

Freud at the Precipice:

How Freud's Fate Sealed the Fate of Psychoanalysis

Robert Langs, M.D.

Introduction to the chapter:

This chapter adopts a new view of Freud's 1897 shift in thinking about the human mind by casting it as a paradigm shift based on unconscious archetypes. The introduction of universals, which are neglected by mainstream psychoanalysts largely because they are expressed primarily through unconscious adaptations to death-related traumas, brings Freud and psychoanalysis into alignment with some of the greatest scientists and scientific discoveries of the past millennium. Noteworthy findings include the discovery of a death-related archetype that strongly influences the creation of first paradigms and creates severe resistances to paradigm shifts; Freud's strikingly counter-paradigmatic initial position and his subsequent conformity to archetype; Galileo's remarkable psychoanalytic wisdom; and similarities and differences between Freud and Einstein in respect to the paradigms they created and then renounced. The chapter shows that adaptive psychoanalysis, which is heir to Freud's first trauma-based paradigm of the operations of the emotion-processing mind, can contribute entirely new insights into both physical and biological nature and thereby help psychoanalysis to take one small step towards becoming a member of the family of biological sciences.

Comments are most welcome.

Chapter Two. Paradigms and Archetypes

Two fundamental forces of nature played a significant role in Freud's revision of his overarching view of the sources of neuroses: The need to create paradigms in order to organize our thinking about basic aspects of animate and inanimate nature, and the influence of evolved or in-built psychological archetypes or universal natural inclinations, on these creations. An exploration of each of these entities sheds considerable light on the choices Freud made and their underlying causes.

Paradigms

A *paradigm* is a basic framework that defines a scientific discipline within which theories, laws, and generalizations are formulated and supportive experiments are performed. Broadly speaking, then, a paradigm is a philosophical or theoretical framework of any kind and thus, although subject to debate in some quarters (Kuhn,...), the term can be applied to the basic framework of psychoanalytic thinking.

Several features of paradigms deserve our attention. One is that they dictate and direct, and thereby restrict, the kind of thinking and research that transpires in the fields to which they apply. Another is that they tend to resist being overturned: the scientists who accept and defend a given paradigm are not inclined to accept or seek viable alternatives even when there is data that strongly suggest that there are basic flaws in

their current position. This is an especially daunting problem in qualitative sciences like psychoanalysis because it is virtually impossible to come up with a definitive measurement failure that demands a reconsideration of existing thought.

Paradigm shifts are, then, revolutionary, cataclysmic changes in basic beliefs and theories. They change the direction of thinking about the world at large and in respect to the individual subject involved, and they redirect research and exploration. These shifts in fundamental viewpoints usually take place through the efforts of a single scientist or thinker, and general acceptance of the new way of thinking usually is slow to take hold. Max Planck, who was one of the engineers of the paradigm shift from the deterministic physics of Newton with its view of matter as continuous to quantum physics with its indeterminism and notion of quanta and the discontinuity of matter, put it plainly: The old guard had to die off before the new physics took hold. As we shall see, in addition to its lack of quantitative data and predictions, there are a number of factors in both the psychological and social structure of the psychoanalytic movement that make a transition to a new theory and world view especially difficult to achieve even in the face of mounting evidence that a change in basic thinking is in order.

Overall, then, there is an evident archetypal human need driven by powerful unconscious forces to cling to established viewpoints and especially to first paradigms. -e.g., that the earth is the center of the universe, deterministic Newtonian physics, and the like. This means that in shifting from a trauma-centered to mind-centered theory, Freud was defying this need-for-constancy archetype. On the other hand, however, given that Freud's second paradigm is the first elaborated basic theory of psychoanalysis, his followers and heirs may be thought of as conforming to this archetypal pattern. Indeed, as we shall see, Freud's second paradigm shares features with natural first paradigms of a kind that makes this conformity quite understandable.

Archetypes

An archetype is an eternal, ever-lasting ideal form (Plato), a universal human trait or relatively fixed behavioral or psychological tendency. The concept was championed by Carl Jung (ref) who discovered the existence of archetypes in his patients as well as in mythical tales. Jung tended to use the term to describe the shared features of the human psyche and personality types. He wrote of five basic archetypes that make up the human personality: The self, shadow, anima, animus, and persona. And he also described behavioral archetypes such as the child, hero, great mother, wise old man, and trickster or fox. Archetypes for Jung are, then, innate universal human prototypes which he linked to his idea that part of the psyche takes form as an inherited collective unconscious component.

More recently, studies undertaken from the adaptive approach, which is grounded in a theory that is akin to Freud's original trauma-based theory of neuroses, have extended the concept of archetypes to allude to universal and thus genetically acquired, specific patterns of thinking, behaving, and coping. Most of these archetypes operate outside of awareness, unconsciously, so their existence and influence are not palpable

consciously, although they are revealed in other ways—mainly through the encoded unconscious messages emitted by the deep unconscious part of the mind.

Many of these archetypes involve how humans consistently tend to cope with death and the three forms of death anxiety it evokes—predatory, predator, and existential (see chapter...). They are unconsciously driven patterns of behavior and thinking which greatly effect how we deal with our most basic challenges in life. They tend to be activated in response to death-related traumas and their presence and ramifications can be found in early writings like the Bible and Greek mythology as well as in patients seen today in psychoanalysis and psychotherapy—they are timeless universal responses to traumatic events (ref).

Indications are that these archetypes are a prime factor in the development of paradigms and paradigm shifts. Because death-related traumas are all but inevitable in a given lifetime, it is highly likely that Freud suffered from such incidents and that they affected the development of his two theories of the mind and his decision to settle on the fantasy-based paradigm. Given that his paradigm shift was based on belief rather than clinical data, we should expect that a combination of hidden personal factors and unconsciously driven archetypes played a significant role in his change of viewpoint. It therefore behooves us to turn now to a study of the human archetypes that tend to influence the development of both physical and biological paradigms of nature. As we shall see, there are some striking consistencies in this regard and they will help us to better understand Freud's fateful selections of paradigms for psychoanalysis.

Three Blows to Human Narcissism

Not surprisingly, the psychological approach to the study of the creation and modification of paradigms is strongly affected by the psychoanalytic paradigm to which a researcher is committed. On the one hand, adherents to Freud's second, inner-directed paradigm will look to needs for incestuous Oedipal triumphs, nurturance, narcissistic supplies, relatedness, and the like for the deeper sources of a preferred paradigm. But on the other hand, adherents to Freud's first, reality-centered paradigm—suitably expanded and up-dated—will look to efforts to cope with personal life traumas and their death-related meanings as the driving forces behind such decisions. In this context, in settling on a final paradigm for psychoanalysis, Freud unconsciously was choosing between sex and death—and he chose sex.

In writing about the history of psychoanalysis, although not framed in such terms, Freud actually was commenting on one aspect of paradigms and paradigm shifts, namely, their effects on human narcissism and their traumatic impact on humankind. In attempting to offer an historical perspective on the rejection in some quarters of psychoanalytic thinking, he brought up what amounts to three of the most important paradigm shifts in the history of science—those engineered by Copernicus, Darwin, and himself (Freud, 1917, pp. 284-5):

In the course of centuries the *naïve* self-love of men has had to submit to two major blows at the hands of science. The first was when they learnt that our earth was not the center of the universe but only a tiny fragment of of a cosmic system of scarcely imaginable vastness. This is associated in our minds with the name of Copernicus, though something similar had already been asserted by Alexandrian science. The second blow fell when biological research destroyed man's supposedly privileged place in creation and proved his descent from the animal kingdom and his ineradicable animal nature. This reevaluation has been accomplished in our own days by Darwin, Wallace and their predecessors, though not without the most violent contemporary opposition. But human megalomania will have suffered its third and most wounding blow from the psychological research of the present time which seeks to prove to the ego that it is not even master in its own house, but must content itself with scanty information of what is going on unconsciously in its mind.

Freud was quite on the mark in claiming that he had introduced a monumentally important paradigm pertaining to our view of the human mind. Historically, he can be thought of as having made two or three unprecedented ventures into defining the basic features of the human psyche and its psychology. The very first paradigm he forged was a shift from a dynamic psychology centered on the contents of the conscious mind to one that gave primacy to the contents of the unconscious mind. This psychology, which Freud eventually named *psychoanalysis* when he announced his need-centered psychology, had many precedents, as the crystallization of a paradigm often does. But previous writers had not, however, synthesized their findings and ideas into a paradigmatic world-view (ref...).

Freud struggled throughout the 1890's to develop his understanding of the unconscious mind into a paradigmatic position and he was unable to do so with any success before he shifted from a reality-focused to a mind-focused theory. He then settled on his second theory of neurogenesis and the human mind as his basic view of the emotional realm and on that basis proceeded to undertake an extensive investigation of the operations of the unconscious mind as it dealt with forbidden sexual and other potentially disruptive inner needs, among them narcissistic needs connected with maintaining a sound level of self-worth and self-esteem. The effects of this research and the development of the paradigm on which it was based can be seen in Freud's view of the effects of the three paradigm shifts to which he alluded in 1917. His understanding is based on his theory that satisfying healthy inner needs are paramount in emotional life and that blows to the paths to their satisfactions can cause emotional harm and suffering. There is evident validity to this insight, but it appears to be superficial and insufficient so let's dig deeper.

The Fourth Blow

Had he stayed with this initial reality-centered paradigm, Freud would have

delivered one more psychoanalytically-founded blow to humankind. The third blow would still have been based on the realization that the conscious mind is not master in its own house—that this power falls to the unconscious mind. But he then would have added a fourth and crushing additional blow to humankind's hubris, namely that many of the most critical determinants of the course of our lives are entirely beyond our control—that from the moment of conception, our lives are driven by natural events and others who cross our paths. Focusing first and foremost on the ramifications of traumatic incidents would have led Freud to eventually realize that accidents of fate play an overriding role in our lives. He would have seen that such matters as where, when, and to whom a person is born, natural disturbances and disasters, the actions of others, social and economic conditions, and the like almost always matter more than the choices we make on our own.

This realization is abundantly clear in Freud's own choice of the archetypal narrative that best characterizes the basic challenges of human emotional life—the myth of Oedipus. Well before his conception, Oedipus is fated by the gods to murder his father and sleep with his mother—he has no choice but to do so. Indeed, there are no indications that Oedipus is being driven by a conscious or unconscious wish to sleep with his mother and murder his rivalrous father. Instead, the pathway of his tragic story is set by doubts cast by a friend as to his biological parents who have secretly more or less determined his lifeline both before and soon after he was born. And as he moves into adulthood, he is far more reactive than proactive, responding to an assault by a party led by a king who turns out to be his father, meeting the challenge to his life posed by the Sphinx, and accepting the reward for this victory set by Jocasta's brother, Creon, which is to marry the Queen of Thebes, who turns out to be his mother. The revelation of this hidden truth then causes her to commit suicide which prompts Oedipus to blind himself.

Even though there are moments when Oedipus draws on his own strength and wisdom to take his future into his own hands, the myth bears witness to how seldom this is the overriding factor in his life and how often he lacks the information and power to determine his own fate. Indeed, the only inner need that drives the story is the need to discover the truth about his origins—and this is necessary because of the fate assigned to him and the death-related trauma Oedipus suffered early in his life.

Our relative helplessness in the face of external forces haunts us from the cradle to the inevitability of the grave. This is blow, which is an assault in the human hope for immortality, is without question the most daunting of them all. And it is the blow that Freud avoided recognizing by shifting paradigms. Despite its acknowledging the hidden power of unconscious thoughts and wishes, his second paradigm not only avoids such traumas as the inevitability of personal death, it also offers hope that we can access our conflicted inner needs and successfully ameliorate their detrimental effects on us. Freud himself contributed to this hope by discovering the secret to the creation of dreams, thus enabling us to unravel their disguised, unconscious meanings and messages. In contrast,

there is very little—and in many cases, nothing at all—that we can do to change most of the fateful events that impact on us and so greatly determine the path taken by our lives.

We are, then, all victims of fate, nature, and the evolved design of the human mind. While we are not entirely helpless against reality's inputs into our lives—e.g., we can improve our chances of personal survival, lessen the frequency of natural disasters, use valid forms of psychotherapy to lessen the effects of our early life traumas and our needs for self-harm, and engage in similar kinds of activities that enable us to wrest a small measure of control over our lives. But the inevitability of personal demise casts a dark shadow over these momentary triumphs for in the end, nature and not our personal wishes holds sway.

This grim picture of the realities of life on earth presents one reason why the trauma theory of neuroses and emotional life is difficult to embrace or remain committed to. There is an enormous amount of human helplessness reflected in the theory and on the whole the best we can do is lessen the impact of this helplessness on our lives and come to terms with the unbearable truths of our personal and collective limitations and of life itself. The second paradigm, fantasy-based theory essentially ignores these truths and does not attempt to cope with them in any substantial manner; this avoidance and denial has cost us all much suffering and grief.

Paradoxically, then, adherence to Freud's second paradigm has served to deny the stark limitations that accrue to our controlling our fates, but it also has, by by-passing these very limitations, added to the helplessness bathed in denial and ignorance we suffer in the face of trauma. And we can see why Freud turned away from reality when he was on the brink of creating the field he was to call psychoanalysis—and why so many have followed him down the path he chose and why so few have questioned his second paradigm or appreciated his first. Indeed, there is a parallel between the human need to think of the earth as the center of the physical universe and the need to think of our own inner needs as the center of the emotional universe—both beliefs are erroneous and both serve human narcissism but even more so, each in its own way, the human need to deny death.

We begin to suspect—and shall soon see—that turning away from reality and dwelling on inner mental needs is a reflection of a basic, death-denying human archetype, one that unconsciously influenced Freud's paradigm shift. But as noted earlier, this also means that Freud went against archetype in formulating his first paradigm of neuroses—only to conform to archetype in fashioning his second theory of the mind. Let's delve further into this subject of paradigms and the psychological archetypes that affect their formulation and adoption in order to understand why Freud carried out this remarkable, far reaching flip flop.

Paradigm Shifts and Existential Death Anxiety

Observers and theoreticians using Freud's second paradigm have had little to say about the underlying psychological factors and archetypes that affect the creation and

modification of paradigms. On the other hand, those working with a modified version of Freud's first paradigm which stresses the critical role of death and death anxiety in the psychology of human endeavors have developed a set of viable ideas about the nature of the unconscious sources of paradigmatic thinking. I begin my study of this phenomenon with the two paradigm shifts Freud alluded to in his story of the paradigmatic narcissistic blows to humankind.

The Center of the Universe

The first paradigm shift mentioned by Freud is the Copernican revolution which dealt with the position of the earth, and thus our personal position, in the universe. It entailed a radical departure from the original Ptolemaic view that the earth was the center of the universe and it afforded this honor to the sun.

As is characteristic of the history of paradigms, the erroneous Ptolemaic position had prevailed for some 1400 years before it was rescinded. Furthermore, the general acceptance of the revised paradigm needed about another 100 years to effect—much of it through the observations and advocacy of Galileo and Kepler. This time lag arose largely because the new paradigm was fiercely opposed by the Catholic church: Orthodoxy defending a flawed and erroneous basic position also is archetypal for initial paradigms of nature and this natural tendency plays a major role in the opposition met by those who offer well documented reasons for making a paradigm shift.

Freud (ref) did not comment on this paradigm shift; he simply viewed the new paradigm through the lens of his fantasy-centered theory. As noted, he simply suggested that the new paradigm entailed a loss of importance for the earth and thus as a narcissistic blow to humankind. Our inner needs for the narcissistic gratifications and support that enhance our self-esteem and self-worth were dealt a serious blow. We became far less important than we thought we were in light of the prior Ptolemaic view of the universe. This is a prime example of how a paradigm pertaining to natural phenomena affects our view of ourselves and our place in the world at large—much of human psychology is determined by our view of our place in the universe (and nature).

Galileo's Astounding Insight

Writing in the 1600's, Galileo also commented on the psychological impact of the Copernican revision and, most remarkably, on the underlying psychology behind the adherence to the first, Ptolemaic view which was prevalent at the time. As a reflection of his genius, he intuitively chose a perspectives that was comparable to Freud's first, trauma-centered paradigm of psychoanalysis to explain the unconscious source of the earth-centered position and the broad opposition to the heliocentric view.

The back story is this: For centuries, astronomers, the Catholic church, and people in general believed, as first argued by both Aristotle and Ptolemy, that the earth was the center of the universe. Inherent to this contention was the further belief that while the earth moves and is changeable, the planets are fixed and immutable—that they are embedded in unchangeable, invisible, material spheres set at fixed distances from the

earth. Their fixity was seen as a reflection of their ever-lasting qualities which provided humans with a symbol of eternal life and thus of God and their own immortality.

In the course of defending the contrarian Copernican viewpoint and criticizing the Aristotelean-Ptolemaic position, Galileo, speaking through his fictional character, Sagredo, commented (Sobel, 2000, pp. 148-9):

The deeper I go in considering the vanities of popular reasoning, the lighter and more foolish I find them..... Those who so greatly exalt incorruptibility, inalterability, etc. are reduced to talking this way, I believe, by their great desire to go on living, and by the terror they have of death. These individuals do not reflect that if men were immortal, they themselves would never have come into the world. Such men really deserve to encounter a Medusa's head which would transmute them into statues of jasper or of diamond, and thus make them more perfect than they are.

Galileo appears to have been one of the first advocates of Freud's first paradigm of psychoanalysis! In so doing, he seems to have probed more deeply than Freud into the nature of the traumas that unconsciously lead to false beliefs, errant paradigms, and by implication, to human neuroses. In particular, he appreciated that the prospect and fear of death—i.e., the recognition of human mortality—is far more critical in human life and its emotional dysfunctions than inner mental needs which play a secondary role to, and are affected by, the realities of personal death.

Inherent to Galileo's profound insight is the realization that the first paradigmatic belief system regarding the solar system was unconsciously fashioned to support the belief that humans live forever—the belief that the immortality of the universe makes human immortality an actuality and real prospect. The propositions developed by Aristotle and Ptolemy were unconsciously driven by the need to deny the inevitability of death and to alleviate the existential death anxiety that this prospect—this certainty—evokes in everyone. Their view of the structure of the universe was, then, unknowingly fashioned as a physically-grounded, cosmic denial-of-death system.

Given that Freud's wish-centered, second paradigm of psychoanalysis precludes the realization that death and its attendant anxieties are the prime movers of human neuroses, the Aristotelean-Ptolemaic position can be seen to be akin to Freud's second theory of psychoanalysis: Both paradigms serve the unconscious denial of human mortality! In contrast, the Copernican-Galilean paradigm, which eventually replaced the Aristotelean-Ptolemaic denial-of-death system, is consonant with Freud's initial, trauma-centered theory of emotional life and the emotion-related mind. And both of these paradigms are without a means of denying the finality of personal death, leaving us as humans with the utter necessity of finding constructive ways to deal with this most disturbing prospect.

Notice too that the two physical paradigms are incompatible: Either the earth or the sun is the center of the universe, both cannot be so placed. And either the heavens

are as changeable as the earth and thus neither immutable or ever-lasting or the heavens are fixed and eternal. In addition, as noted, while the first system affords indirect support for human immortality, the second system does not; no system can both support and not support this belief. As I shall show, these archetypal insights have a bearing on the nature of Freud's two theories of psychoanalysis which, although many analysts contend that they tend to blend into each other, actually they are far more competitive and mutually exclusive than complementary.

It is, then, not surprising that the Catholic church fiercely supported the Ptolemaic position. The church, was—and still is—a bastion of death-denying religious beliefs. It therefore punished those who, like Galileo and Kepler, cited evidence and made claims that challenged its denial-based position. Adherents to death-denying paradigms tend to be quite punitive towards those who challenge their position and as we shall see, this archetypal trend is evident in psychoanalysis to this very day.

Kepler and Another Paradigmatic Battle

In addition to properly locating the center of the universe, there was another astronomical battle that pitted Johannes Kepler against the scientists and Catholic church during his time. In this case, the issue revolved around the nature of the paths taken by planets as they move across the sky. The issue was this:

Kepler had made exquisite use of the careful measurements of sequential planetary positions carried out by Ticho Brahe and on that basis, he concluded that the planets did not move in circles as was the common belief, but in ellipses. This first paradigm, which postulated circular motion, was another physical contention that shored up the human wish for eternal life because it supported the belief that God had created the universe in a perfect manner. Circular motion was therefore taken as proof that God existed and that humans could be immortal and attain eternal life in heaven. In contrast, elliptical motion was thought of as a non-ideal form of movement and its empirical discovery undermined the denial of death system created by the catholic church—and other religions as well.

On both counts, then, the church supported first paradigms that spoke for human immortality and thus the denial of death, and it opposed second paradigms that failed to support the existence of God and thus, the belief in ever-lasting human existence. Humankind in general, including most non-believers, were consonant with the thinking of the Catholic church on these matters. This appears then to be an archetypal response: A preference for paradigms that support the denial of death and the rejection of those paradigms that do not do so. In this regard, as configured at present, psychoanalysis also implicitly stands with the church: It is committed to Freud's second paradigm which inherently ignores and thus denies the critical role that human mortality and other forms of death anxiety plays in human life. One of the clearest statements of this denial appears in *The Interpretation of Dreams* (Freud, 1900) where Freud alludes to the timelessness and inextinguishability of unconscious instinctual drive inner needs. This

property applies to other human need systems as well and it gives an aura of immortality to the second paradigm as it speaks for psychobiological needs that last forever, so to speak.

In this connection, it is well to be reminded that the sequential position of Freud's second paradigm is an aberration in that the theory is aligned with what usually are first paradigms. Freud seems to have been on the verge of developing a major counter-archetypal trauma-centered paradigm when he fell into line with the paradigm-forming archetype with his second theory of the mind. Once set, adherents to this theory, from its founder down the line, have behaved in ways that are typical of those who support a death-denying paradigm. Indeed, a return to Freud's first paradigm would eliminate these denial mechanisms and lead to an inevitable confrontation with death and death anxieties, especially as they operate on the level of unconscious experience.

The persecution and excommunication of those who opposed the church's death-denying viewpoint also has its parallel in the history of psychoanalysis. The most notable example of this trend is seen in the way that Freud and his followers condemned and excommunicated Ferenczi for trying to reinstate the first Freudian paradigm with a strong emphasis on the (death-related) violence done by seducers of young children to their victims (Mason, 19...). While other factors, such as the outright of the seductiveness of the techniques of psychoanalysis advocated by Ferenczi, played a role in this repudiation, Ferenczi's outspoken support for the trauma theory of neuroses appears to have been the main reason for the exclusionary treatment he received. Carl Abraham, an early follower of Freud, who also advocated aspects of the trauma theory, was quickly repudiated by Freud and just as quickly retreated from this position (ref).

The adaptive approach is a clinically derived trauma-centered theory without evident dubious features; it adheres entirely to basic psychoanalytic principles. Nevertheless, the approach also has met with a similar kind of unexamined, outright refutation (see chapter three). It appears, then, that those who create death-denying paradigms are welcome by their fellow scientists and the population at large, while those who discover valid reasons to rescind a flawed or erroneous death-denying paradigm find themselves rejected and persecuted on all sides—a response that tends to last for centuries until the truth of the death-related paradigm finally wins out. With a qualitative science like psychoanalysis that is focused on the unmeasured vagaries of human psychology this waiting period may be far longer than usual.

The basic human archetype that is involved in these scenarios involves the evolved default position of the conscious system of the emotion-processing mind. This system of the mind is naturally inclined to adopt mechanisms and beliefs that support the denial of death and thus inherently favors paradigms, be they of the material or mental world, that indirectly or explicitly support this need. As I have already indicated, for a brief five years or so, Freud was an exception to this archetypal rule. But then, evidently goaded by fate, the death of his father, and unconscious memories of early death-related traumas, he succumbed to hidden, unconscious pressures to fall in line with his archetypal needs and did so. Before discussing the likely reasons for his original

thinking and its abandonment, let's look at several more choices humans have made in creating natural paradigms to see if we are in fact dealing with an archetypal set of needs.

God and The Origins of Species

Paradigms related to the origins and adaptive capacities of the species that populate the earth today and in past eras are closely tied to paradigms pertaining to religious beliefs and the question of the existence of a deity. As for religion, there has been a basic but partial paradigm shift from a first paradigm that fostered an all but unanimous belief in the existence of God to a second paradigm in which God is seen by many individuals as a non-existent, imaginary figure. Each of these paradigms—one religious, the other secular—sponsors a paradigm of creation. Believers are convinced that God created the universe and the species on our planet in one fell swoop, while non-believers are committed to the theory of evolution which Freud alluded to in his 1917 comments.

The First Paradigm of Creation

For thousands of years prior to the intervention of Darwin and Wallace, most biologists and people in general, religious and otherwise, accepted the basic thesis that God created the universe in seven days some ten thousand years ago and that he placed living beings on the earth in eternal forms that are immutable—i.e., forms that have existed unchanged since creation and thus are ever-lasting. This is the creationist paradigm and it is a biological counterpart to the belief in the immutability and fixity of the stars and planets in the physical universe. It is, then, another first paradigm inherently designed to support a death-denying aura of human immortality.

A more recent form of this type of thinking which supports the human belief in God and eternal life is the theory of intelligent design (ref). This version of the first biological paradigm is based on the belief that humans and other living beings are so complex and made of such intricate organ systems that they cannot have been the result of a gradual evolutionary process, but must have been set in place in one fell swoop by God Himself. All of the versions of this paradigm—some existed for ages before Darwin and Wallace argued otherwise, others are counter-reactions to their ideas and to the second paradigm of creation which they both advocated—serve unconsciously to alleviate humankind's existential death anxieties through the denial of death via the belief in the existence of God. This belief system is the age-old, death-denying default position of the human mind—a first paradigm that deals with questions pertaining to the purpose and nature of human existence and issues pertaining to the permanency or non-permanency of a human being.

Variations of this first religious paradigm existed unchallenged for centuries. The second paradigm, which is atheism, is a world view that eliminates the denial defense inherent to the belief in God and speaks for human mortality. While theism has existed since the origins of civilization, atheism as a common belief system and paradigm first

took hold in the Western world only in the late eighteenth century in Europe. To this day, only a minority of humans are atheists, some are agnostics, and the overwhelming majority are theists. So here too the paradigm that supports the denial of death came first and remains the archetypal religious belief system for most of humankind. The religious paradigm is, of course, incompatible with atheism, so once more a choice must be made between these two positions.

There is, however, a contrast to be made between theories pertaining to the location of the center of the universe and those that deal with the existence of God. The former issue is subject to resolution through measurement, the generation of quantitative data, and prediction, while the latter is not. There is no quantitative measure that could resolve the question of the validity of the God proposition—belief or non-belief are matters of faith rather than measurement. Thus the arguments for and against the two competing paradigms—i.e., between a world view that includes or does not include a death-denying belief in the existence of God—engender debates that go on interminably.

This too should serve as fair warning to psychoanalysts regarding their preferences for one or the other paradigm of the human mind because Freud based his paradigm shift on a matter of belief, that is, on his no longer believing the stories of seduction that were told to him by his patients. In making this decision, he was unwittingly conforming to the archetype that is expressed through a preference for death-denying psychological paradigms over those that accept the realities of death and death-related traumas. Even though Freud and his followers garnered clinical support for their position, we should take note again that the Ptolemaic paradigm enabled scientists, through certain mathematical manipulations, to correctly predict the movements of the planets. So given that the support for Freud's second paradigm is entirely impressionistic and correlational in nature, none of these findings constitute definitive proof of the validity of the inner-directed theory Freud settled on for the foundation of psychoanalytic thinking.

The Second Paradigm of Creation

Despite the enormous amount of supportive evidence garnered by the followers of Darwin and Wallace—the theory of evolution is the most successful theory in the history of biology and the foundation of many developments in its own and other sciences—half the population of the United States does not believe that the theory of evolution is a valid or viable paradigm. Most of these individuals believe in the first paradigm of nature, that is, that God created the species populating the earth today and that they are virtually identical to the species God created ten thousand years ago.

Scientifically, evolutionary theory, with its theses of natural selection (Darwin) and survival of the fittest (Wallace), is the most fundamental paradigm within the field of biology. Not only does the denial of death play no meaningful role in this paradigm of nature, death in the form of the extinction of species is a central concept—more than ninety percent of all past living species have become extinct over the ages. The threat of death is then a central proposition of this paradigm and evolving the means of defeating

death and surviving from one moment and generation to the next is its central challenge. The theory of evolution is then intensely death centered, much as the Freud's first trauma-centered paradigm would have been death centered had he pursued it. As we shall see, this thesis is borne out by the fact that the reality-focused, adaptive approach which is an elaboration of Freud's first paradigm is an intensely death-centered theory.

Adherents to the second paradigm of biology postulate that there are two basic mechanisms through which the evolution of species takes place; both play a role when their survival is threatened. The first mechanism, which was the main focus of Darwin's thinking, involves competition for survival between neighboring species. This process began eons ago when our planet became over-populated and organisms had to compete for living space and nutriment. This competition took shape as an arms race in which one species became the predator and another species its prey. By means of its existing natural abilities or by virtue of favorable mutations, the predator developed the ability to destroy its prey. But in response, largely through favorable mutations of its own, the prey tended to develop fresh defenses that rendered it capable of fending off the threatening predator, thereby enabling it to survive and reproduce.

In principle, this kind of arms race tends to escalate as one generation passes on to the next and in general, the predator is favored in one epoch and the prey in the next—unless the prey becomes extinct. This is clearly a life and death scenario with no guarantee of survival and no palpable support for a belief in a God-given purposefulness to these struggles, and it speaks against eternal life for living species including the human observers of these fateful rivalries.

The second mechanism of evolutionary change, which was championed by Wallace, involves the emergence of adverse environmental changes that present threats to the survival of the living beings existing in this environment. In these situations, those species that have the natural resources to survive the new threat or who experience spontaneous mutations that enable them to do so, will live on; those of lesser capabilities to deal with the new dangers will die off.

In both versions of this second biological paradigm, adaptation to external circumstances—be it to the threat from competitors, those bent on causing harm, or from natural disasters—is the basic function of all living beings including humans. Because humans are explicitly aware consciously of death, these threats to survival involve not only death itself but also various forms of anticipatory and reactive death anxiety. Added to the complexity of this situation is the fact that humans not only experience dangers consciously, but also do so unconsciously. I shall have more to say on these matters later in the book (see chapter....).

Despite the overwhelming physical and predictive evidence for the evolutionary paradigm and considerable evidence to the contrary regarding the creationist paradigm, the battle between these two competing theories—actually the evolutionary position is a scientific theory, while the creationism position is a belief system lacking in scientific support—is some one hundred seventy years old. A handful of scientists have tried to unite the two paradigms by accepting the basic ideas of evolutionary theory and

appending to it a belief in the existence of God. These efforts have not been convincing or successful and the view that these two theories are mutually exclusive prevails. Here too we are reminded of the situation with the two paradigms of psychoanalysis: Some analysts have tried to combine the fantasy theory with the trauma theory, but they too have been unsuccessful because it can be shown that each of these paradigms leads to a distinctive set of principles and constellation of ideas that largely fall out at opposite poles (see chapter....).

The duration of the God/creationism versus evolution debate in the face of overwhelming indications as to the more valid position presents us with striking evidence that unmastered death anxieties have enormous power to distort human rationality and reasoning. This situation also shows the extreme measures and beliefs that humans will resort to in trying to cope, however irrationally, with their evident mortality and the degree to which they seek and endorse almost any thesis that supports their need to deny death. Relevant here is a recent book entitled *Fifty Jewish Messiahs* (ref) which describes fifty individuals after Jesus who claimed to have Messianic gifts and assignments, and who attracted intensely devoted followers who gave up their worldly goods and even their lives despite the transparent folly of virtually all of these claims. Each of these purported Messiahs promised their faithful eternal life and of course, none of them was able to fulfill their promises. Most of their stories are so patently absurd as to defy all sensibility. Were it not known adaptively that the prospect of death and the three forms of death anxiety this evokes drives humans insane, these absurdest scenarios would defy explanation. Here too we as psychoanalyst should be warned to examine carefully any death denying paradigm Freud or anyone else has offered us—we are naturally inclined to believe in any false system that enables us, consciously or unconsciously to defend against the inevitability of death.

We can see then that it is extremely difficult for humans to modify or give up any paradigm that supports their denial-based defenses, whatever their cost in loss of knowledge, misleading ideas, and maladaptive behaviors—and possibly the destruction of life on this planet. Catholicism and other religions speak for the broader human need to believe in an individual's immortality, a belief for which countless humans have given their lives in the patently false belief that doing so is proof of this contention. Indeed, the massive violence that believers in God have foisted on non-believers is an extreme example of the intolerance for opposition by those who adhere to a death-denying paradigm of nature. This too is an archetypal phenomenon that exists within psychoanalysis as well (see chapter....). Once Freud had shifted to a death-denying paradigm of emotional life and the emotion-related mind, the resistance to a return to his trauma-centered paradigm in which the denial of death is no longer an explicit or implied feature has been as intense as that seen with the Catholic church and creationists.

Evolutionary theory, with its focus on adaptation to environmental conditions and to the threats posed by other living beings, is, as noted, the fundamental, overarching sub-theory within all of biology. Freud's second paradigm takes exception to this theory and insists that adapting to dysfunctional inner needs rather than external, environmental

threats are paramount in human emotional life. Neither Freud nor anyone else has offered a justification for this position which runs counter to the most basic archetype pertaining to the very existence of living entities. Indeed, in this light, the second paradigm created by Freud and in vogue in some form to this very day seems to be quite wrongheaded and misleading. It suggests that here too the archetypal human need to deny death has overpowered human reason—a thesis for which we shall soon find ample support.

Some Other Paradigm Shifts

The archetypal pattern is, then, for denial-based defenses against existential death anxiety to be the driving force for the first version of most scientific (and religious) paradigms in the animate and inanimate realms. In situations where the collection and working over of new data indicates that this first paradigm is significantly flawed—as often is the case—one requisite for the development of a new and more viable paradigm lies with being able to find the wherewithal to give up the denial-of-death defenses that are an inherent feature of the first paradigm—but not the second. This step, which is yet to be accomplished in religion or psychoanalysis, may take centuries to accomplish. By and large it takes the emergence of a revolutionary scientist-thinker and a set of overwhelming findings which contradict a flawed first paradigm and decades of processing of these findings to engineer this kind of vital paradigmatic change. The absence of such data in psychoanalysis has made—and is making—this shift extremely difficult to achieve.

These archetypal patterns are seen again in several other first paradigms and paradigm shifts that Freud did not bring up. The paradigm shift involved in Newton's discovery of the laws of motion and gravity is one example. Strikingly, the subtext here is very much like that which underlay the issue of the location of the center of the universe. The prevailing paradigm before Newton's revolutionary insights entailed the belief that the earth was a part of the solar system that stood apart from the stars and planets which are set above in the skies, and that the changeable laws that prevail on earth are different from the eternal laws that prevail in the immutable heavens. Newton's key insight was that to the contrary, identical laws operate in both the skies above and below, here on earth. As such, his new, second paradigm, which unified the two domains—heaven and earth—was another blow to an existing paradigm that deprived humans of support for their need to deny the finality of death. Gone was a paradigm that supported this denial by implicitly sustaining the belief that while the laws pertaining to the inevitability of death prevail on earth, they do not apply to the heavens where the law of immortal life holds sway. Here too death anxiety was laid bare and needed to be dealt with in some way other than through denial and obliteration.

Newtonian physics was strictly deterministic as was his theory of the nature of matter, so despite his unifying the heavens and earth, his theory there offered a modicum of support for the human need for denial in that it implied the existence of a perfectly lawful and therefore God-given universe. But given that physics is a quantitative

science, measurements arose that were not in keeping with the Newtonian position. The main phenomenon in question, called black-body radiation, could not be accounted for through equations based on Newtonian principles and in addition, certain features of gravity also did not fall into line with expectations based on Newtonian theory.

Matters were set straight when Planck developed a viable set of explanatory equations that were based on the idea that matter was not continuous as proposed by Newton, but instead came in packets of energy and mass called quanta. This new paradigm of nature spoke against a simply ordered, God-given universe in which immortal life was possible. On its heels came Einstein's theory of relativity, which spoke against fixed spatial quadrants and ordered motion, and quantum physics in which the order of subatomic nature was no longer seen as rule-bound and regular, but as a matter of probabilities and chance. In each of these cases, the new paradigm entailed a loss of implicit support for the denial of death and in each case, the initial opposition was fierce. This state of affairs is captured by Planck's statement that the physicists of the time never accepted quantum physics; they had to die off before the new paradigm took hold—and this in the face of massive supportive quantitative findings.

For his part, after he made his contribution to the new physics, Einstein tried to repudiate its findings and its probabilistic world view. He insisted that God does not play dice with the universe. His change of heart is reminiscent of Freud's change of heart in that both men had first forged a paradigm that implicitly called for an accounting of death and death anxiety and both subsequently refused to accept the findings that they and others had generated which supported their initial viewpoint.

It is at this juncture that Freud and Einstein part ways. Freud was dealing with a qualitative science in which clearly defined quantified were non-existent (see however, ref), so he was able to easily shift positions. On the other hand, Einstein was dealing with a quantitative science and as a result, he could not return to a death-denying deterministic physics without supportive measured findings. It took some time, but eventually an experiment was crafted to test his deterministic predictions against those made on the basis quantum physics—it involved subatomic influence or action across huge distances. The results, which were definitive, went against Einstein's position. So even though he continued to press for an alternative to quantum physics, Einstein no longer held a tenable position and there was no groundswell of physicists to rally to his side. Quantification makes a great deal of difference in deciding between competing paradigms and in giving up false or incomplete theories; psychoanalysis is all the poorer because it lacks such measures.

There is another noteworthy similarity between Freud and Einstein. When his father died, Freud responded by reasserting his trauma theory of neuroses; then at the time of the anniversary of his father's death, he repudiated that position. Einstein published three highly original papers pertaining to atomic theory, relativity, and quantum physics in 1905. Around the time that he began work on these papers, his illegitimate daughter, Lieserl, died. So death and unconscious death anxiety must have driven his original creativity, much as it did with Freud. I have not been able to pinpoint

the personal event in Einstein's life that motivated him to repudiate his contribution to quantum physics largely because Freud's prevailing second paradigm of psychoanalysis does not recognize the powerful role that death and death anxieties play in human life. As a result, historians have often failed to pursue and record many of the most crucial traumatic events in the lives of our most creative—and most destructive—leaders.

Finally, these realizations also recall the fact that Newton's sudden insight into gravity and the universality of the laws of the universe occurred to him at a time when he was at leisure because his area was beset with the plague. He too undoubtedly was suffering consciously and unconsciously from both existential and predatory death anxieties and it can be conjectured that the intensification of these anxieties played a role in his breakthrough. His paradoxical response to the intensification of these anxieties, as seen in fashioning a theory that no longer supported the denial of death, stands in contrast to Freud's reaction to the anniversary of the death of his father. Freud's reaction went in the opposite direction: He gave up a potentially death-related paradigm of emotional life to one that was constructed in a manner that implicitly supported the denial of death. Let's look at this entire matter a little more closely.

Freud's Shift From Counter-Archetype to Conformity

Freud's paradigmatic positions ran counter to the more usual, archetypal trend which involves a first theory that supports the denial of death and a second theory that no longer does so. The scientists who made this shift—Copernicus, Galileo, Newton, Darwin, and Einstein—did so by defying their own nature, their natural need to deny death implicitly or explicitly. In their cases, given that the rest of the population was fixated on and strongly invested in such denial, their second paradigms were quite unpopular and took many years to become established as validated scientific facts for however long they will prevail as such—i.e., until another paradigm shift, if called for, takes place.

In contrast, in the case of Freud's paradigm shift went from a potential openness to death-related issues to a closed-minded denial of death. As a result—and here's the rub—despite his own despair over this development, his second position received slow but increasingly large support from psychologists and the population at large. This happened because he went from defying a crucial archetype to conforming—and in these matters, humans archetypically prefer death-denying theories.

There appear to be two reasons why Freud initially ran counter to archetype—one was general and the other personal. The general is suggested by an analogy with the paradigms developed regarding the geography of the earth. The first paradigm saw the earth as flat and formulated the related danger of falling off its edges. This clearly was a death-related paradigm which was changed only after fearless explorers like Magellan actually circumnavigated the earth and found it to be a globe. In this case the existing initial data spoke overwhelmingly for a flat earth and there was no indication of data to the contrary. The paradigm shift arose only after such data appeared.

Similarly, Freud's own clinical observations and the reports he obtained from his

colleagues and the French psychiatrists he visited in Paris spoke overwhelmingly for the central role of early trauma in the development of neuroses (Balmory and masson). Even so, his emphasis on seduction—i.e., on sexually-based early traumas—suggests a need on his part to avoid formulations in which assault, violence, and death played a pivotal role. We may take this as a sign of unresolved death anxieties and mark it for further study later in the book.

As a committed empiricist, then, Freud forged an initial paradigm of emotional life that was trauma-centered. As such it eventually would lead him to death-related issues and their effects on the human psyche. It was then the massive amount of trauma-related clinical data that Freud was collecting that prompted him to theorize against his own archetypal inclinations.

As for personal reasons for defying his archetypal tendencies, the most likely conjecture is that Freud adopted his first viewpoint because he had a smattering of conscious and a strong set of unconscious reasons to suspect or know that his father and others had subjected him to early-life traumas, seductive and otherwise. The actual level of awareness at which Freud experienced these incidents is unknown, but this hypothesis is suggested by his initial expressed conviction that seductions by fathers, including his own, played a role in neurogenesis (ref). Whatever Freud knew consciously and unconsciously facilitated the development of his first paradigm of neuroses, and this knowledge and his commitment to the truth were strong enough as unconscious motivators yet in a sufficiently tolerable state to enable him to articulate his first reality-centered theory.

A year later, however, at the time of his father's unveiling and after efforts at self-analysis of which we know very little in the way of specifics, Freud denied the role of fathers as seducers in neurogenesis—personally and collectively. More broadly he gave up his pursuit of his patients' and his own early traumas and focused instead on guilt-ridden incestuous fantasies. It seems likely that Freud was approaching a less disguised or partially conscious awareness of the truths of his early life—horrible as they must have been—and that this situation unconsciously drove him to abandon their pursuit. And with that, gone was the centrality of external traumas in the vicissitudes of emotional life and in its place, there entered a world of make believe and fantasy. In a few words, as I shall show later, Freud saved his life by making this paradigm shift.

That Freud knew that he had copped out is suggested by his allusion to Rebecca taking off her gown because she no longer was a bride. On one level, mostly unconsciously, Freud seemed to know that he had retreated from the truth and no longer deserved the fame and riches of a great man of discovery—that he no longer deserved to stand next to Copernicus and the others who had defied their personal and universal archetypes to establish more valid paradigms of nature. What Freud could not have known is that he had given up a heroic position contra archetype only to succumb to his nature in a way that took him down a road marred with blindness and false premises. Even without identifying the early traumas involved, we are entitled to see this as yet one more example of how fate sets the course of a human life—and because the life

belonged to Sigmund Freud, fate also helped to establish the operative paradigm of psychodynamic human psychology for years to come.