

FREUD AND JUNG: What Emotion did not allow to Unite¹

(Opening Lecture of the First Venezuelan Congress of Psychoanalysis Caracas, June 2005).

Carlos Amadeu Botelho Byington²

Dear Colleagues,

Many thanks for the honor of being invited to present one of the two lectures for the opening of this Congress. I am especially grateful to Gonzalo Himiob, Luis Sanz and the Venezuelan Association of Analytical Psychology, the Venezuelan Society of Depth Psychology and the Center for Jungian studies for inviting me.

Firstly, I'd better say that I speak of Freud and Jung as the heroic fathers of my vocation. Whilst still in high school, I began my analysis with a psychoanalyst and soon fell in love with Freud's work. I studied psychoanalysis at the time with the firm intention of becoming a psychoanalyst myself. It so happened that my analyst "without my permission" went into analysis with Dr. Nise da Silveira. She had learnt about the work of Jung, and had undergone analysis with him and Dr. Marie-Louise von Franz in Zurich, and then returned to Rio de Janeiro where she became the pioneer of the expressive techniques of Analytical Psychology in Brazil. And so it was that my first analysis, which was then in its fourth year, came to an end. Or rather, it continued in a journey to Zurich where I became qualified as a Jungian analyst. On concluding my qualification course, I wrote a thesis titled *Authenticity as the Duality in Unity*. In that thesis I included the notion of complementarity between the work of Freud and Jung, which caused a rift between myself and Dr. von Franz Jung's erudite disciple and my dear analyst of five years. On returning to Brazil and founding the Brazilian Society of Analytical Psychology, together with other Brazilian colleagues, I continued my creativity in the development of psychological theory that included the complementarity between the work of Freud and Jung within a symbolic and archetypal referential which I call Jungian Symbolic Psychology. In this theory, I return to the work and the person of Freud to nourish myself, and, in doing so, frequently remember the famous sentence from the French culture, which so developed the art of love: "we always return to our first love"—*on revient toujours à notre premier amour*. It is within this perspective of affection and gratitude that I will be speaking to you today about how I understand

¹ The opening lecture at the 1st Venezuelan Congress of Analytical Psychology. Caracas, June 2005.

² Medical Doctor Psychiatrist and Jungian Analyst. Founding member of the Brazilian Society for Analytical Psychology. Member of the International Association for Analytical Psychology. Historian, Educator and creator of Jungian Symbolic Psychology. E-mail: c.byington@uol.com.br Site: www.carlosbyington.com.br

the emotional problematic in the relationship of these two pioneering geniuses of dynamic psychology.

Jung possibly got to know about Freud's thinking by reading *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900) because in his own Psychiatric thesis —*About Occult Phenomena*—he quoted Freud's work three times.

The first personal meeting between the two, that lasted thirteen hours, in February 1907, in Freud's house in Vienna, was therefore, the great occasion that united them in a reciprocal fascination with one another until 1912. The essence of their creative and defensive emotional and transference relationships was possibly the paternal complex of them both.

Freud, nineteen years older than Jung, at 50, had already built the pillars of his monumental work which would transform the culture with the introduction of the concepts of the dynamic unconscious and of psychological evolutionism. His problem, as a Jew within the German culture and a neurologist qualified in Helmholtz's Positivist School of medicine, it was the institutional ratification of these new Psychological and Psychiatric ideas, centered on sexuality, within a psychiatric tradition in which it was not militant and which was practiced within a traditionally Christian and moralist culture, with a strong anti-Semitic component. In this context, Jung had various characteristics that made him an ideal son, heir and divulger of the father's work. As well as being the head of the famous Bleuler clinic, which had just coined the term schizophrenia, and of heading the Burghölzli, in Zurich, one of the great centers of psychiatry in Europe, Jung was the son of a Protestant minister, in other words, a better "goyn" could not be found.

Jung, in turn, at 31, had only just begun his extensive career. He had only written about psychiatric matters—the very subject of Spiritualism had been dealt with as a thesis of Psychiatry. The giant, who would spend the next 53 years employing the concept of archetypes as the root of all human phenomena, both individual and cultural, in the transcendent creative imagination of the instinct of individuation, was just an intelligent and ambitious young medical psychiatrist.

All the psychological components of the complexes, symbols and archetypes are bipolar. The principal bipolar archetypal constitution of the paternal complex is predominantly expressed in images of the father and the son. From their life stories, we can infer that both Freud and Jung presented significant limitations that resulted from the fixations due to their badly elaborated paternal complexes. Freud's paternal complex, as we know, led to the brilliant discovery of the Oedipal Complex. As the firstborn, with five sisters and a brother who was ten years younger, in a patriarchal tradition that overvalued males, with an attractive mother who was only 21 years older than himself, it would have been difficult for him not to be affectively attracted to her. At the same time, his father, a commercial man, 20 years older than his mother, was a fragile rival when faced with his academic ambition in the normal rivalry between father and son. The anti-Semitism of the Viennese society

and the difficulties Jewish father and head of family had to face were exemplified in Freud's adolescence, when his father was seen to be unable to defend himself in the street when he was humiliated by a group of anti-Semitic youths who knocked off his cap. This incident possibly also contributed to Freud's badly elaborated de-idealization of his father. His father's death when Freud was 40 years old and the satisfaction mixed with guilt and pain led to the brilliant discovery of the Oedipal Complex in himself. But from that to conclude that all boys, at birth, already had incestuous and parricidal tendencies as the central instinct of the id was an untenanted generalization.

Freud's identification with Oedipus is impressive, as is illustrated in an episode told by Jones. On his 50th birthday, Freud's disciples presented him with a medallion, created by Paul Feden, which had his image on one side and, on the other, Oedipus in front of the Sphinx with Sophocles's famous phrase: *he who deciphered the famous enigma was an extraordinarily powerful man*. It was synchronicity because, as Freud, emotionally confessed to those present, he had, when young, walked through the corridors of the University of Vienna, and had stumbled upon these same words on the busts of ancient professors and had fantasized that one day he, too, would become famous.

Well, we know that Oedipus's fame occurred only partly because he solved the enigma, but, principally, because he killed his father and had an incestuous relationship with his mother, having four children with her. His fame cannot also be separated from the fact that he mutilated and blinded himself once he knew what he had done. Oedipus only became existentially wise after he repudiated the war between his two sons and his pilgrimage to the Temple of Erineas, the Furies, described by Sophocles in Oedipus in Cologne, the last play in his trilogy. Only then is he consecrated and finally led by Theseus to the Hereafter.

The drama of Oedipus therefore transmits a paradox that united the glory of the intellect according to the existential tragedy. The honor the disciples placed on him with the medallion was certainly due to the identification placed on Freud with the side of Oedipus's personality that deciphered the enigma, but, how do we relate Freud to the other side of Oedipus's personality, that left his intellectual victory for the most rugged of defeats in the existential process?

In order to attempt to answer this question which is so threatening to the glory of such a great genius, we must penetrate more deeply into the myth of the Sphinx. This is the very image of incest, conceived with other monsters in the mythological imagination of the pre-Olympic period of the Greek Culture. His mother is the dragon Echidna, lover of his own son, the hound Orthos. His other brother is the three headed hound Kerebos, who guards the gates of Hades. His body with the claws and mane of a lion, the head of a woman, and the wings and nails of an eagle express the monstrosity that incest represents when it occurs within the family and the culture built under the taboo of incest.

As Engels (1884) so well described, following the work of Morgan (1861), the absence of the knowledge of the biological paternal function in the family groups of the hunter-gatherer tribes prevented the existence of the social role of the father which was established in the patriarchal family, which gave origin to civilization. My interpretation of the significance of the patriarchal family is that its organization naturally produced the incest taboo. This way, incest and parricide only became immoral with the predominance of the patriarchal Archetype in the family and culture, which marks the beginning of civilization. We can suppose that in the bands of hunters-gatherers, whose pre-patriarchal family, according to Morgan, the women probably mated with any male that possessed her, regardless of their relationships. Parricide, in turn, was not forbidden because the father figure did not exist.

This way, with the passing of generations, the resulting children accumulated all the family roles. From the point of view of the Collective Consciousness, at this phase of cultural development, this was natural and not in the least monstrous.

However, after the structure of civilization became based on the patriarchal family and the incest taboo, this indiscrimination became the equivalent of a monstrosity and was projected, in Greek mythology, onto the images of fantastic animals that openly practiced incest. This being the case, the Sphinx is the representation of incest existent in the Matriarchal dimension and that, in the Patriarchal dimension of culture, began to be seen as a monstrosity. From the fact that the incest taboo accompanied the codification of the law, we can understand the association of incest with parricide, because both, respectively, represent the maximum transgression of the family and of society. In this sense, the symbol of the Sphinx that comes to punish **Tebas** and that would be deciphered by Oedipus included incest and parricide.

The word Sphinx comes from Greek Mythology, which named the monster Sphigks, perhaps because of its similarity with the verb sphiggo, which means to tighten and that was the origin of the word *sphincter* in Medicine. For this reason, Kerényi interpreted the meaning of Sphinx as “that which tightens”, or rather, as “the strangler”. Within this meaning, we can see the Sphinx as an archetypal image of the fixation, brilliantly described by Freud as the principal disturbance of libido in the developmental process.

The enigma of the Sphinx is the question about which is the being that walks on four legs at first, then, in the middle, on two; and on three at the end. Solving the riddle as being the human being in infancy, in adult life and then in old age, the Sphinx falls to the bottom of the abyss. If it represents incest and parricide, and if Oedipus wins in order to later fall into incest and parricide, this paradox can mean that he, apparently, wins by means of the intellect but the intellectual victory is an illusion because, in existential reality, he returns to the bottom of the abyss to defeat it. The false victory over the Sphinx therefore represents the omnipotence of rational Consciousness which, by

speaking about life, believes it controls it. We immediately think of reason corroded in Paris by the Enlightenment, which is soon to be shipwrecked by Terror. But we can also think of *insight* as the major disillusion of Psychoanalysis. In fact, the discovery of the unconscious processes gave origin to the illusion that the simple rational understanding would explain any symptom and lead to its cure, in the same way that Anna O. woke up cured of her water phobia when, hypnotized by Breuer, she remembered that her phobia began when she saw her governess's puppy drinking water on top of the table. As illuded as Oedipus was, countless psychoanalysts began treating phobics, depressives, seriously anxiety cases, addicts, personality disorders and even esquitzophrenics by seeking a cure by insight by means of up to six sessions a week of exhaustive interpretations. Months and even years would go by. The interpretations seemed to be correct. Patients verbalized their (previously) unconscious contents, but the cure never came. Everything was explained as resistance, nothing as an error of theory. Like Oedipus, patients and analysts drowned in pathology and the compulsion to repetition, and the Sphinx accumulated an increasing amount of victories.

The Greeks called omnipotence *hybris*, the arrogance of men who lost their sense of proportion and upset the gods. The hubris of Oedipus, of the Enlightenment and of the magical illusion of power is archetypical. In fact the Cartesian cogito is experienced by the child by the acquisition of the word. "I speak, therefore I am". It is by means of tumbles and falls that it learns by experience that "the Verb becomes flesh"

The enigma of the Sphinx refers to time and the stages of life. As the brilliance of Freud discovered and Oedipus tragically learnt, it is the existential development process by means of life experience that forms Consciousness, not the other way round. If Oedipus had also understood the enigma at the existential level, and not just at the intellectual, perhaps he would have examined his infancy better and his relationship with his parents in Corinth and discovered the real story of his existential process. By deciphering the Sphinx only at the intellectual level and believing himself to be the omnipotent knower of truth, Oedipus had to pay the tragic price in order to discover his existential truth.

We need to always and again remember that Freud and Jung mutually analyzed some of one another's dreams, but that neither of them had been analyzed. It can be expected, therefore, that despite the genius of them both, many of their theories reveal defenses acted out as rationalizations. Due to their extraordinary creativity, their theories contain great discoveries, but, as the same time, their existential processes operated defensively, as happened with Oedipus. The major example of these defenses, regarding the relationship between the two, was, to me, the abrupt separation in the middle of their extraordinarily creative association, without any **emotional elaboration** and without any integration of their difficulties. They lost out, for sure, but, because they were the pillars of dynamic psychology, their traumatic separation fundamentally affected the whole field of Psychology.

They became polarized in the study of the collective and personal unconscious. This way they did not realize that the separation between the personal and the archetypal does not always exist, since the personal dimension has an archetypal foundation, starting with the symbols of father, mother and child as well as all the defenses described by Freud to form the personal unconscious. For this reason, we should stop believing that each of the theories is self-sufficient and can be disconnected from the theories of the other because, when we do this, we perpetuate the limitations of the two geniuses and paralyze Psychology by its fixations. It is congresses like this one which helps us recognize and try to overcome the splits and gaps they left behind.

In my opinion, the principal theoretical consequence of the insufficient elaboration of Freuds parental Complex, was his description of the Oedipus Complex, brilliantly discovered in himself, as normal and existing in all children. Any newly qualified analyst would not have the slightest difficulty recognizing the rationalization if someone said they had a problem, but that all children were born with the same problem. This rationalization caused an enormous confusion between the normal and pathological theory of personality development, by postulating that all children are born perverse-polymorphic and need to be repressed so as to sublimate their Oedipus complex, form their Superegos and become civilized.

This focus is very different to the archetypal focus, which understands the parental complex with the infinite experiences of the relationship between parents and children, which, if fixated, can lead to the Oedipus Complex, which Freud observed in himself.

On abandoning the polymorphic-perverse theory, we see that just like monstrosity of the Sphinx, this theory expresses the prejudice of the patriarchal dominance over the matriarchal, identified as a perverse and parricidal desire. However, if we agree with Erich Neumann that the first stage of infancy is dominated by the Matriarchal Archetype and that the child, like culture, passes into a second, patriarchal, stage, we can theorize that this can happen without the sublimation of the polymorphic-perverse to form the Superego. In fact, one must admit that the matriarchal dominance in the first stage of infancy occurs in the midst of all the possible fantasies, which include incestuous and parricidal tendencies. However, when the child goes through potty training, learning to talk and socialization, which occur under the patriarchal hegemony implanted with the acquisition of the incest taboo and the law, it is necessary that we separate the normal transformations from the fixations, which do, indeed, generate disturbances of the parental complex which can be framed in the Oedipus Complex. When we ascribe the polymorphic-perverse and oedipal dynamism to children at birth, we pathologize their Ids *a priori* and create huge theoretical and practical problems in order to perceive the non normality inherent in the fixations and defenses during the development process. When we do this, we reduce the Matriarchal Archetype to the immature and unruly and create enormous difficulties in conceiving the functioning of the matriarchal dynamism **during** the

functioning of the patriarchal dominance in the second stage of infancy and for the rest of the person's life. As I have tried to show, from adolescence onwards the Anima and Animus Archetypes begin to operate within the Alterity Archetype, which conjugates the dialectic interaction of the Matriarchal Archetype, as desire and sexuality; and of the Patriarchal Archetype, as law and order.

Freud's difficulty in perceiving the Oedipus complex as a pathological variation of the countless characteristics of the parental complex prevented him from seeing it as the first and principal archetypal image of the countless polarities that would permeate the symbolic elaboration of the individuation process throughout childhood, maturity and old age, as was indicated by the enigma of the Sphinx.

We can say that, for his part, Freud acted out the *senex* side of his paternal complex, fixating on the Oedipus complex. Jung, in turn, acted out the *puer* side of the same fixation. It is a known fact that Jung's relationship with his father had been problematic from the start, principally in relation to his father's dogmatic attitude to religion. In this respect, Jung's vision, at the start of his adolescence, clearly illustrates his negative paternal complex.

One day, on his way home from school, Jung had a vision of his father defecating and splattering Basle Cathedral. This vision, which greatly disturbed him, he interpreted as his revulsion/rejection of dogmatic religion in his search for the living God, which characterized his own religiosity. By associating Basle Cathedral with the major symbol of Protestantism, of which his father was a minister, and realizing that Jung was entering puberty, it is inevitable that we relate his vision with an intensely negative paternal complex, which was probably constellated in his relationship with Freud. "I considered him to be a superior personality, onto whom I projected the father image". (Jung, *Memories, Dreams and Reflections*).

It is undeniable that the disagreement about the sexual nature of libido, which Freud never accepted, was the central point of the rupture, but only the underlying emotional luggage to the rupture can explain why so many of the other aspects/characteristics of the work of the two were kept separate.

The major resistance that Psychoanalysis has to Jungian theory is centered, in my opinion, on the concept of archetypes. However, no psychoanalyst denies that psychic functions such as projections, introjections, identification and all the functions described as defense mechanisms, such as repressions, reactive formation, transference, resistance and the compulsion to repetition exist in all people of all cultures. (Check the Portuguese version for a double negative) In fact, the concept of the collective unconscious underlies psychoanalytic theory. If these structures were to be accepted as archetypes, it would be easier to see them operating normally, without fixation, or defensively, with fixations, which would characterize them as archetypal structuring function operating normally in

Consciousness, as non fixated structuring functions, or in the repressed unconscious, as defensive structuring functions, uniting the two around the transference.

When we read Jung's *Psychology and Transference*, and compare it to neurotic transference, described by Freud, it looks, at first, as though the one has nothing to do with the other. However, if we unite them as archetypal structuring functions; Jung's as creative, and Freud's as defensive, we can clearly see that the two are extraordinarily complementary in explaining the normal and pathological human relationship: Jung's creative transference used in to the search for complete development by means of Individuation, and Freud's defensive transference, applied in fixation and the projection of defenses.

In the same way, the archetypal perception of the primary scene, of the castration complex and the compulsions to repetition can also expand their valuable content to the individual and collective existential context and (thereby) leave the reductivism in which they are customarily used.

Jung theoretical reaction to the rupture was also very significant, starting with the fact that he described the functioning of the archetypes and the whole individuation process only in the second half of life, without it having anything to do with Ego formation. In fell to Jung's followers, such as Jolande Jacobi, Michael Fordham and Erich Neumann to describe Ego formation by means of archetypes and of the Individuation process from the beginning of life. Jung's failure to perceive archetypal formation of the Ego before his followers appears, this way, to be a possible phobic reaction to Freud's work.

Another major limitation of the Jungian school seems, to me, to be the problem of the formation of the Shadow, originating from the reluctance to incorporate Freud's brilliant discovery of the fixation of the formation of these defenses. This resistance has the stubbornness of the defenses of an emotional nature and greatly limited psychopathology and the study of ethics in Analytical Psychology and the very interpretation of Jung in historical phenomena, and, principally, Christianity.

Inspite of Psychoanalysis having, frequently, confused the normal with the pathological, starting with the description of the Oedipus Complex and the recommendation of its repression in order to sublimate it and form the Superego, the concept of fixation allied with defense, above all of the resistance of the compulsion to repetition, are central contributors to the formulation of psychodynamic psychopathology, or rather, that which recognizes the importance of the unconscious processes.

By not systematically incorporating the function of the Shadow, the Jungian School frequently reduces the Shadow to that which is incompatible with Consciousness. This perspective, however, leads to enormous theoretic confusion when interpreting the valuable symbols of the Shadow. Sometimes they are seen as positive, in contrast to the situations where they are considered negative or destructive. When we take into account the phenomena of fixation in the formation of

defenses and of the Shadow, this does not make the least amount of sense, seen as how **all symbols and functions** fixated in the Shadow are of value, because they are necessary for the Individuation Process. .

The same thing happens with the concept of the ethic of Evil, which Jung valued so highly, but which, by leaving aside the concept of fixations, made them, in many instances imprecise and confusing. This way, Jung often formulated ethics, situating it in the Individuation Process, yet without defining the dysfunctions or explaining the formation of Evil. In his book *Aion* he did speak of **Absolute Evil**, but without grounding it scientifically. In the middle of this conceptual confusion, in order to emphasize his belief in the existence of Evil, Jung embarked on a major crusade against the Roman Catholic doctrine of *Summum Bonum*, which affirms that God is good and that Evil is the absence of good (*privatio boni*). Well, when we admit that the Shadow is Evil, originating in the fixations of symbolic elaboration, we clearly see that it is neither in the archetype nor in the genome when we are born, but instead that it is formed as a fixation of the archetype (*Privatio Boni*) during development. In this case, the Central Archetype, which gives origin to the image of totality expressed by the concept of God in the religions, has the potential for full realization (*Summum Bonum*) and it is its dysfunction during elaboration that generates the Shadow and Evil.

Another consequence serious consequence of Jung not adopting the concepts of fixation and defense in his work, in spite of the fact that he was well aware of them from Freud, was his difficulty highlight and clearly differentiate the positive and negative aspects of cultural phenomena, which was revengefully used against him by those who accused him of anti-Semitism. This limitation cost Jung many serious misunderstandings, such as, for example, his interpretation of Nazism by means of the warrior archetype of Wotan. There is no doubt that this existed within the traditional militarism of Germany, but to fail to link it to the terrible hysterical psychopathic fixation that characterized Hitler's personality and National Socialism meant that he was unjustly massacred with the accusation of anti-Semitism and of being in sympathy with Nazism.

The interpretation of Christianity, together with his criticism and apology, was a precious theme that Jung dealt with extensively throughout his work. The lack of use of the differences between the fixated and non-fixated psychic functions, once again greatly damaged his thinking, because he treated them as one thing only and did not differentiate between the creative power of the original Myth and the fixated defense of the patriarchalization during its institutionalization, which tortured and killed people in the name of the Messiah of compassion. Had Jung held onto and absorbed the concepts of fixation defense discovered by Freud, he would certainly have better analyzed the countless cultural themes that he studied, including the basic differences between himself and his own father, to be found between the stagnant dogmatic fixated and defensive position of the

institution and the living, powerful and mystic position of the Myth, both of which were expressions of Christianity.

I wish to congratulate the idealists responsible for this Congress and once again thank them for the kind invitation to participate, because this means of dialogue between the followers of the great pioneers, including the valuable work of one of Freud's followers—as important as Lacan—is, without doubt, the way to honor their creativity, using their own concepts and discoveries to mutually fertilize Psychology in a way that their own personal and emotional limitations had failed to unite.

Bibliography

BYINGTON, Carlos A. B. (1965). "Genuineness as Duality in Unity". Thesis for the Diploma of Analyst the C.G. Jung Institute, Zurich, 1965.

_____ (1983). Uma Teoria Arquetípica da História. O Mito Cristão como Principal Símbolo Estruturante do Padrão de Alteridade na Cultura Ocidental. *Junguiana, Revista da Sociedade Brasileira de Psicologia Analítica*. Petrópolis, 1983, nº1, pgs. 120-177.

ENGELS, Friedrich (1884). *A Origem da Família, da Propriedade Privada e do Estado*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1977.

FREUD, Sigmund (1900). *A Interpretação dos Sonhos*. Obras Completas. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Imago, Vols. 3 e 4, 1972.

FREUD, S e JUNG, C.G. Carta 139, 16/04/1909.

JONES, Ernest (1953). *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*. New York: Basic Books, 1953. vol. 1, pg. 322.

JUNG, C. G. (1950). *Aion*. Obras Completas. São Paulo: Ed. Vozes, vol. 9 Parte II, 1982.

_____ (1959). *Memórias, Sonhos e Reflexões*. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Nova Fronteira, 6^a edição, 1975, pg. 19.

KERÉNYI, Carl (1959). *The Heroes of the Greeks*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1959.

MORGAN, Lewis Henry (1877). *Ancient Society*. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr.