

than his own might still be correct on independent grounds. Rawls (with J. S. Mill) had suggested, for example, that superior education might lead to greater disinterestedness among voters. Barry claims to refute this by reporting that constituencies made up of university graduates elect "rather undistinguished Tories." That even undistinguished Tories might have their virtues does not seem to cross his mind.

There are methodological problems as well. Barry defines Liberalism as a position viewing society as "made up of independent, autonomous units who cooperate only when the terms of cooperation are such as to make it further the ends of each of the parties." Barry then argues for socialism through the use of microeconomic models which presuppose just such a view of human society and motivation. He also presents a two-dimensional diagram to show the absurdity of Rawls's lexical ordering of principles. He is apparently not aware that lexical ordering is specifically intended for problems requiring more than two dimensions, making his demonstration quite irrelevant.

The Freud/Jung Letters edited by William McGuire

(Princeton University Press—Bollingen Series XCIV; 650 pp.; \$17.50)

Joseph F. Rychlak

Though exchanged between Freud and Jung, these letters reflect a distinct triangle, for always hovering in the background is the shadow of Eugene Bleuler, Jung's superior and sometime mentor at the Burghölzli Hospital. Freud and Jung even diagnose the situation as that of a "father complex" for Jung, who must decide where his allegiance lies in his budding career. Is he an academician and conventional scientist in the medical-biological tradition represented by Bleuler, or is he now committed to a new father in the figure

By far the most serious flaw is Barry's failure to defend his socialism with arguments as weighty as its claims. Rawls's original position was an attempt to reach a conceptual core of justice applicable in all times and places. In contrast, Barry identifies justice with the furtherance of working-class interests. Yet not every age can be said to have had classes, let alone working classes. Some had large status groups, others are best seen in terms of dyadic relations along any of a number of lines. Indeed, even a concept so central to socialism as property cannot be analyzed apart from various cultural, legal, and religious frameworks. Weber made these points against Marx, and the debate has continued since. Barry shows that he is aware of these difficulties, fails to follow his acute criticisms of Rawls with a persuasive grounding of his own position. Until such a defense is forthcoming, socialism remains a (rather ill-defined) position, which sometimes has worthwhile remedies for present ills, but remains little more than a stutter in the conversations of eternity.

of Freud, who has a revolutionary form of science needing promulgation? In the early letters there is no doubt on Jung's part—at least in his conscious sphere. Though he was later to expect a more nearly equal status in the relationship, Jung could say in a letter of February, 1908: "Let me enjoy your friendship not as one between equals but as that of father and son." Freud readily granted this request, referring to Jung later that year as "My dear friend and heir." The father-son theme reappears throughout the let-

ters, which cover the period April, 1906, through January, 1913, at which time a complete break between the correspondents occurred. (There are a few scattered letters from Jung after this, but of no real consequence.)

One might even see these letters as a quadrangle. For if Bleuler was a shadowy figure in the father complex of Jung, then surely on Freud's side there lurked the image of Wilhelm Fliess. Freud had carried on a lengthy correspondence with Fliess, whom he called his "only audience," during the difficult years of his self-analysis in the 1890's. But this very personal relationship had ended in bitter dispute over the proper role of psychoanalysis in the explanation of neurosis. Fliess was just as committed to the medical-biological explanation as was Bleuler, and it would be easy to see how some invidious symbolisms could have taken root in Freud's feelings for the Bleuler-Jung tandem as a potential source of opposition to psychoanalytical explanations of behavior. There is no doubt that Freud was crushed by the parting with Fliess, and many clues appear in the present correspondence which suggest that he endured a mild neurosis as a result of this affair. So, as Jung was working through his father-complex in the relationship, so too was Freud reworking his Fliess episode—which accounts for the extreme anxiety displayed by Freud if Jung's letters were tardy or insufficient. Jung was to complain of Freud's excessive expectations as correspondent, and Freud admitted that it had to do with Fliess.

Of course, these letters are far more than a chronicle of the minor neuroses of Freud and Jung. They show how two dedicated men were able to take a relatively narrow-gauged group of Viennese physicians and professional people with a new and strange outlook on life and broaden this collection into a worldwide psychoanalytical society. Jung played an immense role in this, as he himself states at one point. Freud worked more in the background, but he was always clearly in command.

The personal observations we get of various important figures in the psychoanalytical movement—Adler, Stekel, Ferenczi, Jones, Binswanger, etc.—are priceless. Jung in particular, as the young lion, is aggressively adept at turning descriptive phrases which can cut a man down with humorous sarcasm. Freud usually tempers his excesses with the insights of age.

We can look at the split between Jung and Freud from two directions. On the technical side there were growing differences in how each man viewed the human condition in terms of sexuality. The letters reveal that Jung was at one point far more committed to the sexuality thesis than he has admitted being in others of his writings. But the fact that Jung was ready to "give" on this thesis and to adapt his libido conception to an *élan vital* interpretation (as he was to do on a solo trip made to America in 1912) doubtless presaged his fall from Freud's grace. Freud was always adamant in putting theories of infantile sexuality, unresolved Oedipal conflicts, etc., before his explanations of the neuroses as predicate assumptions. To weaken in any way such predications was to court disaster in relations with Freud, as Breuer, Fliess, Adler, and Rank were also to discover.

We can also view the split—and this is probably closer to the "real" reason for the break—from the perspective of the personal involvements of these two highly ambitious men of genius. Jung's role as he perceived it was to mature, to establish his own style of thinking, and add thereby to psychoanalysis something which was not entirely "Freudian" but which might still be valid in studies of human behavior. The beginning of the end came in October, 1909, just after Freud and Jung had returned from their visit to Clark University in America. Jung announced that "Archaeology or rather mythology has got me in its grip." Freud made fumbling attempts to suggest that though psychoanalysis did indeed need such studies, he and Jung were actually dilettantes in this area. As noted, this was a

recognition that a new terrain was being opened up by the younger man, a terrain on which the older man's authority could more easily be challenged. Events were to prove this true, for it was Jung's vast studies—making him no dilettante but a foremost expert in the religions and mythologies of mankind—which were to provide him with what he called "objective evidence" to back up his deviationist conceptions of libido and other workings of the psyche.

But Freud could not from his end view this as the maturation of a son and heir. He considered the evolving Jungian emphasis to be a loss of allegiance to his cause, a *continuation* rather than a resolution of the father complex they had been in agreement about. At another level, it was also the Fliess matter all over again. Apparently there had been some preliminary analysis of this Fliess involvement on the trip to Clark University when the two men fell into analyzing each other's dreams. At a critical point in his free associations, Freud stopped short, remarking that if he were to continue he would lose his authority in the relationship to Jung. Though Jung accepted this in 1909, he threw it up again to Freud in a letter of December, 1912, when their relationship was on the verge of collapse. The point is: Jung could see no way to be his own man with such a father-figure, and he felt that Freud was using psychoanalytical theory to detract from his individuality.

For example, Freud insisted on interpreting Jung's "slips" in writing to be various signs of his flagging allegiance. This irritated Jung, and he tells Freud in a December, 1912, letter: ". . . your technique of treating your pupils like patients is a *blunder*." Jung wanted Freud to admit his own neuroticism in their relationship, and thereby to alter the nature of their association from father-son to one more strictly colleague-to-colleague. Freud responds with the statement: "You have not, as you suppose, been injured by my neurosis." But the rift is now extreme and *highly personal*, so that

Freud says in a letter of January 3, 1913: "It is a convention among us analysts that none of us need feel ashamed of his own bit of neurosis. But one who while behaving abnormally keeps shouting that he is normal gives ground for the suspicion that he lacks insight into his illness. Accordingly, I propose that we abandon our personal relations entirely." Jung concurred, in a letter of January 6, 1913.

One can take sides in this exchange, which seems in the final analysis a rather petty ground on which to part company. But we must remember that psychoanalysis is dedicated to the very study of such "personality clashes," and hence it is natural for the two giants in this field to frame their differences in terms of the rubrics of their specialty—rubrics which strike us as *ad hominem*s rather than scientific points of dispute. It is not for us to judge these men, but one cannot help feeling that psychoanalysis lost a good deal more from this parting than it lost from the other schisms. This book is an invaluable addition to the literature of psychoanalysis and analytical psychology (Jung's term), as well as to the literature of biography and intellectual history.

CONTRIBUTORS

NORMAN MARKOWITZ teaches history at Livingston College, Rutgers University, and is the author of *The Rise and Fall of the People's Century*, a biography of Henry Wallace.

EUGENE FONTINELL is a member of the Department of Philosophy at Queens College, New York.

JAMES A. GOODMAN is a freelance writer, a close follower of Greek politics.

ALAN EMDIN is a graduate student in political philosophy at the University of Chicago.

JOSEPH F. RYCHLAK is a member of the Department of Psychological Sciences at Purdue.

Briefly Noted

Common Globe or Global Commons by John C. G. Boot

(Dekker [New York]; 138 pp.; \$7.75)

Books that are easy reading yet not simplistic are rare. This one is easy reading and simplistic. We are told once again that population growth is *the* key to global poverty, pollution, and inequity. Little of the professional demographer's enforced modesty is evident. There is an imaginative proposal for reorganizing a no-growth international economic system around agreed-upon national "multiples" rather than present market and regulatory forces. But then the proposal is acknowledged as being politically improbable, and that is that. Apparently designed as an introductory textbook on the problems of population growth after the limits to growth have been reached.

Man's Responsibility for Nature by John Passmore

(Scribners; 213 pp.; \$7.95)

The Australian philosopher turns his attention to the "ecosophy" now so fashionable. Passmore is unapologetically a "human chauvinist" who calls his readers to resist the totalist trend of much environmentalist thought and to reaffirm the tasks of an essentially atomistic approach to science, rationality, and civilization. Strangely indifferent to the religious and metaphysical rootage of the Western culture he advocates, Passmore's argument is weakened by its almost total dependence upon a pragmatism of muddling through. Nonetheless, the polemic is well aimed and the cautions are timely to the point of urgency.

The Law in America by Bernard Schwartz

(McGraw-Hill; 382 pp.; \$12.50)

The very prolific professor of law at New York University here offers an overview that suggests itself for textbook use. The general reader, however, will welcome it as a solid introduction to the history and practice of law in America. A balanced and sympathetic treatment is more than slightly marred by a rather superficial handling of the "ends of law" which largely ignores the philosophical, even religious, presuppositions upon which the law's interaction with social values is based. In this respect, unfortunately, the book merely reflects the state of most legal thought—even that which passes as being "philosophical"—in contemporary America.

American Populism by George McKenna

(Putnam; 326 pp.; \$7.95)

An anthology of "populist" writings from Jackson through Jack Newfield, brought together with commentary by a political scientist at City College, New York. McKenna suggests that, for all its vagaries left and right, populism is the pervasive mood of American public life. Some of the statements, especially from the late nineteenth-century Populists, are instructive and not readily available elsewhere.

The Last Enemy by Richard W. Doss

(Harper & Row; 104 pp.; \$4.95)

Americans, as we are told time and again, are afraid to talk about death. If so, they seem now to be making up for lost time. Here is one more entry on the currently bullish market for books on death. Subtitled "A Christian Understanding of Death," it is just that, one more. While it

will no doubt be helpful to some people in a pastoral sort of way, it is hard to see that it adds anything to the discussion of the subject.

The Reich Marshal by Leonard Mosley

(Doubleday; 394 pp.; \$12.50)

A biography of Hermann Goering; carefully researched and tightly written. A clown, dope addict, and overdressed fop, to be sure, but the Reich Marshal here comes off as much more. Although concluding that he was finally and fatally guilty of moral cowardice, Mosley finds much that is favorable in Goering's administrative ability, devotion to Germany, and personal transcendence of some of the more lurid aspects of Nazism. One hopes that revisionist history rehabilitating Nazi leaders will never come into fashion. At the same time, rescuing men such as Goering from the stereotypes to which they have been heretofore consigned can only increase our understanding of how that horror came about. Mosley makes a fine contribution in that direction.

Notes on the Old System: To Transform

American Politics by Marcus Raskin

(McKay; 180 pp.; \$6.95/\$2.95)

At the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington some very bright people alternatively sit and run around tossing out ideas, some useful, some speculative fun, and some just silly. Marcus Raskin is co-director there and his work fairly represents the spectrum of Institute ideas. In the fun and possibly useful category is his proposal for Congressional grand juries that would institutionalize a stronger link between Representatives and what the people back home are thinking about. It deserves very serious consideration.

The Young Evangelicals by Richard Quebedeaux

(Harper & Row; 157 pp.; \$2.50 [paper])

We have from time to time called attention to this group that just might be reshaping American religion and its link to social change. Quebedeaux offers a helpful once-over-lightly of where evangelicalism ("fundamentalism," as it is called by the unfeeling) has been, its various parties, and where it might be going. If there is a problem with the author's analysis, it is that too often "progress" among the evangelicals is a matter of their becoming more like the "Ecumenical Liberals" of the Protestant mainstream. That, however, is a problem Quebedeaux shares with a good many Young Evangelicals. Upon its resolution depends the question of if and how the new evangelicalism will affect the general culture and consciousness of America.

The Chicago Declaration edited by Ronald J. Sider

(Creation House; 144 pp.; \$2.45 [paper])

An *Ur-text* of the "new evangelicalism" mentioned above. In December, 1973, forty prominent evangelicals met in Chicago and issued a statement on Christian responsibility for society. The repercussions continue to grow. Here is a handful of essays on the Chicago Declaration and its significance, together with brief reflections by additional participants. The renaissance of social concern among evangelicals may, of course, turn out to be little more than a flash in the pan, but these essays make clear that it will have been no flash of fool's gold. This joining of religious devotion and social commitment is the real thing. The prospect of its catching on with the forty million or more American members of evangelical churches is, to say the least, exciting.

God in Public: Political Theology Beyond Niebuhr by William Coats

(Eerdmans; 216 pp.; \$7.95)

The subtitle seems a gratuitous slam, since it is hardly clear that Coats has gone "beyond" Reinhold Niebuhr, and since Niebuhr does not play that much of a part in Coats's argument. The argument is by now orthodox restatement of the Marxist worldview as appropriated by some Christians. The utterly predictable polemic is against the barbarities of class-ridden, decadent Western capitalist societies. Princeton's Richard Shaull offers a foreword in which, curiously enough, he cautions against the doctrinaire revolutionism that he once promoted and that Coats would now have us all embrace. Coats offers yet another instance of that religious fervor with which some Christians bid *faîr* to revive the Marxist faith.

The Politician Primeval: From the Amoeba to the White House

by Edgar Berman

(Macmillan; 206 pp.; \$6.95)

Get together Robert Ardrey, René Dubos, Konrad Lorenz, Theodosius Dobzhansky, and a few other fervid proponents of the genetic construction of human reality and ask them to explain American politics through the eyes of H.L. Mencken, and you end up with *The Politician Primeval*. Hubert Humphrey writes the Preface and says we should all keep our sense of humor about these things, and he is no doubt right. After fifty pages of rather heavy-handed parody, keeping one's sense of humor begins to feel like something of a duty. Whatever "message" there may be is the obvious dressed up in the bizarre. The kind of book that will no doubt find its audience in a time of political disillusionment.

Pox Britannica by Clive Irving

(Saturday Review Press; 244 pp.; \$7.95)

A fast-paced and sometimes cruel analysis of "the unmaking of the British" by a British journalist. Comparison is again and again made with the Americans ("open," "energetic," "imaginatively experimental"), and by that comparison Britain is exposed as hopelessly corrupt—politically, socially, and economically. Those who value "the special relationship" between Britain and America will wish that Irving's description was not so sadly confirmed by daily items in the news.

The President Is Calling by Milton S. Eisenhower

(Doubleday; 599 pp.; \$12.50)

Milton Eisenhower has lived through, and been deeply involved in, an enormous slice of American history, having served Presidents in various capacities since the Coolidge Administration. Yet, aside from a few proposals for Constitutional changes (most of which are hardly original with Mr. Eisenhower), the semi-autobiographical reflection on it all is extraordinarily banal. Scintillating analysis no one had a right to expect, but the almost complete absence of new anecdotal material or of "now for the first time" opinion is disappointing.

A Matter of Honour by Philip Mason

(Holt Rinehart; 579 pp.; \$12.95)

A history of the Indian Army from 1746 to 1947, when the British era formally ended. It is a story of uncommon nobility and conventional perfidy, and the author explores with sensitivity the factors that "bond" the human male in the face of danger and the hope of glory. A big, sometimes poignant, always fascinating tale that is very well told.