

SEEING BOTH SIDES IS FREUD'S INFLUENCE ON PSYCHOLOGY STILL ALIVE?



Freud is a dead weight on psychology

John F. Kihlstrom, University of California, Berkeley

The twentieth century was the century of Sigmund Freud, because Freud changed our image of ourselves (Roth, 1998). Copernicus showed us that the Earth did not lie at the center of the universe, and Darwin showed us that humans were set apart from other animals, but Freud claimed to show that human experience, thought, and action was determined not by our conscious rationality, but by irrational forces outside our awareness and control – forces which could only be understood and controlled by an extensive therapeutic process called *psychoanalysis*.

Freud also changed the vocabulary with which we understand ourselves and others. Before you ever opened this textbook, you already knew something about the id and the superego, penis envy and phallic symbols, castration anxiety and the Oedipus complex. In popular culture, psychotherapy is virtually identified with psychoanalysis. Freudian theory, with its focus on the interpretation of ambiguous events, lies at the foundation of 'postmodern' approaches to literary criticism such as deconstruction. More than anyone else, Freud's influence on modern culture has been profound and long-lasting.

Freud's cultural influence is based, at least implicitly, on the premise that his theory is scientifically valid. But from a scientific point of view, classical Freudian psychoanalysis is dead as both a theory of the mind and a mode of therapy (Macmillan, 1991/1997). No empirical evidence supports any specific proposition of psychoanalytic theory, such as the idea that development proceeds through oral, anal, phallic, and genital stages, or that little boys lust after their mothers and hate and fear their fathers. No empirical evidence indicates that psychoanalysis is more effective, or more efficient, than other forms of psychotherapy, such as systematic desensitization or assertiveness training. No empirical evidence indicates that the mechanisms by which psychoanalysis achieves its effects, such as they are, are those specifically predicated on the theory, such as transference and catharsis.

Of course, Freud lived at a particular period of time, and it might be argued that his theories were valid when applied to European culture at that time, even if they are no longer apropos today. However, recent historical analyses show that Freud's construal of his case material was systematically distorted by his theories of unconscious conflict and infantile sexuality, and that he misinterpreted and misrepresented the scientific evidence available to him. Freud's theories were not just a product of his time: They were misleading and incorrect even as he published them.

Of course, some psychologists argue that psychoanalysis has a continuing relevance to twenty-first-century psychology (Reppen, 2006). In an important paper, Drew Westen (Westen, 1998), a psychologist at Emory University, agreed that Freud's

theories are archaic and obsolete, but argued that Freud's legacy lives on in a number of theoretical propositions that are widely accepted by scientists: the existence of unconscious mental processes; the importance of conflict and ambivalence in behavior; the childhood origins of adult personality; mental representations as a mediator of social behavior; and stages of psychological development. However, some of these propositions are debatable. For example, there is little evidence that childrearing practices have any lasting impact on personality (Harris, 2006).

More important, this argument skirts the question of whether *Freud's* view of these matters was correct. It is one thing to say that unconscious motives play some role in experience, thought, and action. It is something else to say that our every thought and deed is driven by repressed sexual and aggressive urges; that children harbor erotic feelings toward the parent of the opposite sex; and that young boys are hostile toward their fathers, whom they regard as rivals for their mothers' affections. This is what *Freud* believed, and so far as we can tell *Freud* was wrong in every respect. For example, the unconscious mind revealed in laboratory studies of automaticity and implicit memory bears no resemblance to the unconscious mind of psychoanalytic theory (Kihlstrom, 2008).

Westen also argued that psychoanalytic theory itself had evolved since Freud's time, and that it is therefore unfair to bind psychoanalysis so tightly to the Freudian vision of repressed, infantile, sexual and aggressive instincts. Again, this is true. In both Europe and America, a number of 'neo-Freudian' psychoanalysts such as W. R. D. Fairbairn and D. W. Winnicott in Great Britain, and even Freud's own daughter, Anna, have de-emphasized the sex, aggression, and biology of classical Freudian theory, while retaining Freud's focus on the role of unconscious conflict in personal relationships. But again, this avoids the issue of whether *Freud's* theories are correct. Furthermore, it remains an open question whether these 'neo-Freudian' theories are any more valid than are the classically Freudian views that preceded them. For example, it is not at all clear that Erik Erikson's stage theory of psychosocial development is any more valid than Freud's was.

Some psychoanalysts recognize these problems, and have argued that psychoanalysis must do more to re-connect itself to modern scientific psychology (Bornstein, 2001; Bornstein, 2005). Doubtless, such efforts will help clinical psychoanalysis come up to contemporary standards for scientifically based treatment. But it is not at all clear how this project will benefit scientific psychology. While Freud had an enormous impact on twentieth-century culture, he was a dead weight on twentieth-century psychology – especially with respect to personality and psychotherapy.



John F. Kihlstrom



SEEING BOTH SIDES

IS FREUD'S INFLUENCE ON PSYCHOLOGY STILL ALIVE?

Freud's influence on psychology is alive and vibrant

Joel Weinberger, Adelphi University

Is Freud still alive? Of course Freud is dead. He died on September 23, 1939. No one asks whether Isaac Newton or William James is dead. For some odd reason this is reserved for Freud. If the question is whether psychoanalysis, the branch of psychology he founded, is dead, the answer is clearly no. Psychoanalysis survived Freud and thrives today. The American Psychological Association's division of psychoanalysis is the second largest division in the association. There now exist several schools of psychoanalysis, some of which Freud would probably not recognize. That is just what you would expect from a discipline whose founder is now 70 years dead.

Are Freud's ideas dead? They certainly are not. They have entered our common vernacular. They have entered and forever changed our culture. Think of the terms of *id*, *ego*, *superego*, *Freudian slip*, and so on. There are psychoanalytic writers, historians, psychiatrists, and of course, psychologists. The real question, I suppose, is whether Freud's ideas are still *valid*. The answer is that some are and some are not. A surprising number remain relevant, even central, to modern psychology. So I suppose the charge is to state which of his ideas remain valid. And that is what I will address.

Let's look at some of Freud's central ideas and see how they stack up with today's psychology. Freud said that all human motives could be traced back to biological sources, specifically to sex and aggression. There is a branch of psychology now termed evolutionary psychology (Buss, 1994a,b); there is also sociobiology (Wilson, 1975) and ethology (Hinde, 1982). All champion the importance of biological factors in our behavior. And all have data to back up their claims. This aspect of Freud's thinking is certainly not dead. As for the importance of sex and aggression? Just look at the best-selling books, hit movies, and TV shows around you. What characterizes virtually all of them? Sex and violence. Hollywood and book publishers all seem to be Freudians, and so are the people who sample their wares.

Another idea of Freud's that was very controversial in his time was his notion that children have sexual feelings. Now that is simply commonplace knowledge.

Psychoanalysts have long held that one of the major factors accounting for the effectiveness of psychotherapy is the therapeutic relationship. For many years this was not accepted, particularly by the behaviorist school (Emmelkamp, 1994). We now know that this is a critical factor in therapeutic success (Weinberger, 1996). The related idea that we carry representations of early relationships around in our heads, an idea expanded upon by object relations theory (a school of psychoanalysis) and attachment theory (the creation of a psychoanalyst, John Bowlby), is also now commonly accepted in psychology.

The most central idea usually attributed to Freud is the importance of unconscious processes. According to Freud, we are most often unaware of why we do what we do. For a long while, mainstream academic psychology rejected this notion. Now it seems to have finally caught up to Freud. Modern thinkers now believe that unconscious processes are central and account for most of our behavior. Discussion of unconscious processes permeates research in memory (Graf & Masson, 1993), social psychology (Bargh, 1997), cognitive psychology (Baars, 1988), and so on. In fact, it is now a mainstream belief in psychology. More specific notions of Freud's such as his ideas about defense have also received empirical support (Shedler, Mayman, & Manis, 1993; D. Weinberger, 1990). So have some of his ideas about unconscious fantasies (Siegel & Weinberger, 1997). There is even some work afoot to examine Freud's conceptions of transference (Andersen & Glassman, 1996; Crits-Christoph, Cooper, & Luborsky, 1990).

Of course, many of the particulars of Freud's thinking have been overtaken by events and have turned out to be incorrect. What thinker who died over 70 years ago has had all of his or her ideas survive intact, without change? In broad outline, however, Freud's ideas are not only alive, they are vibrant. We should probably be testing more of them. Any notion that Freud should be ignored because some of his assertions have been shown to be false is just plain silly. It is throwing out the baby with the bath water. And, he is so much fun to read!