

[Draft #2]

Social Crises and the Nature of Mind

Leo Rangell

This essay I am presenting, at the invitation of Arnold Richards, is to share with the readers of this psychoanalytic web-site an introduction I wrote for the latest meeting of a discussion group I have been conducting with a group of West Coast psychoanalysts over the last decade. While the contents of these interchanges are free-ranging, the fulcrum around which the general orientation revolves, by the original consensus, is the unitary view I hold about psychoanalytic theory. In a summary formulation, this view is of a “total composite psychoanalytic theory”. However variable and ad-hoc each session evolves, the discussions, both free and in depth, attest to how the most varied, diverse, creative and innovative contributions about innumerable aspects or tributaries of theory can be subsumed under that cumulative, organizing conceptual frame, which unifies and makes coherent all observable, Jackson Pollack-like, seemingly chaotic data.

One of the original aims of this blog, Arnie explained at the beginning, was for it to be a vehicle for works in progress, not necessarily finished products, thus to better stimulate research and creative interchange. To encapsulate this particular introductory essay, its central theme is to describe a new or fresh concept of a historic path toward theory formation, the intimate inter-relations between theory and the external surround. Empirically and by serendipity, this is shown to have played its part in leading to the structural point of view. This fresh look counteracts the current trend to downplay or even discard that previously-superordinate point of view of Freudian metapsychology.

The id was born of Victorian Vienna. The ego reached its operative zenith during the inventive, can-do optimism of post World-War-2-America. The superego comes into sharp focus, even if via its negative, at the end-of-century corruption of ethics and morals, with its flood and ubiquity of compromises of integrity. This story does not follow that sequence, but that is how history took place.

Our meeting in Kensington this time (Feb. 28, 2009) will focus on larger issues, a macroscopic view of psychoanalysis in relation to its cultural surround.

Here are some personal points of contact with such an orientation. I will pass these before you in an introductory survey, followed by a sharing of relevant experiences and reflections. Our clinical experiences, as usual, will be sought in corroboration and expansion of this subject.

1980.

”Convulsive times turn up new views of our inner selves” Carol Houck Smith, editor of “The Mind of Watergate”, wrote in the flyleaf of my 1980 book.

Carol just died in New York this past December, I read, surprisingly, in the Los Angeles Times. When she edited my book 30 years ago, I did not know that she was to become a distinguished figure in the publishing world, who edited three poet laureates, Pulitzer Prize and National Book Award books, all of which I learned from the national obituary following her recent death. I had seen her a few times in between. [Here is her obituary and Carol’s picture]

“I am in awe”, Carol had written me when the book was first accepted by Norton and she was to become its editor. But the central message it introduced and pursued did not fare as well in general absorption as the others of Carol’s efforts. This was so even within our own socio-scientific milieu of psychoanalysis. Perhaps this reflected the fate of psychoanalysis in general at its origins, which was far from fast. Moral conflicts, in fact, have an even tougher way to go than instinctual ones.

“The turbulence of the 70’s exposed a syndrome that world-renowned psychoanalyst Leo Rangell calls ‘the compromise of integrity’”, Carol went on in the flyleaf. “The drama we refer to as Watergate was more than a complex of apartment buildings; it was -and is- a complex in the mind of humankind”.

Here are some summary excerpts from my study of the national crisis at that time:

“The ‘syndrome of the compromise of integrity’ (C of I) is as ubiquitous as neurosis in human affairs.

Ambition, power and opportunism, the three horsemen of “the syndrome of C of I”, are normal traits gone awry.

Narcissism unbridled is the enemy of integrity.

All of these are normal, adaptive, psychological attributes when existing in appropriate dosages. We wish our children to develop ambition, to acquire the power

of mastery, to love the self. Yet all such aims and traits can become malignant in overdose, whether in a dictator or in the average individual.”

The abnormal period under study (of Nixon’s Watergate) uncovered this pathology, perhaps more important in groups and the masses than in individuals. It is the base of the population pyramid that determines the direction and state of the nation. 39 Of the 40 “men under Nixon” went along knowingly with the wrong-doing, a ratio that can likely be extrapolated to larger groups. The people elected Nixon President by a landslide after his nickname had been “tricky Dick” for a quarter century, and after the criminal break-in had been traced to the White House.

A new universal syndrome had been added to the psychoanalytic armamentarium alongside neurosis and psychosis as endemic to man in his struggles to cope with external and internal unconscious conflicts. We might say that this was the first or the most extensive depth probe of the fragility of the superego in the development of psychoanalytic theory.

Uncovered first in the political realm, the psychological mechanisms exposed are equally present in all aspects of human life, in business, sports, academia, at all socio-economic levels, all ages, and in all strivings and behavioral activities of man.

This historical stratum of data and their segment of theory construction unfolded with the serendipital socio-political developments of the first few years of the early seventies- the precipitating stimulus was the infamous Watergate break-in in June, 1972.

Vienna, 1890.

Looking back with the same subject in mind, theory and society, the data from which Freud started his exploration and construction of the nature of mind was from the sexual mores of the Victorian culture, as these were presented to him and an older neurologist, Josef Breuer, in fin de siecle Vienna.

From this bed of clinical data, after he discovered the method of free association, Freud began to construct the theory of the human mind that became psychoanalysis. Among the pillars were the successive building blocks of: the unconscious, repression, the instincts of sex and aggression, the reservoir of repressed contents which came to be known as the id, defenses, the system ego, and a cluster of functions comprising the rule-setting superego. Among several guiding formulae

that came to play major, enduring roles were the pleasure-pain principle and 5 metapsychologic points of view useful to encompass any psychological data.

From my viewpoint and orientation, and an overview of the historical development of the theory of psychoanalysis, the first 4 decades of the Century of Freud saw the first outlines, if not the full construction of a total theoretical tree. The original strong foundation by Freud himself in effect led to both the footprint and silhouette of the first phase of a total composite theory, even though the highlights of various sections were to come in successive historical phases.

While in assessing a final psychic product we cannot underestimate either the role of the creator or the data from which it is derived, my focus today is a view of the surround in the birth and development of psychoanalytic theory. To consider what came to the attention of Freud and Breuer (we should add Charcot to Breuer as accomplices and co-authors), for Freud to dream and plan and execute the concept, the soil it came from had to be there as well.

Half a century later, Erik Erikson, the analyst most identified with the reciprocal role of the individual and society, articulated this principle: “times meet the man”. Both have to be there. In current life, Jesse Jackson was there, and Al Sharpton, but the surround was not ready. Obama was there at the right time.

As an example in which the two are not there together: in our milieu right now, a President of the American Psychoanalytic, who agrees with my composite theory, told me analysts are not ready for a unified theory, therefore it is not to be suggested or supported at this time.

Back to Freud: From the first glimmer of insights emanating from the original clinical experiences to the rapidly cumulating discoveries that followed, the seeds that were to develop into the lush, new ideational growth stemmed from the external surround, its yield taking root in the mind of its main progenitor, who nurtured the newly-born ideas into the innovative and comprehensive form it would take. The external inputs during this remarkable first gestation period spanned from Victorian Vienna, with its sexual repression, through World War 1, with its death and aggression. The former led to the sexual instincts and the theory of dreams, the latter to the addition of the aggressive drive, and it’s more surreal and disputed accompaniment of the death instinct.

The Id.

In terms of the focus within early theory and its impact on the receptive world, the influences of these cumulative insights came seriatim. The first phase in these respects, perhaps the first third of the Freudian Century, was synchronous with Freud's personal output, from about 1890 through the 1930's. The central cluster was to become the trunk of the specific psychoanalytic tree of knowledge (see the tree in "The Road to Unity", Rangell, 2007), the contents of the repressed unconscious. From repressed instinctual drives, unconscious affects, and intrapsychic conflicts, acted upon by unconscious defenses, came the understanding of dreams and symptoms.

I would like to linger a moment, as a symbol and metaphor, on the role and fate of a special, integral concept of Freud's, within the psychoanalytic trunk, his famous and controversial "metapsychological points of view" (1914-16). Considered by Freud to be capable of encompassing any psychological phenomenon, these multiple directions, though relatively loosely applied, remain logical and rational concepts. They were originally 5, made into 6 by the important addition of the adaptive by Rapaport and Gill (1959), and by the work of Hartmann (1939).

It has been customary for revisionists, mostly those who still wish to embrace most of the Freudian opus, to attempt to shorten or streamline this series, by discarding one or more of the specific elements, in the name of avoiding redundancy or in a general "post-modern" revisionist mind-set, an international movement questioning intellectual development across the board.

Of the dynamic, genetic, economic, topographic, structural and adaptive views, the most vulnerable have been the economic, widely criticized, and the topographic, argued against in two closely-reasoned monographs (Gill, 1963; Arlow and Brenner, 1964), both of which accrued large adherents. The latest such trend was the surprising reversal by Brenner (1994, 2002), who had been one of the most authoritative supporters of the Freudian view, to question the necessity of the structural view, which many, myself included, regard as the apex and peak concept of this series. Earlier in his long, productive career, Brenner had argued, with great support, for the discarding of the topographic and economic points of view.

In a dialogue with Sandler, Anna Freud (Sandler and Freud, A., 1985) felt that there seemed no valid reason for minimization of either the economic or topographic or for that matter any specific one of these points of view, that each served its own function in a theoretically useful way. I (2000) have written similarly of my difference with Brenner about structural theory. The present paper is an example of its continued usefulness. This work subsumes the entire life history of

psychoanalytic theory under the rubric of that structural view, embracing all observed data into the three psychic systems during the three phases of theory development I am here describing.

Besides the central trunk, the outer rim of the periphery of this theoretical tree was also visible during this phase of Freud's direct creativity, although the details of inner contents were not as much highlighted. Yet these were considerable, paid less attention to only because of the startling impact of their antecedents. There were also during this span the seeds and a large amount of detail of a group psychology (1920), and an archaeological look backward evolutionarily, with Totem and Taboo (1913), always from the intrapsychic to the outer world, in both directions, with firm connections in-between. Yet historically, this was a period, a circumscribed one, of id psychology: the unconscious, instinctual drives of sex and aggression, unconscious intrapsychic conflict, and symptom formation. The theory of anxiety (1926) was a bridge between id and ego, activity between the two being continuous and reciprocal.

At Freud's death in 1939, the legacy of theory he left behind was an id psychology in substantial depth, and the outlines of a general theory with many lacunae still to be filled.

“Ego psychology”.

In the time between the two Wars--a period on which Germany as a nation also layed much stock--there was a steady advancement and consolidation of this early theoretical structure by Freud and his early followers to expand and strengthen it. But this was also accompanied by the beginning outline of an alternative theory--of Harry Stack Sullivan--emphasis on the interpersonal, cultural, and external, rather than the intrapsychic. As the run-up to World War 2 darkened and the roles of the group and of interpersonal conflict heightened, Sullivanian theory was joined by Fromm, strongly supported on a socio-political level. Toward the end of this period, Karen Horney also grew in influence and stature, as did her strong cultural input. “Neurosis is a product of our times”, was her theoretical center, the focus shifting from the internal to the external world.

In my concept of a cumulative, steadily-developing, composite Freudian theoretical tree, the new emphases of Sullivan, Fromm, and Horney would have been grafted and nurtured to grow ON this tree. The same was true of the early pregenital emphasis of Melanie Klein, taking off in the opposite direction during this early

historical period, away from the external world to the deeper inner world of the infant.

Retrospectively, the same could have been said about earlier dissenters or alternative theory builders, as Jung, Adler and Rank, whom fate--due to people, ideas and the historical times--relegated to separate systems. The field was too fragile at the beginning, in addition to the creators being too insecure in their moorings, to be able to tolerate diverse paths. Adler could have been added to ego psychology, Rank could have presaged Klein, or Spitz, or Stern, and Jung could have been seen as a precursor of ambiguity, uncertainty, spiritualism and faith, so much in the vanguard today.

World War 2.

In 1939, besides the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the German panzers, Heinz Hartmann published his classic Ego psychology, and Anna Freud shortly before that her epic Ego Defenses. An intellectual tug of war was going on, with giant analytic thinkers (Robert Waelder can be added to the Freudian side) and the culturalists equally energized and animated on each side. The former group, centered on internal etiology, linked with the existentialists Heidegger, Jaspers, Kierkegaard and Sartre.

Otto Fenichel, one of a heroic band fleeing ahead of the advancing Nazis, weighed the two approaches, was in conflict between Freud and Marx, and came down on the side of protecting psychoanalysis, then in the form of the International Psychoanalytic Association. Wilhelm Reich wavered, and in the end was entrapped by a combination of irrational psychoanalytic theories and private madness. Edith Jacobson was one of that group, who made it to New York. Fenichel came to Los Angeles, where he joined Ernst Simmel, both there at the behest of Freud.

America joined the world battle in 1941. Many of us analysts and candidates-to-become-analysts left our lives and were promptly into the war. Psychoanalysis became the dynamic compass of military psychiatry. Even in WW1, Ernst Simmel, at the time an officer-psychiatrist in the German army, had written that shell shock (the name then) was due not to petechial hemorrhages in the brain but to castration anxiety. In the American war experience 25 years later, in the spirited training, writing and indoctrinating by such recruited analysts as Wm. Menninger, Roy Grinker, Jock Murray and Douglas Bond, battle fatigue or war neuroses (the new names) and PTSD were traced to their underlying unconscious conflicts. Some of us taught these concepts to young military physicians in The School of Aviation

Psychiatry in the Air Force. A large cadre of future psychoanalysts was born in those days.

Following “the good War”, 1946.

The post-War era was a banner period for Freud’s psychoanalysis. In the great Army discharge months of 1946, trickles of analysts, at all stages of their development, began to pour into every major city in the United States --to their home cities and to new, chosen locations. I was part of an avalanche of dynamic psychiatrist-analysts to the West Coast, a group displacement from the Eastern seaboard’s winter cold.

In all of these places, where unity in theory and organization was at first the rule, the late 40’s through the ‘50’s and ‘60’s went on to become “The Golden Years”, when patients, candidates, teachers, and theorists had a hey-day and flourished. Nowhere as in America did the culture respond and support the glamorous, still-new theoretical system that explained everything. Deep rivers of clinical work met reciprocal receptive streams in literature, film, art, theater, in the conversations of everyday life.

In the initial overall, binding theory, all aspects fused into a coherent whole. With controversies at the periphery at every outer segment of the circle, these were lived with and known and faced while the center held. This was the socially-embraced reign of “ego psychology”, which became the domain of the American Psychoanalytic. This actually was one of the most deceptive labels in our history, since the binding theory was not of one psychic system but a total one, which combined the three psychic systems and the external world. No data was left out. There were time-bombs on all sides, socio-political-administrative-educational-who were to be trained as analysts?, but the unified theory, existing above all these questions, attained and maintained a period of consolidation.

The International during this period was more democratic than the American, and more in line with Freud’s views on training. Yet regarding theory, Anna Freud, for example, was closer to American friends even though she was part of the administratively-hurt non-medical segment. Intellectually, she was far more at home with the likes of Gitelson, Hartmann and Rapaport than with Klein in her own city, or the dispersed Kleinians in England, Europe and South America, where medical vs non-medical was not the dividing line.

The ground behind the shorthand title of American theory was the total id-ego psychology to which the field was being extended at that time in its history. The

accurate fact was that the clinical-theoretical surge that took off post-War did for the ego in mid-century what the Freudian pioneers had done for the id in the first 4 decades of the history of the new science. The American ego, born to rugged individualism and dedicated to preserve independent individuality, found its mantra. The science had now grown to be a fused ego-id theory in fact, although its outlines had been laid down since Freud's Ego and the Id in the '20's. The glib slogan of "ego psychology", ironically, was a distraction. To add, not replace, was in operation, and should have been more recognized at this core phase of theoretical developmental history. The going and successful explanatory system of the gilded period was the total theory as developed to that point. This was in reality the era of ego-id psychology, both in theory and technique.

During this peaceful and fruitful era, the third structure was also there and quietly in place. There was no large or looming moral infringement, no violations on the theoretical front. During this time, a precarious balance existed, in which a unified theory lived alongside darkening clouds on the administrative-educational levels with no intellectual incompatibility threatening any split regarding theory. Both sides of the growing administrative chasm between medical and lay analysis favored the existent and expanding tripartite theoretical system.

This position of psychoanalytic theory, the total theory under the logo of ego psychology, remained the dominant theory as the field prospered and gained ground on all fronts during its incremental period from post World War 2 into the '50's and '60's. Patients and candidates were in abundant supply as the discipline, its science and its practice, enjoyed inner and outer respect and success. Its applications kept briskly apace as well into the arts, sciences, academic and commercial worlds.

1969.

As is now well-known and a much-dissected fact, a peak came at the end of the '60's, with quite some precision in timing and initial location. While tensions were growing as to whom the field belonged, scientific developments followed their own course under their own specific determinants, meeting a major turn in the road at the end of that decade. At that time, a window into a quite unified American psychoanalysis was opened by first a few, then a steady march of Kleinian theorists into the Los Angeles Society-Institute, and gradually from there onto the larger U.S. scene. This inroad had been built-up by private study groups in that area for a short time before these moves, and led to a newly-excited atmosphere of theoretical discussion. These developments coincided with my accession to the Presidency of the International in 1969.

I cannot follow the details here, which I (2004) have described in depth previously. In summary, in my view and account of this history, centering in LAPSI, the scientific method of theory expansion and development was severely compromised as an explosion of theories ensued in a compressed and turbulent time, leading to the pluralism of today. Operating under motivations of frustrated ambition, envy, and competitive rivalry, the same leaders who orchestrated the initial changes shifted in rapid succession from Klein to Kohut, to Bion, to Stolorow and intersubjectivity, and other alternative theories and schools, each of which would acquire a following for a circumscribed period. For documentation of these events that changed the course of psychoanalytic history, I refer the readers to my book “My Life in Theory”, 2004. The various end results are either extolled or critiqued, depending on which version a particular recorder of history was bred and informed.

Along with these developments, parallel administrative and group changes came about as the invited Kleinians became uninvited by the host group that had brought them to the Los Angeles Society. What resulted in the aftermath was a proliferation of new Societies and groups, some aiming to become accepted into ongoing larger Associations (the American and the International), others preferring, or feeling they had no choice but to go it alone. Thus Los Angeles eventually became the scene of a PCC, ICP, a merged Center (NCP), and an independent non-medical group (LAISPS) that pursued its own history of training and eventual success in becoming part of the IPA. There are other off-shoots as well, for a variety of reasons.

It was this historical development that led to the study group from which I am writing this essay. About 10 years ago, a few San Francisco analysts, Adrienne Applegarth and Jules Weiss, approached me because of their apprehension that the same sequence, a flood of new theories, might overtake their Society, which they saw as undesirable and already starting. The present discussion group evolved from that.

Incidentally, their fears were well taken. An inevitable parallel development did get under way, although not with exactly the same interpersonal backgrounds. This proceeded by incremental steps to the present ambience of pluralism, which most of the official Society-Institute seems to now take for granted and to consider progressive and an advanced state of the field.

While the long-simmering antagonism toward the American was related to its stance on lay analysis, critiques about theory stand on a different base and need to be separated from the former. Both approval of standard theory and bitter attacks against it were, in my opinion, equally represented in medical and lay circles,

although the deeply-divisive affects about training invaded and led to confusion in the theoretical arena as well. From Anna Freud to Robert Waelder, Ernst Kris, David Rapaport and Erik Erikson, non-medical analysts were as prominent contributors to “ego psychology” as were the medical Hartmann or Fenichel.

The same applies to the contributors to the array of alternative theories that led to the splintering of the theoretical field from the seventies on. Among actual and would-be innovators, there was no distinction between those within and those who came from outside a biological orientation. The bio and the social coexisted at the beginnings of the field, in the very early pioneers, and continued as partners as progress and expansion of the theoretical frame proceeded.

But in the decades since the end of the sixties the procession of new theories flowed in a constant stream, from their initiation in Los Angeles to the present moment, still a challenge to the consistency and coherence of psychoanalytic theory. During that time of a succession of new theories, which I have described as partial explanations substituting for the whole, a unitary theory that stood on a collective bed of observations has been on the defensive, fending off accusations of arbitrariness, authority, hegemony and dictatorship.

To name a few of these diverging theories or altered centers of interest, after a previous temporary popularity of “the therapeutic community” almost as an alternative to individual psychoanalysis, there followed periods favoring or focusing upon enactment, self-disclosure, countertransference on a par with transference, two-person psychoanalysis, or, as more complete systems, self-psychology over ego psychology, or the total works of Bion, or then an overall dominance of intersubjectivity, widely supported as an antidote to the abhorred neutrality or “objectivity” of the classical analyst.

As I said about the common traits of ambition, power and opportunism, that each of these is normal in appropriate dosages, the same is the case with regard to new assertions about theory said to be central. It is never a question of all or none, but of how much of a new focus has been added and what has been excluded. There is always some self disclosure; the analyst always observes actions, postures, mannerisms i.e., enactments; and there is always self analysis going on, as well as analysis of the analyst by the patient. In each instance, an exaggerated normal is converted to a system of explanation while minimizing or even eliminating original insights and method. In this vein, self psychology downplays the role of the ego, even the existence or value of such a construct, and in the opinions of many, of the

unconscious as well. Similarly, Kleinian psychology focuses on the preoedipal at the expense of oedipal conflicts, to the detriment of the explanatory power of the total, complete psychoanalytic theory, in which one leads to the other and both continue to operate. In the interpersonal theories, the intrapsychic is usually minimized, and with it also the unconscious. The castration complex, I have pointed out, is often lost in favor of primitive separation anxiety.

I consider it no accident that the period of decline of our science, discipline and profession coincides with the date of this huge alteration of our intellectual spine.

Psychoanalysis and Society.

To return to social crises and their effects on theory, my initial point of entry, there is an uncanny yet not surprising overlap in developments along both of these lines, theory and society. Both find themselves currently in states of crisis. On the social front, built around the recent national election, a milestone moment of transition (to Obama) has the whole world in a state of suspension. Will promises and expectations be translated into facts? I described, in an op-ed piece from a psychoanalytic point of view, which kinds of fruition can await us. Now we wait to see whether the hopes of change (the most-used word by both sides) aroused by the election will be fulfilled. My interpretations of what was achieved by the election of Obama and the end of Bush rule, was an advance in the manifestations of instinctual behavior, emotional maturity and intellectual honesty, i.e., attributes derivative of id, ego and superego functioning. Would these now come through as promised and hoped?

The same hope and promise and wonder await the world of psychoanalytic understanding and its derivative treatment: will the potential held forth by theory succeed in being able to encompass and explain clinical and other observable data with a sufficient amount of satisfaction and reward? Will the promise of psychoanalysis be followed by a comparable payoff in results? Will the ultimate state of our theory and the direction it takes indeed provide any convincing cause and effect satisfaction at all for the long-laboring and patient psychoanalyst at work?

The Superego.

If the late 19th and the early 20th century provided the soil for the consolidation of id psychology, and the mid-century and its post-war rush led to the mushrooming of the adjacent ego, the time has come for catch-up by the third great, active psychic system, the superego. For this, the phenomenology is ripe on all fronts. From Nixon

on in the last third of this Century of Freud, we have been treated to a succession of events on the socio-economic-political scene dripping with superego pathology.

In a talk on “Psychoanalysis and Politics” at the last Berlin Congress, I (2007) stated that the hysterical patient of fin-de-siecle Vienna has been superseded by the corrupt or at least unethical compromiser of integrity at the beginning of this next century of human history. Wherever we turn, from politics to business, sports, academia, science, economics, we are confronted by the same unexpected fall from grace of a highly-respected figure to the depths of embarrassment and disgrace. We have but to think of such names as Gov. Spitzer or Blagojevich, Sen. Craig or Stevens, Pete Rose or Barry Bonds, Ken Lay or Bernard Madoff, Jim Bakker or Ted Haggard, examples of the lives of the highly-respected in diverse activities, to be struck with humility about the composition and potential fate of everyman.

Our discipline is no exception. The number of luminaries who have fallen by the wayside, from exalted positions to expulsion, from organizational and educational peaks to boundary violations of sex, power and money, match those in any field. The Chairs of Psychiatry at Stanford and Emory, co-authors of a leading textbook, are partners in unethical activities with pharmaceutical companies.

We are in an era of the superego, even if in its breach. Perhaps the phase of failure comes before the positive, just as that was the historical sequence with the other 2 psychic systems. With both id and ego, it was compromises in the first case, deficits or deficiencies in the other that preceded knowledge of the adaptive and creative functions of each.

I suggest we exercise the same combination of alertness, tolerance and objectivity in estimating the state and nature of our theories in the moral realm as we did in the empirical issues of ego and id. Ethical and moral phenomena in subtle form are not new. Ernest Jones, upon becoming the Editor of the new International Journal of Psychoanalysis in 1920, in an editorial in the first issue wrote that there were two forms of opposition to psychoanalysis. The first, a direct opposition, denying the new truths as false, is the least dangerous. The second form “is to acquiesce in the new ideas on condition that their value is discounted, the logical consequences not drawn from them, and their meaning diluted” (p. 4)”. This attitude, which can have a moral as well as defensive base, is still endemic today, although in the opposite direction. It is the persistence of the old theories or ideas, rather than the value of the new that, although acknowledged, is operationally denied.

Often complex outer manifestations of conflict reflect a subtle combination of both types of inner conflict, the ego opposing id impulses or resisting superego value

inputs, or both at the same time. Moral conflicts are old, but they are not always welcome, and their centrality can often not be easily abided. I add, with hesitation yet for your consideration and reflection, that my Berlin paper on the ubiquity of C of I was rejected by the International Journal in its report of contributions at the International Congress. The mainstream, whether it moves forward or stands still, is no longer main. The paper, however, was requested and published in the Rivista di Psicoanalisi in Italy.

In 1980, over 26 years ago, when my Watergate book appeared, locating the roots of C of I in the public, the first review was a few sentences buried in the New York Times, written by a then-little-known Jeff Greenfield, later to become a familiar commentator. "I just knew some shrink would come along and say it was our fault", he wrote in a dismissive opinion that helped push the book into immediate oblivion. Today, in 2008, reviewing one of a spate of books and films on the public's acquiescence with Hitler, Roger Ebert writes "[It is] a fact of human nature: Most people, most of the time, all over the world, choose to go along. We vote with the tribe".

The erosions of integrity that are the order of the day in public life is as ego-syntonic as are neurotic character traits endemic to civilized living. It is a long jump from C of I to pdychopathy or crime. Mild lacunae exist unseen and un-tagged throughout the population pyramid. The barrage of scams and swindles in every aspect of personal life residing in and aimed at the average citizen is steady and endemic.

The presence of corruption at the base of the population does not eliminate the role of the leaders. There is a gross saying: a fish stinks (I would add: or smells good) from the head. On the list of Presidents since Nixon, we have had: (these are selected data from each; they do not preclude the laudable accomplishments of each of them): Ford, who pardoned Nixon and thereby was limited to one term; Carter, the clean-up man, who was thereby relegated to one term: a plain, clean President has as little chance against a charismatic rival as the brilliant and articulate Adlai Stevenson had over a military hero, General Eisenhower; Reagan, whose secret actions in Nicaragua via Iran-Contra, which could have constituted treason, were much more serious than the clumsy burglary by Nixon's plumbers; he also enjoyed his own private war incursion into Grenada almost un-noticed by the rest of the world; with a casual nod of his head, he could even ward off talk of Alzheimer's; Bush 1, whose excursion into Kuwait was as much an initiated war as was that of his son to come later; his "no new taxes" turned out to also be an embarrassing falsehood; Clinton, who did well for the people but could not control his personal, and much more endemic, transgressions; then Bush 2, whose bald lie told for an initiated war of his own was only one of his mediocre or worse traits that belittled

the Office of the President. The present President finally gives promise of turning the corner into the direction of ethical conduct.

If leaders were disappointing, we have the base, the electorate, to thank each time. Democracy comes at a price. I have shown, in an analysis of public opinion that the people participating in an election, or viewing a Super Bowl game, or listening to the Senate Judiciary Committee discuss whether to confirm Clarence Thomas as a Supreme Court Justice, are characteristically split into a virtual 50-50 division. Almost every Presidential election is around 48 Or 49 vs. 51 or 52% (with exceptions).

On almost every crucial and controversial dichotomy that arises, people are internally split as to what or who is right or wrong, what is best, whether to be independent or to be cared for, whether to grow up or stay young. The Presidential elections, even the one decided by the Supreme Court, are closely determined, split the country in two. The Supreme Court's decision electing Bush #2 was by a 5-4 vote, a division, I wrote, that reflects the basic, universal nature of conflict in the unconscious, individual and collective. "From good to evil", writes Solzhenitsyn (1974) is one quaver. If it were only so simple. If only there were evil people somewhere insidiously committing evil deeds and it were necessary only to separate them from the rest of us and destroy them. But the line dividing good and evil cuts through the heart of every human being. And who is willing to destroy a piece of his own heart?'

The traditional analytic views on the non-moralistic stance of the analyst I believe are long gone. While I reverberated positively in early years to Hartmann's guidelines about the analyst's neutral moral front to the patient, (and Waelder's and Anna Freud's) I believe that this was desirable to achieve during those years, when a non-judgmental position went a long way to sculpt the sought-for objectivity that brought a new scientific attitude to the subject of human conflict. But as time went on into the complex presentations and behaviors of modern emotional disturbances, such a stance has long been in need of modification. Following my introduction of C of I and the continuous mushrooming of this type of psychopathology in current life, an omission of concern over this type of intrapsychic conflict leaves a huge gap in the psychoanalytic firmament.

The economic crisis so much upon us today is matched by a lurking apprehension about advancing moral chaos. Our national mood on a large scale these past years has been suffused with an awareness of a pervasive moral laxity; such names as Abu Ghraib or Guantanamo bring up images of our roles in a broken Geneva Convention, disregard of international covenants, initiated war. On the individual level, every

other marriage dissolves, fidelity and commitment are quaint words, civility is mostly sought and disappointing. A vice-Presidential candidate is seriously presented, who would stand one vascular episode away from the Presidency, whose persona is embarrassing to the nation and the world. Yet she draws a considerable vote and attention.

Psychoanalysis, derived from and serving society, is confronted by a new brand of unconscious conflicts. This is to be seen clinically, although it might require a new awareness and readiness on the part of the observing analyst. In line with the principle “add, not replace”, this does not eliminate neurosis, or psychosis or borderlines. The new category complements, does not eliminate the old. We now must take into account borderline states between neurosis and erosions of integrity.

As ego distortions at times invade the analytic method, resulting in less-than rational guiding principles or analytic behavior, the same goes for superego lacunae. New theories at times rest on shaky and spurious ground. Is it not quite evident that many new, fashionable, up to cultist theories elevate a part and make it a whole? The interpersonal (of Sullivan) exists firmly within Freudian theory; the earliest pregenital inputs of Klein live explicitly in Freud’s psychoanalysis; the self and the whole (Kohut) are within Freud; openness to new ideas in each hour (Bion) is routine analysis; subjectivity, relatedness (Mitchell) have been part of analysis from the beginning; acting in and outside of the hour (enactment) similarly. How long will the emperor have no clothes? I do not mean to dismiss or treat serious views lightly; I have elaborated on each of these divergent theories as they deserve in other places. Many have resulted in helpful additions or modifications of traditional theory.

Perhaps only after we have lived through a period of granting this final, third system its due place can we combine all three psychic systems to stand for a total, comprehensive psychoanalytic theory. We cannot afford to lose inputs from ego, id, or superego without compromising the rounded coherence of our theory of understanding. Such an operating instrument becomes the automatic, unconscious guide of the analyst in every clinical hour that flows along analytically. ”Integration”, a word that contains “integrity”, connotes wholeness, besides bespeaking the moral. Only all systems acting together, in both participants, are capable of producing the syntonic arrangement between patient and analyst that results in the psychic symphony unique for each individual patient-analyst pair.

This view of the development of theory is to be added to the contents of the analytic instrument described by Nunberg. The examining instrument, in its composition, reflects and partakes of the elements it is designed and dedicated to oversee. This is

also another refutation of the last contribution of Brenner (1994, 2002) who, after a lifetime of being one of the leading advocates of classical theory, expressed the opinion that the structural view might be discarded. To what I (2000) have argued before in opposition to this suggested alteration, I add the value of the structural view in the very construction of psychoanalytic theory, and its enduring value in its therapeutic role. I also include all other components of Freud's metapsychology, the most frequently disparaged section of his abstract theory, as an overall guiding construct that I continue to value not for reasons of loyalty but for its pragmatic usefulness.