have written it together’ or (2) ‘it was written by both of us in joint work’.” I have not seen these two typed German alternatives and therefore cannot comment on their authorship, or their place

¹⁰According to Roazen (in press) another “fragment by Freud” that “somehow survived” which “would appear to be about part of a manuscript Bullitt prepared” (a fragment Roazen failed to disclose to me) states (in German): “The last contributions to Wilson were too short for an evaluation, I have to wait until a longer piece exists. [However] I noticed that the expression ‘libido that flows toward the father through the channel of passivity’ recurs all too frequently.” (See Freud’s and Anna Freud’s similar criticisms of Bullitt’s style of psychoanalytic writing, discussed above.)

in the sequence of the texts that I have seen. All I can say is that the fact that precisely this sentence was disputed by Bullitt's alleged senior author settles the entire controversy in favor of the opinion that "The text now printed must be ascribed to Bullitt, because he either transcribed or wrote, translated or caused to be translated, every word of it" (Erikson 1967, p. 462).

Even Roazen, the strongest proponent in recent times of Freud's complicity in the Wilson biography, was ultimately forced to concede that, to say the least, "Anna was correct in proposing that while the ideas were given by her father to Bullitt, the manner of their application and the rhetoric were Bullitt's own."

The only remaining question is this: Why then did Freud eventually agree, in 1938, to the publication of this highly problematical book? The fact that he did agree to *some* version of it being published is confirmed by the existence of the two book contracts listed above (item 21). What remains obscure is *which* version he agreed to publish, and how it differed from the "unpublishable" version that both authors signed in 1932. The first of the contracts, dated January 20, 1932, states that Freud and Bullitt "*are now engaged* in a collaboration on a book" (emphasis added); the second, dated June 15, 1932, states they "have already submitted the definitive text of the introduction in German, and of the psychological part in English. The English text of the historical part *will still be worked through by Mr. Bullitt*, and it will be submitted to the publisher as soon as possible" (emphasis added). It is also interesting to note that Freud, the supposed senior author, was to receive only one-third of the royalties. This of course does not amount to documentary evidence that Freud accepted any version at all in 1938, let alone the version Bullitt chose to publish.¹¹ Most significant, though, is the fact that we also do not know which version of the key sentence in the introduction was meant to appear in the version that Freud "found no difficulty in agreeing" to in 1938. In the event, none of the revisions described above appeared, and Freud's reservations were silenced.

The most likely answer to the question of why in 1938 Freud might suddenly have agreed to publish is embedded in Bullitt's foreword: "In 1938 the Nazis permitted Freud to leave Vienna. I met him at the railroad station in Paris, where I was then American Ambassador, and

¹¹In December 1933, in a letter to Marie Bonaparte, Freud was still stating emphatically that the book "will never see the light of day."

suggested that we might discuss our book once more after he was settled in London. I carried the manuscript to Freud and was delighted when he agreed to eliminate the additions he had written at the last minute, and we were both happy that he found no difficulty in agreeing on certain changes in the text” (Freud and Bullitt 1967, p. viii).

With a minimum of inference, this account suggests that Freud relented *due to his gratitude for the part Bullitt played in saving his family from the Nazis*. I personally find it astonishing that Bullitt thought it appropriate to raise the matter of the disputed book with Freud within seconds of his escape from Vienna. Nevertheless, the last surviving letter in the recently discovered correspondence, written (in German) shortly after his arrival in London, on June 18, 1938, clearly expresses Freud’s sentiments:

Dear Bullitt,

Now that I am sitting here in tranquillity, peace and beauty, after all the experiences of the past months, I feel compelled to thank you once again for the part you had in the liberation of myself and the members of my family. I cannot evaluate that part for certain, as everything went on behind the scenes, but it was probably powerful. And if there was, behind you, someone else at work, about whom I should officially know nothing, I ask you to express my thanks should the occasion arise. In the hope that I can welcome you some day to London,

Yours faithfully,
Freud

1279

Anna Freud’s preparedness to collaborate again, when a typed version of the Wilson manuscript surfaced in 1956, may be attributed to similar sentiments. Lasky (1967), for example, commented in his editorial footnote to the *Encounter* serialization of the book that from conversations with Anna Freud he gathered the impression that she “remains immensely grateful to Ambassador Bullitt for his timely diplomatic intervention with President Roosevelt (White House pressure, in 1938 when the Nazis conquered Vienna, saved her father’s life and her own).”

It should be said that if the publication of *Woodrow Wilson: A Psychological Study* under Freud’s name was the price that he and his descendants (and followers) had eventually to pay for this intervention, it was more than worth the embarrassment.

And there is an unexpectedly happy ending to this sorry tale: the survival of the manuscript printed below. This essay was written

entirely in Freud's own hand, notwithstanding the fact that Bullitt may have been responsible for an earlier draft (or drafts) of the same. As noted at the outset, this essay is valuable and original, and it is as confidently attributable to Freud as the introduction that his admirers have always acknowledged—indeed, perhaps (in light of the suppressed change in the latter) even more so.

As Freud observes in the essay below, "To simplify is admirable, but truth should not be sacrificed to simplicity. The truth appears to be that the world is something very complicated." Perhaps not surprisingly, these lines do not appear in the version published by Bullitt.

AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF FREUD'S MANUSCRIPT

Many books have been written about Thomas Woodrow Wilson, and many people close to him have tried to give an explanation, for themselves and for others, of his personality.¹² All these attempts at explanation have one thing in common—they end with a question mark. Even for his biographers and supporters, Wilson has remained a character full of contradictions, an enigma. Colonel House notes in his diary on June 10, 1919: "I think I never knew a man whose general appearance changed so much from hour to hour. It is not the President's face alone that changes. He is one of the most difficult and complex characters that I have ever known. He is so contradictory that it is hard to pass judgment upon him." Wilson's friends and biographers have all come, more or less explicitly, to the same conclusion.

Wilson was certainly a complicated personality, and it will not be easy to find the way to an insight that may reveal the basis of the apparent contradictions in his nature. We do not want to entertain false hopes as we set out to subject his mental life to analysis. This analysis cannot be complete and entirely satisfactory, because we know nothing about many aspects of his life and personality. What we do know about him seems less important than what we do not know. All the things we would like to know about him we would be able to learn if he were alive and were to submit to the rigors of a psychoanalytic investigation. But he is no longer alive, so no one will ever be able to learn those things. We have no prospect of ascertaining the crucial facts of his

¹²This text has been translated by Mark Solms.

mental life with all their details and the way they all fit together, and we therefore also have no right to call our work a psychoanalysis of Wilson. It is a psychological study, based on the material that was available to us; we make no higher claim for it.

On the other hand we do not want to minimize the fact that we do know a good deal about many aspects of Wilson's life and character. Even if we cannot aspire to a complete analysis, nevertheless our knowledge is sufficient to justify our hope of correctly inferring the main lines of his mental development. In addition to what we know of Wilson as an individual, we may also include what psychoanalysis has taught us generally about all human children. After all, Wilson was basically a human being like any other and subject to the same laws of mental development. Psychoanalytic research has proven the universal validity of these laws by investigating countless individual cases.

When we say this, we do not mean to claim that psychoanalysis has uncovered the ultimate secrets of human mental life. But it has, so to speak, opened the door leading to this inner life and has permitted us to recognize certain things in the vicinity of this door, while others, deeper within, are still shrouded in darkness for us. It has nevertheless allowed some light to enter this darkness so that we are able to discern the outlines of many things. Further effort will in all probability show us that we have not quite correctly perceived their form. But that doesn't matter. Our expectation that the details of our present concepts will have to undergo change need not keep us from employing them, for now, just as they are. Our science is still very young. Newton's achievement was not invalidated by the later appearance of Einstein's theory, and without a Newton there probably would not have been an Einstein. We shall therefore make use of some of the theorems that psychoanalysis has provided and asked us to accept, and we must present these definitions and presuppositions as concisely as possible before addressing the psychological problem that Wilson's character poses.

Our starting point is that there is from the very outset a force at work in human mental life that we call *libido*, the energy of the sexual drive.¹³ The question of its origin does not concern us here. It is not superfluous to mention that the sexual drive, the energy of which we have introduced as *libido*, although it includes what we generally call by that name, also encompasses far more. We say that it expresses itself

¹³The remainder of this paragraph is deleted in the published book (Freud and Bullitt 1967, p. 36; hereafter "the published book").

in everything for which we use the ambiguous word “love.” Its scope coincides roughly with Plato’s concept of *Eros*. It would probably make things easier for outsiders if instead of sexual drive and sexuality we used the terms *Eros* and *erotism*, and defined *libido* as the energy of *Eros*. But for certain reasons this did not happen in psychoanalysis, and we cannot change it now.

This *libido* must be accommodated somewhere. We believe that it “cathects” certain regions and parts of our mental apparatus somewhat as an electric charge attaches to a conductor, that just like an electric charge it undergoes quantitative changes, and that at rest it produces a tension corresponding to this quantity and presses for discharge. Further, [we believe] that it is continuously fed and renewed from somatic sources.

Accommodation for the *libido* is first provided by the self-love of *narcissism*. This is most obvious in the newborn, the interests of which are restricted to the activities and products of its own body, and which finds all sources of pleasure in its self. The nursing infant does of course have the maternal breast as an object, but it is obliged to absorb this object into its ego and treat it as a part of its self.

1282

We set *object love* in contrast to *narcissism*. In rare cases adults remain in a position that is similar to the *narcissism* of the newborn. Such people strike us as monsters of egoism, incapable of loving anything other than themselves. Normally in the course of life a portion of the *libido* is directed to objects, but another part remains attached to the ego. *Narcissism* is the *libido*’s original home; it also remains its most lasting one. The relationship between *narcissistic* and *object libido* can vary within a wide range; the main portion of the *libido* can be with the ego or with objects, but no human life is entirely without self-love.

Our second theorem states: all human beings are double-gendered or bisexual. Every individual, whether male or female, is composed of both masculine and feminine elements. This fact is just as basic in psychoanalysis as, for example, in chemistry is the fact that the elements oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, etc. are to be found in all organic bodies.¹⁴ We need not provide proof of this statement here, and we also may spare ourselves a discussion of all the difficulties encountered if we want to ascribe to the terms “male” and “female” a psychological meaning in addition to their biological one. Our proposition will gain

¹⁴The remainder of this paragraph is deleted in the published book (p. 37).

credibility, however, if we recall that the male sexual organs occur in both the male and the female body, differing only in the extent of their development and in the change or loss of their function. Thus, the male body has two totally useless mammary glands, its prostate gland corresponds to the uterus, and the penis has its counterpart in the small clitoris of the female.

When the primary phase of pure narcissism has been surpassed and object cathexes begin to play their role, three kinds of libidinal accommodation ensue: these are, in addition to narcissism, male and female urges. We view all those urges characterized by passivity as an expression of femininity—above all the need to be loved, but also the tendency to submit to others, which reaches its extreme form in masochism, in the urge to suffer pain at the hands of others. On the other hand, we call masculine everything characterized by activity—hence, the need to love, to gain power over others, to subdue the outside world, and to alter it according to one's wishes. So we allow masculinity to be equated with activity and femininity with passivity.¹⁵ The relative proportion of this masculinity and femininity appears to be constitutionally determined in people who are bisexually oriented. In general the rule here is that the ratio is decided by the manifest gender of the individual. When someone is equipped with the organs that enable him to perform the masculine role in the sexual act, we may expect the degree of masculinity in his constitution and his behavior to be greater than the degree of femininity; and the same applies in the case of female sexual activity. (The opposite applies in many animal species.) This rule, however, allows for numerous exceptions. Anatomical masculinity and psychological masculinity often do not coincide. It happens that males are born with so little masculinity and so much femininity that by far the greater amount of their libido is characterized by feminine urges; inversely, there are females who are endowed with so little femininity that they resemble males in every respect except the anatomy of their genitals. How this happens, we do not know. Psychology must accept these facts; it need not explain them. Perhaps someday advances in endocrinology will solve this puzzle for us. Endogenous secretions, however, are not a subject for psychology. For the present, it suffices us to know that such things occur.

1283

¹⁵The remainder of this paragraph is deleted in the published book (p. 38).

Such extreme homosexuals are, in any event, quite rare.¹⁶ In the majority of cases both masculinity and femininity are well developed in human individuals. Innate masculinity may be stronger than femininity, or the latter stronger than the former. All possible degrees of difference in relative proportion are realized in individual persons.

If the extent of innate femininity in a male exceeds that of his masculinity, this by no means indicates that he is now predestined to lead the life of a homosexual. His childhood experiences can still push his libido, as regards object choice, in the one direction or the other. He may become a homosexual, but he is equally likely to become a normal heterosexual. In the converse case, if his masculinity is stronger than his femininity, it is still not certain that his libido will opt for normal heterosexual object choice; under the influence of powerful childhood experiences he can still become a homosexual. A very masculine male can develop into a homosexual despite full preservation of his masculinity, so that it is not the character of his sexuality but only that of his object that is changed. It must not be overlooked that even these two factors do not stand in a clear and fixed relation to each other. All that can be said is that the male who is equipped with more masculinity from the outset has a better chance of withstanding those childhood influences that could push his libido in the direction of homosexual object choice. A brother, on the other hand, in whom the opposite, feminine predisposition is stronger, could easily find the way to a normal heterosexual life if childhood influences were favorable. All these many variations are inessential compared to the fact that the libido, insofar as it has not remained narcissistic, is divided between both male and female relations to objects.

The first human objects encountered by the child are the mother and the father or their substitutes. Initial relations with them are of a passive nature: the child is nurtured, caressed, guided by their orders, and punished by them. The child's libido is therefore directed first at these relations. Then, we observe, a reaction gradually sets in. The child wants to repay his parents for what they do to him; he wants to take an active role with them, caress them, dominate them, take revenge on them. Hence, his libido has four possible outlets: those of passivity toward father and mother, and those of activity toward them. This situation provides the basis for the emergence of the Oedipus complex.

¹⁶This entire paragraph and the next one are deleted in the published book (p. 38).

In order to explain the Oedipus complex we must introduce here the third proposition of psychoanalytic theory, an assumption regarding the drives. It states that two main drives are active in mental life: that of Eros—sexuality in the broadest sense—whose energy we have already described as libido, and another one that we call the death drive, in view of its ultimate goal, which makes itself known to us in the form of impulsions toward aggression and destruction. The death drive is the antagonist of Eros, which strives to produce ever greater unities held together by the libido. Both drives are present simultaneously in mental life from the outset. But we rarely or never come across them in pure form; rather, they are generally soldered together in varying proportions.

What we perceive as masculinity and femininity never consists of libido alone, but is always accompanied by a certain admixture of aggression or pleasure in destruction. We assume that this admixture is far greater in masculinity than in femininity, but it is not absent in the latter,¹⁷ where it is directed inward instead of outward, against the person herself. It would lead much too far afield to attempt to provide the evidence here for this piece of psychoanalytic theory. We want only to warn the reader against succumbing to an inclination to simplification, and thereby to identifying the contrast between masculinity and femininity with that between Eros and the death drive. To simplify is admirable, but truth should not be sacrificed to simplicity. The truth appears to be that the world is something very complicated.

We emphasize once more that every libidinal cathexis is accompanied by a piece of aggression—and we return now to the Oedipus complex. We shall, however, trace it in the male child only.¹⁸ The Oedipus complex develops differently in girls. The difference lies in its relation to the castration complex, about which we shall hear more soon. In boys the Oedipus complex precedes the castration complex and is brought to an end by the fear of castration. In girls the discovery that they have been castrated is the first step in a development leading to the formation of the Oedipus complex.

We have seen that the libido of the young child has five paths open to it: (1) that of narcissism; (2) that of passivity to the mother; (3) that of passivity toward the father; (4) that of activity (with aggression) toward the mother; (5) that of activity toward the father. The Oedipus

¹⁷The remainder of this paragraph is deleted in the published book (p. 39).

¹⁸The remainder of this paragraph is deleted in the published book (p. 39).

complex now arises from the conflicts between these various urges of the libido. Initially the child is not aware of any conflict; he derives satisfaction from all these urges and is not disturbed by the contradictions between them. Gradually, however, it becomes too difficult for him to reconcile his active urges toward father and mother with his passive urges toward them, either because the intensity of these urges has increased, or because there is now a need to unify (synthesize) all these libidinal positions. It becomes particularly difficult for the male child to combine his activity toward the mother with his passivity toward the father. If he wants to give full expression to his activity toward his mother, he finds the father in his way, for in reality it is the father, not he, who possesses the mother. He would like to direct his aggressive activity against the father, to remove him as an obstacle in relation to the mother, but on the other hand he wants to submit to the father in every respect. He cannot simultaneously possess the mother and remain passive toward the father. His desire to eliminate the father is incompatible with his passivity toward him. Libidinal expression in all of these attitudes is now inhibited and the child finds himself in conflict. That is the Oedipus complex.

1286

In the early stage of the establishment of the Oedipus complex the boy has as yet no knowledge of the anatomical difference between the sexes.¹⁹ He differentiates father and mother as personalities but not as sexual beings. He still thinks that all human beings are in possession of a penis, as he himself is. We say that he is in the phallic phase. But at some point before the age of three he observes that the penis, which he had attributed to all people, is missing in some. It is understandable for him to draw the conclusion that the woman is a man whose penis has been taken away, cut off. As a result of this experience he is stricken with castration anxiety; he is afraid that his own penis will be taken away. (The little girl has meanwhile assumed to her horror that she too once had a penis that was cut off.) Psychoanalysis has taught that this castration anxiety has always been present in nearly all human beings. It is an experience that scarcely anyone has been spared.

The next consequence of castration anxiety is an enormous intensification of the conflicts inherent in the Oedipus complex. The flow of the boy's libido into his active attitude toward the father increases

¹⁹This entire paragraph and the following four (ending “. . . some form of escape”) are deleted in the published book (p. 39).

greatly; added to this, hostility and hatred now make their appearance, stemming from the fear that the father is going to punish him by castrating him for coveting the mother. The more pronounced the boy's masculinity, the stronger his hostility toward the father. In order to free himself from castration anxiety and secure possession of the mother, the boy as a rule comes to wish for his father's death, and because the father doesn't die, it stirs the wish to kill him.

On the other hand, the boy's affectionate-active attitude toward the mother undergoes a considerable diminution, not only because of the danger of castration connected with the satisfaction of this libidinal current, but also because the mother as a castrated being has lost part of her attraction for the boy, indeed has even become an object of horror for him. This latter factor also reduces the passive flow of libido toward the mother. In this way castration anxiety leads inevitably to the mother losing value as a libidinal object.

As the boy's libido turns from the mother to the father, a great intensification of the passive attitude toward the father occurs. The portion of the boy's libido that had been directed toward femininity, toward taking pleasure in being passive, toward the need to submit to the father, would presumably be fully satisfied if the boy's assumption were correct that castration turns a male into a female. The boy believes in this transformation. His passivity pushes him to want to accept castration—to become female, and in this way escape castration anxiety once and for all. The female he wants to become is as a rule his own mother, whose place he takes with the father, substituting for her with the father. Thus, identification with the mother is established, and from this point on it is included as a permanent component of the boy's unconscious, and is destined to play a major role in his subsequent life. Later we shall become acquainted with another mechanism that contributes to the formation of this mother-identification.

The influence of castration anxiety on the boy's activity and passivity forces upon him a struggle against both of the dilemmas that constitute the Oedipus complex. He wants to kill his father and at the same time he wants to submit to him without reservation, even to the point of accepting the sacrifice of castration and transformation into a female. On the other hand, he wants to possess the mother as her lover, while at the same time he is repelled by her because she is a reminder of the dreaded castration. The conflict eventually becomes so unbearable that the child is compelled to find some form of escape.

The resolution of the Oedipus complex is the most difficult task facing human children in their psychic development. For boys the effect of castration anxiety²⁰ is that the greater part of their libido is directed away from the mother toward the father. Thus, the main problem is the incompatibility of two drive impulses, namely, to kill the father and to submit to him without reservation, both of which he passionately desires. A secondary problem is the irreconcilability of his erotic desire for his mother with the horror she awakens in him.

Identifying with the father is a technique practiced by all male children to free themselves from the major problem connected with the Oedipus complex. Equally unable to kill the father or to submit to him, the child finds a way out that is similar to eliminating the father yet at the same time avoids killing him. He identifies with the father. This satisfies both his loving and his hostile impulses. Not only has he given expression to his love for and admiration of the father, he has also eliminated him by incorporating him, as though in an act of cannibalism. Now he himself is the great, admired father.

1288 This step of identifying with the father also makes understandable the boy's urge to surpass the father, to be greater than the father, a desire we so often see dominating the life of a growing boy. To be sure, the father with whom the little boy identifies is not the father as he really is, and as his son will later recognize him to be, but rather a father whose power and merits have undergone an extraordinary exaggeration while his weaknesses and faults have been disavowed. It is the father as he appears to the little child. Measured in later years against this ideal figure, the real father inevitably falls short; and when the youth wants to surpass the father, he is really only turning from the father of his present experience back to the father figure of his childhood. As a result of incorporating his father, the all-mighty, all-wise, all-benevolent father of the child's early years has meanwhile become an internal mental agency, which in psychoanalysis we refer to as the ego ideal or superego. The superego manifests itself throughout life in the form of commands and prohibitions. Its negative prohibitory function is known to us all as conscience; its other, positive, authoritative side, although perhaps less easily perceptible, is certainly even more influential. It finds expression in everything a person strives for, consciously as well as unconsciously. In this way identification with the

²⁰The reference to castration anxiety is deleted in the published book (p. 40).

father evolves from the boy's unsatisfied desire to kill him, and from this identification in turn, evolve the ego ideal and superego.

The introduction of the superego of course does not resolve all the difficulties associated with the Oedipus complex, but it does provide a location for a certain part of the libido flow, which originally appeared as activity toward the father. However, it also becomes the source of new difficulties with which the ego henceforth has to struggle. For the superego will, for the rest of one's life, admonish, censure, repress, and attempt to rein in all libidinal urges and divert them from their aims, which in their original form do not meet the superego's demands. For many people this struggle between the libido within the ego [i.e., the libidinal ego] and the superego does not turn out too badly, either because the libido is weak and easily controlled by the superego, or because the superego is so weak that it must tolerate the libido going its own way, or, finally, because the demands of the superego do not greatly exceed what human nature is capable of, so that it no longer expects more of the libido than the latter is able to provide. A superego like this is very comfortable for the person who possesses it, but it has the disadvantage of allowing nothing more than a quite ordinary child of man to develop. A superego that does not demand much from the libido will not obtain much from it; the person who does not expect much of himself will not accomplish much either.

1289

At the other end of the spectrum is the superego whose demands are so grandiose that it continually exacts what is virtually impossible from the ego. A superego like this sometimes produces great men, as well as many psychotics and neurotics. The manner in which such a superego comes about is no mystery. We have heard that every child's imagination exaggerates the father's greatness and power, but in some cases this exaggeration is so extreme that the father, with whom the child identifies and who is the material from which his superego is constructed, is equated with almighty God the Father himself. In this case the superego indeed demands the impossible from the ego. Nothing the ego achieves in life satisfies the superego. It admonishes the ego incessantly: You must make the impossible possible. You can do it. You are your father's beloved son, you are your father himself, you are God. Such extremes on the part of the superego are not rare; psychoanalysis can affirm that identifying the father with God is a normal, if not usual, occurrence in mental life. And if the son identifies with the father, then identifies the father with God, and sets up this father image

as his superego, then the son feels that he has God within himself, that he himself has become God. Everything he does has to be right because it is God himself who has done it. The amount of libido invested in the identification with God is so great in some people that they lose the ability to acknowledge those facts of the external world that are inconsistent with it. They then end up in an asylum. To be sure, a man whose superego is based upon this kind of identification and who has retained full respect for reality can, if he possesses the capability, achieve great things in the world. His superego has demanded much and received much in return.

Naturally, it is one of the major tasks for every human being to come to terms with the world of reality. This is no easy task for the child. None of the urges of his libido can find full satisfaction in reality. He cannot kill his father; he cannot possess his mother. It is impossible for him to submit completely to his mother; it is just as impossible to submit completely to his father and become his wife by means of castration. The child cannot be almighty like God. Somehow or other all these contradictory desires must be reconciled, not only with one another but also with the realities of life. The demand is made of every human being in the world to achieve this reconciliation. Those who completely fail in the task will succumb to psychosis, to madness. Those who can attain only a partial, and thus unstable, balance among the conflicts will become neurotic. Only someone who succeeds in attaining a perfect balance will become a healthy, normal person. It must be added, though, that only rarely will healthy people be able to reconcile these conflicts so successfully that the balance achieved would not break down under the assault of external difficulties. We are justified in saying that all human beings are more or less neurotic. Nevertheless, for many people the balance is so firmly established that they can endure great misfortune without lapsing into neurosis; for others it takes very little misfortune for them to develop neurotic symptoms. We may say in conclusion that every human ego is the end product of the effort to reach a balance among all these conflicts: the conflicts between different libidinal urges, and the conflicts between the libido and the demands of the superego as well as those of the real external world. The kind of balance ultimately achieved depends, on the one hand, on the extent of the innate masculinity and femininity, and on the other hand, on the impressions received by the human being in childhood. The outcome of this attempt to establish balance is what we call the character of the ego.

The ego's task of reconciling the demands of its libido with the commands of the superego and with the conditions imposed on it by the external world is, as we have said, not an easy one. All the demands of the drives must somehow be dealt with; the superego insists on its demands, and adaptation to reality cannot be evaded. If it is impossible to fully satisfy the libido, then three mechanisms, which we shall now turn to, are available to complete the task: repression, identification, and sublimation. Repression consists in disavowing the drive demand that craves satisfaction, to treat it as if it didn't exist, to leave it in the unconscious and forget about it. Identification seeks to satisfy a drive wish by transforming the ego itself into the desired object, so that it is both at the same time—the desiring subject and the desired object. Sublimation uses the method of satisfying the drive wish at least partially, by substituting its unattainable object for another one that has nothing to fear from the reaction of the superego or from external circumstances. In this way the drive wish is displaced from a highly satisfying but inadmissible aim or object to a perhaps less satisfying but more readily attainable one.

Repression is the most impractical of these methods of bringing about the desired resolution of conflict, because it is impossible in the long run to disregard drive demands. Pressure from the libido eventually becomes too strong. The repression fails, and the libido breaks through. The intensity of the libido is greatly increased by repression, for it has not only been cut off from any possibility of discharge but also has been deprived of the moderating influence of reason, which takes reality into account. Behind the dam that repression has built, pressure from the libido grows, making its breakthrough inevitable. Repression succeeds insofar as the libido does not reach its original object but rather must strike out on new paths and attach itself to another object.

For example, a boy who completely represses his hostility toward the father will not for that reason be free of the drive-wish to kill him. On the contrary, behind the dam of repression aggressive activity toward the father builds up until the pressure becomes too great for the dam. The repression breaks down, and the hostility toward the father bursts through, manifesting itself either against the father himself or against persons who can be substituted for him, who somehow resemble him, and so on. If a neurosis develops, the child will displace his relationship with the father onto an animal and will display symptoms of the corresponding phobia.

Hostility toward the father is unavoidable for the boy insofar as he lays claims to masculinity. If a male has completely repressed this drive impulse in his childhood, in later life he will surely lapse into hostile relations with father representatives. He will manifest this hostility even when those in question do not deserve it but incur it for no other reason than that they in some way remind him of his father. In this case the cause of his hostility lies completely in himself—there is virtually no external reason for it. But if it should happen that he does have real grounds for his hostility, then his emotional reaction will be excessive and far out of proportion to the real situation. Such a person will generally have difficulty maintaining friendly relations with other men of similar position, power, and abilities, but he will find it utterly impossible to get along with those who are superior to him in position, power, and abilities. He is compelled to hate them.

We cannot leave the subject of repression without mentioning the technique used by the ego to reinforce individual instances of repression. To do this the ego creates what we call reaction formations, usually by strengthening impulses that are the opposite of those to be repressed. Thus, for example, repression of an initial predilection for dirt (originally for one's own feces) is replaced by a strong tendency toward overcleanliness or an aesthetic attitude in general. The tendency to repress passivity toward the father may result in an overemphasis on masculinity, which is then expressed in the arrogant rejection of any father substitute. Human mental life is a very complicated thing. Reaction formations against repressed drive impulses play no less a role in character formation than do the two early identifications with the father and with the mother.

The method of identification, which the ego employs to satisfy drive demands, is a very useful and frequently applied method. We have already traced the process by which aggressive activity toward the father leads to father identification and the creation of the superego, and by which passivity toward the father becomes mother identification. But everyone uses countless other forms of identification every day. It has been observed how a child whose kitten has been taken away compensates for the loss of this object by identifying with the kitten and the way it meows, crawls around, and eats from the floor. If a child is accustomed to have his father, as a "horsey," carry him on his shoulders, and the father is away for a long time, the child may put a doll on his own shoulders and carry it as his father carried him, now taking the

role of the father. A man who has lost the woman he loves may attempt, until he finds a new love, to substitute himself for the lost love object. (We shall come upon an instructive example of this kind in Wilson's life.) A man whose passivity toward his father could not find a direct outlet will often have recourse to a double identification. He will identify with his father, and he will seek out a younger man whom he identifies with himself and on whom he bestows the same love that he wished for from his father but that remained unsatisfied because of his passivity toward him. In this way he may become an active homosexual.

In many cases a man whose passive attitude toward the father has not found direct expression will find that expression by identifying with Jesus Christ. This identification is a regular occurrence, so to speak, in the mental life of a Christian; according to the testimony of psychoanalysis it can be demonstrated in completely normal people.²¹ That should not surprise us, for this identification accomplishes the feat (apparently miraculously) of reconciling two extremely powerful and absolutely contradictory wishes by fulfilling them both at the same time. The two wishes are: to be completely passive and subservient toward the father, to be completely feminine, and on the other hand to be completely masculine, powerful, and authoritative like the father himself. Christ was able to fulfill both these wishes: by humbly submitting to the will of God the Father he was able to become God himself; by surrendering to total femininity he was able to attain the ultimate aim of masculinity. Thus, it is understandable that identification with Christ is so frequently used to deal with the more important of the two Oedipal problems—the relationship with the father.

It is perhaps no accident that with the worldwide spread of Christendom during the first centuries after the birth of Christ an extraordinary decline in the direct expression of homosexuality coincided with its official suppression. Its direct expression simply had become unnecessary. Identifying with Christ gave expression to homosexuality in a manner that not only found social approval but also must have been acceptable to the superego, which always strives to resemble God. Christ is, after all, the perfect reconciliation between masculinity and femininity. Belief in his divinity includes the belief that one can realize the wildest dreams of activity by means of the utmost passivity; by submitting unreservedly to the father, one triumphs over him and becomes

²¹The remainder of this paragraph and the whole of the next one are deleted in the published book (p. 45).

God oneself. This mechanism of reconciling opposing impulses of masculinity in the constitutionally bisexual human being by identifying with Christ is something so satisfying that it assures the Christian religion a long existence. People will not readily be willing to give up something that rescues them from the most difficult conflict they have to grapple with. They will continue to identify with Christ for a long time to come.

There is yet another way to take care of the father problem inherent in the Oedipus complex once and for all, a way that involves a double identification. When the boy has become a man and has had a son of his own, he will identify this son with himself as a child and himself with his own father. His passivity toward his father now expresses itself in his relationship with his son; he gives his son the love he had once craved from his own father. This resolution of the Oedipus complex is the only normal one provided by nature, but it requires having a son. The working out of one's passivity toward the father is thus added to all the other motives for wanting a son.

We have already explained above how passivity to the father results in identification with the mother. Now we must mention a strengthening of this identification, which takes place when the Oedipus complex dissolves and the boy gives up his mother as a love object. One part of his active as well as his passive attitude to the mother is preserved by the boy's displacing both attitudes onto other women, but another part is not satisfied by this substitution, and identification ensues. In accordance with the mechanism with which we are familiar, the child compensates for the loss of the mother by identifying with her. In the course of his life he will then bestow on other men who take the place of the child he once was, more or less of the measure of love that he as a child had craved from the mother.

The third method used by the ego to reconcile its conflicts is sublimation, which, as we have said, replaces the libido's original aims with others to which neither the superego nor society objects. As far as objects are concerned, the same goal is attained through the process of displacement. This is the case when a boy, who after all cannot possess his mother, directs his libido away from her toward his sisters, if he has any, and then toward his cousins or his sisters' girlfriends, and finally from them toward unrelated women with whom he falls in love—until this path leads him to the woman he marries. The greater this woman's similarity to his mother, the more abundant the libidinal flow to his marriage can be and the greater the satisfaction he will find in it. And

yet, just as many reasons for dissension are present in this mother relationship. The number of sublimations that occur in people's libidinal investments is truly countless. We have these sublimations to thank for all higher achievements of our culture; all art and literature, for example, serve to create an outlet for some unsatisfied libidinal urge or other; even scientific research is the offspring of the child's early curiosity concerning his parent's genitals. Human society itself is held together by sublimated homosexual libido, for the passivity of boys toward their fathers later transforms itself into a love of their fellow human beings that serves society. If human bisexuality necessarily appears to us at times as a heavy burden and the source of endless difficulties, we must not forget that without it human society could not exist at all. If men displayed nothing but aggressive activity and women nothing but passivity, the human race would have become extinct long before the dawn of historical times, because the men would all have murdered one another. It is homosexuality—although not in its manifest form but rather in its sublimations—that ensures the continuation of a community of men and that will perhaps succeed one day in uniting all races of humanity in one great brotherhood.

1295

Before ending this presentation of the basic presuppositions of psychoanalysis, it may be useful to mention some additional findings.

Anything that prevents the draining away of libido creates a damming up and increases pressure in the affected area, pressure that can then extend to other areas. The libido just presses for discharge. Damming up of the libido is not tolerated for long above a certain level. We can compare the libido to a stream of water flowing down from a high mountain reservoir, fed by sources that never dry up, a stream that then divides into a number of channels. This analogy is useful as it reminds us of the libido's characteristic of demanding discharge and also illustrates the possibility of communication between its various channels. The comparison is inadequate, however, because it does not sufficiently emphasize that the libido can remain at rest, as a cathexis of a certain level.

The libido's intensity—or, we should say from our point of view, its quantity—varies greatly from person to person. Some have an extraordinarily powerful libido, others only a very weak one. Or to use our metaphor: in some the reservoir on the mountain is a large lake, in others a small pool.

The libido will always abandon the channel it flows into when a new one, closer to its source, opens up—provided that the opposition

from the ego and the external world is not greater in the case of the new one. It will also be prepared to relinquish a sublimation if it can find another one that is more satisfying.

In childhood the discovery of gender differences led to castration anxiety²² with all its consequences. There is another childhood experience, second in importance only to this one, and that is the birth of another child. When confronted with the arrival of a little brother, a boy generally reacts in a specific way: he feels betrayed by the father, as well as the mother, because both of his wishes—to have a child with the mother and to bear a child for the father—have now been disappointed. The fact that a child has arrived through the interaction of father and mother but without any consideration of his own fervent wishes drives him to feelings of intense hostility toward both parents, hostility that can culminate in wishing them both dead. The reproach for having been betrayed by his parents, and the hatred, can then be transferred wholly or partially onto the younger brother. A normally developing child will free himself of hatred by means of a typical identification. He becomes the [new] child's father and puts the younger brother in his own place. But in a less normal development the reproach of betrayal remains attached to the brother, and for the rest of his life the older boy will be suspiciously on the lookout to see if the friends who later take the place of the younger brother act toward him in ways that repeat the earlier betrayal.

In the case just described, the feeling of having been betrayed is based on the disappointment of active as well as passive libidinal impulses. But something much more serious can result from passive homosexuality. Its repression drives many people into the persecutory form of paranoia, into delusional persecution. As a rule, the patient at first believes that he is being persecuted and betrayed by the one he has loved most. The delusions of betrayal and persecution often have no factual basis whatever; they express the need to break free from the loved person who has not gratified the patient's passive homosexuality. If the patient can assume that the person he loves so ardently is betraying and persecuting him, then he can replace love with hate and is thus free of the love. All cases of unjustified mistrust and delusions of persecution can easily be traced back to repressed homosexuality. People who cannot be called mad also make use of this same

²²The reference to castration anxiety is deleted in the published book (p. 48).

mechanism to keep their passive homosexuality from getting out of hand. Whenever we come across someone who is inclined to believe that his closest friends want to betray him, we may assume that his suspicions are a sign that he is protecting himself against passive homosexual feelings. If a friend can in any way be seen as a representative of the original betrayer, the younger brother, then this defense against homosexuality obviously will have an easier time of it. Fortunately it is difficult for halfway normal people to be compelled to turn from the facts of real life to imagined facts; this occurs only in those unfortunate individuals whose passive homosexuality is excessive.

It is perhaps a law, but in any case a frequent occurrence, that one directs a considerable amount of hatred toward a person one loves with particular intensity. When this occurs, one or the other of these opposing emotions is wholly or partly forced into the unconscious. We call this the fact or principle of ambivalence.

Frustrations and misfortunes of every kind have the effect of forcing the libido back into its previous positions—for example, of reversing sublimations to their original wishful cathexes. This is what we call regression.

In the course of a human life it can happen that at some point mental development comes to a sudden standstill and termination. An overwhelming event has forced the libido into positions that are then clung to until death or until mental deterioration occurs. This is the definition of fixation.

[Freud's manuscript ends abruptly here, but in the published book is followed by a new chapter that begins as follows: "We have now set forth a few of the discoveries of psychoanalysis which we shall treat as axioms in making our psychological study of Thomas Woodrow Wilson. . . ."]

REFERENCES

- ERIKSON, E. (1967). Book review. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 48:462–468.
- FREUD, S. (2006). Ein bisher unbekannter Text. *Neue Rundschau* 117:9–26.
- & BULLITT, W.C. (1967). *Woodrow Wilson: A Psychological Study*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- GORER, G. (1967). Book review. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 48:468–470.
- JONES, E. (1957). *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud: Vol. 3. The Last Phase, 1919–1939*. London: Hogarth Press.

- LASKY, M. (1967). Editorial footnote. *Encounter* 28:3.
- RICHARDS, A. (1987). Editorische Vorbemerkung. *Gesammelte Werke, Nachträgsband*. Frankfurt: Fischer Verlag, pp. 683–685.
- ROAZEN, P. (in press). *The Doctor and the Diplomat*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- SCHUR, M. (1972). *Freud: Living and Dying*. New York: International Universities Press.
- STRACHEY, J. (1974). Addenda and corrigenda. *The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, vol. 24. London: Institute of Psycho-Analysis & Hogarth Press, pp. 407–468.

International Neuro-Psychoanalysis Centre
13 Prowse Place
London NW1 9PN
UNITED KINGDOM
E-mail: mark.solms@neuro-psa.org