CHAPTER TWO

FREUD AND HISTORY OF IDEAS
"Only within yourself exists that other reality which you long. I can give you nothing that has not already its being within yourself. I can throw open to you no picture gallery but your own soul."

Herman Hesse

Commenting on the European heritage, and the contributions of the Jews to it, George Steiner observed: "To every domain they brought radical imaginings; more specifically the more gifted Jews repossessed certain crucial elements of classic European civilization in order to make them new and problematic. All this is common place; as is the inevitable observation that the tenor of modernity, the shapes of awareness and query by which we order our lives are in substantial measure the work of Marx, Freud and Einstein." At the outset, to begin with such a statement may seem too subjective. The allusion to the Jewish genius being a statement of fact, Steiner's observation is above any parochial pride, indeed, an authentication of the sweeping influences of Marx, Freud, and Einstein. We discern in all three, a masterly impulse of visionary logic, the intimation of an imagination at once sensuous and abstract. Their legacy has cast an indelible mark in every walk of our awareness today.
Freud, the most enigmatic of the three, has as much influenced the twentieth century mind as has disturbed it. "The entry in to Freud can not avoid being a plunge in to a strange world and a strange language ...." Just as Darwin, and Marx, who revolutionized the thinking about man and society, something critical has occured in the human society with Freud. "It is frequently asserted that in all our thinking today, we lay in the shadow of Freud. So powerful, indeed, has his influence been that it is all but impossible for us to imagine ourselves out from under it and to reconstruct the mental habits or attitudes of a pre-Freudian age." The controversies, associated with Freud's ideas, make the task formidable to place him appropriately in the context of history of ideas. On the one hand the complexity of his thought defies any kind of labelling, on the other the pro-Freudians and anti-Freudians make the task more difficult because of their passionate and too subjective claims and counter-claims for glorifying Freud as a prophet or denouncing him as a renegade. In the process Freud who has become an integral part of our consciousness bears little resemblance, except in gross outlines to the Freud of reality. However, "anyone who has a nodding acquaintance with the history of human thought can not fail to recognise time and again in its totality or in its details how much, Freud's work embodies in form and in content the main features of the Western attempts to understand human nature and human mind".
Freud has combined both the philosopher and the scientist in him. His inquiry into the complexity of human condition is divested of the mysticism that is usually associated with the study of mind. His interest to become a scientist like Darwin, and others led him to study medicine, but as a psychologist he reached the original goal of philosophy; his well nourished predicament. Though, Freud's ideas got a raw deal in the hands of academic philosophers, yet, it is interesting to note that the three important philosophers of our century; Russell, Sartre and Wittgenstein have all given Freud due consideration.

The strongest of the criticisms raised against Psychoanalysis is on the issue of its scientific status. Psychoanalysis when viewed as a scientific theory, after closely examining its tenents, the critics conclude that the basic theories of Freud as well as his postulates on free association, dream analysis, transference, etc. were not quite tenable facts to be called scientific. Freud's effort to find out a place for his science in the scientific arena, as critics argue, does not even fulfill the minimum scientific criterion such as testibility and empirical verifiability.\(^5\) Ernst Nagel's essay on "Methodological issues in Psychoanalysis",\(^6\) probably presents the most devastating criticism of Psychoanalytic theory. He argues that if psychoanalysis is a "theory" in the sense of the molecular theory of the gases or the gene theory in biology, a set of propositions that systematizes, explains, and predicts certain observable phenomena, then it must satisfy the same logical criteria as other theories.
in the natural or social sciences. Nevertheless, this qualified criticism often ignores the peculiar nature of psychoanalysis.

Heinz Hartman perhaps provides the best defence in favour of psychoanalysis as a scientific theory, keeping in mind its peculiar formulations. He argues that the subject matter of psychoanalysis is the study of behaviour, and in this respect it does not differ from the empirical point of view except in its stress on "latent" behaviour. The systems and agencies (id, ego, and super ego) are not "entities" but aspects of behaviour; a behaviour is said to be over "determined" when it can be related to several structures and submitted to multiple levels of analysis. Finally, psychoanalysis aims at the study of total personality and satisfies the organismic "point of view" by reason.  

Freudian theory deserves a better consideration from the logical empiricist point of view. As Richard Wollheim argues:

"By contrast the philosophy of mind that is associated with logical empiricism was written virtually without reference to Freud; and, so far as reference is made to him within this whole tradition, it is likely to occur in the philosophy of science. That this is so is the consequence of two heuristic principles powerful in, indeed largely definitive of, that tradition. The first assumption is that philosophy can have nothing to say on any substantive, as opposed to formal or methodological, issue, whether about nature or knowledge. The second assumption is that the scientific status of any form of inquiry can be determined in a totally a priori fashion."
However, any methodological criticism of Freud cannot ignore the relationship between the psychoanalytic doctrine and its techniques. The required emphasis is not on the technique but its products. Any criticism of Freudian theory, therefore, should accept the basic premise that psychoanalysis is a method of objective study of the subjective mind.

Freud saw himself as an intellectual *conquistador*, the leader of a movement to extend his vision beyond the empiricist limits. Freud's own clear understanding of his system is the *raison de'être* of psychoanalysis. As Philip Reiff observes:

"Once again, history has produced a type specially adapted to endure his own period: the trained egoist, the private man, who turns away from the arenas of public failure to re-examine himself and his own emotions. A new discipline was needed to fit this introversion of interest, and Freudian psychology, with its ingenious interpretations of politics, religion, and culture in terms of the inner life of the individual, and his immediate family experiences, exactly filled the bill."\(^ {11} \)

Historically, Freud belongs to the Victorian period. Intellectually, he was never at ease with the Victorian setting. The radical and the revolutionary in him forbade him to be a conformist. Ultimately, his thoughts are shaped as a reaction to the Victorianism. Looking critically at the background of the Victorian era, and also the prevailing *zeitgeist*, one will be compelled to accept the occurrence of a phenomenon like Freud or Marx. Jung is right in his observation saying that
"the historical condition which preceded Freud and formed his ground work made a phenomenon like him necessary ...."¹²

Freud's ideas, in every respect, was antithetical to the Victorian complacency over its middle-class values and feelings in terms of everything as sub rosa. Summing up Freud's position in the Victorian context, Jung says:

"Freud's world-historical contribution does not consist in these scholastic mistakes of interpretation in the special scientific field, but in the fact in which his fame is founded and justified, namely, that, like an Old Testament prophet, he overthrew false idols and pitilessly spread out to view the rottenness of contemporary soul."¹³

Psychoanalysis shares with philosophy as Abraham Kaplan puts it: "a mistrust of what people think they know".⁹ Human knowledge broadly divided either as the product of "intellect" or "feeling" can be put to the parameters of "observation" and "experience" for their logicality. Nevertheless, the idea that any kind of knowledge becomes impossible without a knowing mind, was explicit in Kant's thought. Freudian paradigm, in his attempt to study human mind prefers Kant to Hume. "But in the place of Kant's pure Reason with its transcendental categories, Freud puts a mind with a determinate history, rooted in the biology of the organism and flowering in the sublimations of culture."¹⁰ Obviously, Freud's ideas need a new set of tools for their methods of inquiry. He differs from the classical empiricists and attributes more importance to the functionalist
emphasis on "experience", as observed by John Dewey, whose philosophical and psychological theories had a profound effect on pedagogical thought and practice in the whole of western world during mid twentieth century. Freud belonged to an intellectual tradition that has all along given some consideration to the unconscious. The concept of the unconscious is perhaps the single most important contribution of Freud to the history of ideas. Freud has made it clear that his new found knowledge is more than the philosopher's idea about the human mind. "It is true that philosophy has repeatedly dealt with the problem of the unconscious, but with few exceptions, philosophers have taken up one or other of few following positions. Either their unconscious has been something mystical, something intangible, and undemonstratable, whose relation to the mind has remained obscure or they have identified the mental with the conscious and have proceeded to infer that what is unconscious can not be mental, or a subject for psychology."14 Freud has claimed the independence of his thought, yet, the many connections Freud's thought shares with some past masters help us to group him with an illustrious line of thinkers.

By Freud's own testimony Goethe was his acknowledged master. He shared with Goethe and other natural scientists not only their complex organic view of the mind but also their vital confidence that mind and nature could come to some large mutual understanding. Acknowledging his debt to Goethe, Freud says:
"... and it was hearing Goethe's beautiful essay on Nature, read aloud at a popular lecture by Professor Carl Brühl just before I left school that decided me to become a medical student."\textsuperscript{15}

It is not only the picture of the beautiful and bountiful in Goethe's essay that attracted the youthful Freud, but something more than that. As Whittls thinks, "what attracted Freud in Goethe's essay was the sense not only of beauty in nature but also of meaning and purpose. There is no reason to think that Freud ever cudgeled his brains about the purpose of the universe — he was always an unrepentant atheist — that mankind is moved by various purposes, motives, aims, many of which may not be evident ones, was a conception he must always have had in his mind, long before he developed it so brilliantly by solving the riddle of the Sphinx".\textsuperscript{16}

Essentially, Freud belongs to the tradition of philosophy of nature. Above the inadequacies of mechanistic naturalism, mid-nineteenth century witnessed a new emerging concept called the Vitalistic view of nature. The achievements in the field of biological sciences, particularly the evolutionary theories of Darwin and Lamark necessiated the study of nature in terms of some vitalistic principles. The development of Freudian thought makes a transition from a biological to a psychological to a social interpretation of man. His early clinical observations forced him to accept the emerging biologicist model of vitalistic naturalism. Freud was fascinated to Darwinism from an

\textsuperscript{Vitalism in nature refers to a philosophical and biological theory, characterized by the assumption of a non-material agency undertaking vital phenomena.}
early stage of his intellectual life. As he recalled in his autobiography:

".... the theories of Darwin which were, then of topical interest, strangely attracted me, for they holdout hopes of an extraordinary advance in our understanding of the world, ...."\(^{17}\)

Darwin dismantled man's false position in the universe and put forward a thesis that his divine inheritance is a counterfeit belief. He is as much animal as other animals are. Following the footsteps of Darwin, Freud arrived at some definite conclusions that: "three great blows that man's pride had suffered at the hands of science, his displacement from the center of the universe, and then a unique position in the animal world, and lastly the discovery that he is not even the master of his own mind".\(^{18}\) The biologism of Freud is very much guided by the same method as that of Darwin. Darwin's predictions, almost anticipated Freud:

"In the future I see openfields for far more important researches. Psychology will be securely based on the foundation already well laid by Mr. Herbert Spencer, that of the necessary acquirement of each mental power and capacity by gradation. Much light will be thrown on the origin of man and his history."\(^{19}\)

Freud, through his revolutionary discoveries, has furthered the anticipations of Darwin. Both saw in the past a key to the present. As Darwin has proved his predecessors wrong on the concept of rudimentary organs and the arbitrary creative fiat in nature and demonstrated the historical meaning of such organs explaining their state of atrophy. By the same mode of reasoning, Freud attributed psychoanalytic meaning to disperse
phenomena as symptom formations, dreams, slips of tongues, and so on. Freud's study exhibited the precarious condition of man, who does not have any control over his own mind.

The Freudian concept of *ontogeny recapitulating phylogeny* is a confirmation of Haeckel's *biogenetic law*. Haeckel's monism is more animistic and explained human life by the means of natural laws. The biogenetic law explains that the development of the individual recapitulates the development of the species. The study of the phylogeny has been very significant in the study of psychoanalysis. The concept of neurosis, which is a direct product of repression along with its archaicness embodies in itself the phylogenetic manifestations. The primordial in man is an important aspect; the concept of which later on was advocated as the *collective unconscious* by Jung.

The theory of the instincts led Freud to be in agreement with post-Darwinism, and naturalism. Darwinism is often called a theory of transformism. It sets out to demonstrate that in the long run the species are transformed under the pressure of circumstances. To the life of the psyche, Freud applied an analogous notion of transformism. "Unconscious impulses are such that they cannot assert themselves under their original forms; but they have a change of psychic energy which makes

---

* **Ontogeny** refers to the evolution, and the development of the individual in contrast with **phylogeny** which refers to the origin and development of the race.

* **Biogenetic Law** is the principle that the development of each individual recapitulates the evolution of the race.
it impossible for them to be completely suppressed. For this reason they present themselves in transformed shapes, in dreams or as neurotic symptoms, adopted to the conditions of life that the censorship and social controls have, so to speak, dictated.\textsuperscript{20} This mechanism resembles as in nature the strategy of the unconscious to be under camouflage to avoid censorship. The doctrine of regression of Freud bears traces of Darwinian concepts. The dream process can be traced back from the higher and more complex psychic levels to more archaic ones. "On the strength of what Spencer called levels of integration the later stages of development are regarded as higher and the dream work like the neurotic functions, — is considered as a relapse to past stages, a sort of atavism."\textsuperscript{21} Freud also accepted Darwinian presupposition in the context of the tension that usually emerges from a conflict between the irrational instincts of the unconscious and the ego. In a broader prospective Freud adhered to Darwinian explanations in his study of the man, society, and morals. As Frank. J. Sulloway puts it:

"Also stemming directly from this Darwinian historical point of view were Freud's efforts to place human morality, social laws, and religious institutions in an elaborate phylogenetic perspective — as he did for example in Totem and Taboo (1912-13), The Future of an Illusion (1927c), and Moses and Monotheism (1939a). It was in the same Darwinian-historical spirit that Freud later distinguished the purely material truth embodied in such social institutions from the historical truth that originally inspired their evolution."\textsuperscript{22}
A shift from the biological concept to the psychological interpretation of man is a watershed in Freud's career. Freud, a natural child of both mechanistic and vitalistic traditions acknowledged filial obeiscence to none. A fresh approach was attempted by him for the interpretation of the dynamics of selfhood, which clearly demonstrated its usefulness in untangling the hiddenself. Freud's reduction of selfhood to a function of the *unconscious* and the radical determinism which underlies his method put forward a new attempt to express the historical reality of human existence in a naturalistic framework.

In his cautious approach to the study of the human mind, Freud studiedly followed the principles of Helmholtz. His ideas on the psychic energy coupled with the concept of the nature of the *unconscious* led him to interprete the psyche with a fresh approach. Helmholtz in many ways is called a neo-Kantian. As he believed: "...... our human representations and the representations of any intelligent being whatsoever are all images of objects, essentially dependent on the nature of the consciousness that represented them."\(^{23}\)

The gamut of Freudian thought is governed by the principle of dualism. "Running throughout his work that is what Heinz Hartman has called, a very characteristic kind of dialectical thinking' that tend to base theories on the interaction of the opposite powers."\(^{24}\) The starting point of Freud's cogitation with psychology was based on the dialectical aproach. As a result of his extensive experience he was seized with the concept of
warring opposites in the life of the psyche and was naturally concerned to apprehend the nature of the opposing force. Freud in his concept of the mental polarities became a natural ally of the *nature-philosophie* doctrine. Most probably it is his basic curiosity about human nature that led him to consider the negative aspect of every phenomenon. As a theorist of the philosophy of Nature, Schelling, while explaining its many tenets observed that in nature there are "pairs of antagonistic and complimentary forces, that might unite in the form of difference". This dynamic interplay of antagonistic forces in nature also had been confirmed by physiologist, August Winkelman. In his words: "Nature is the struggle of forces, the conflict of a positive and negative force."²⁵

The so called negative force of the Psychic phenomena is the *unconscious*. Hitherto studies on human mind were only explained in terms of the *conscious*. Freud has claimed his independence all along for such a fundamental discovery. But the history of human thought holds out ample proof that there are some illustrious forerunners of Freudian discovery. Freud though publicly disclaimed his many connections to intuitive thinkers like Schopenhauer, Von Hartman, and Nietzsche, and creative writers like Blake, and Goethe, he essentially belongs to their tradition. As he confirmed that the creative writers and intuitive thinkers knew about the *unconscious* before he did. Whatever might be his reasons for isolating himself intellectually, the result was salutary. Electrically he took to the
ideas of such forerunners, and modified them into a coherent theory on man.

However, the study of *unconscious*, its nature, origin, and development will not be perfunctory, rather it will add in a better way, to throw light on the Freudian stand. The concept of a force equivalent to that of the Freudian *unconscious* can be traced back to William Blake. "When the half truths about Blake, and Freud are countered, and qualified, the two minds cross an expanse of time and space, and meet in .... a radical union of poetry and science, synthesis and analysis, romanticism and determinism. They meet through a metaphorical process, through the poet in Freud and the psychoanalyst in Blake." Blake takes the fact of irrational energy to mean the collapse of the false distinction between body and soul. As he observes in his *The marriage of Heaven and Hell*:

"That man has two real existing principles: viz., a Body and a Soul.
That Energy, called Evil, is alone from the body; and the Reason,
called Good, is alone from the soul.

Man has no body distinct from soul; for that called Body is a portion
of soul discerned by the five senses ....
Energy is the only life, and is from the Body; and reason is
the bound or outward circumference of Energy.

Thus one portion of being is the prolific, the other Devouring:
to the Devourer it seems as if the producer was in his chains;
but it is not so, he only takes portions of existence and fancies that the whole.
But the prolific would cease to be prolific unless the Devourer as a sea, received the excess of his delight."

The active energy to Blake was the essence of the undivided body and soul. Reason instead of its opposite and master, is merely the outward bound of active energy. Indeed, reason, or the Devourer exists only in terms of "the prolific" energy it measures. This polarity of energies and their interrelationship is a parallel to Freudian analogy.

Though, Freud refuted, when referred by Ferenczi, the claim having similarity of his thought with Goethe, yet, Goethe was acknowledged in his autobiography as the greatest of his masters. He not only has shared the views of Goethe in many ways but also emulated the great home d' letters. Freud has extensively quoted from Goethe and he was certainly inspired by Goethe's multifaceted personality. What Freud calls the unconscious was identified by Goethe as a primal, undifferentiated force. Goethe was aware of the existence of such a force and called it the Demoniac:

"Although this demonical element can manifest itself in all corporeal and incorporeal things, and even expresses itself most distinctly in animals, yet with man especially has it a most wonderful connection, forming in him a power, which, if it be not opposed to the moral order of the world, nevertheless does often so cross it that one may be regarded as the warp and the other as the woof."
The demoniac as understood by Goethe is the animal in man. It is an energy which is not reducible to rational and moral categories. The demoniac is knowable only as the mental contradiction of all the principles, we assume. It is seductive and terrifying. It seems to lay at a point where organic nature, inorganic matter and the human mind come together.

The concept of the unconscious in the course of history has undergone a long evolution of meaning. Leibniz used it to describe the appetitive intensions of a transcendental nature installed in the self. But later philosophers particularly Schopenhauer and Nietzsche broadened the meaning of the unconscious in such terms which lead directly to Freud. No wonder that all the philosophers, who have given thought to such a force Freud has come closest to Schopenhauer and Nietzsche.

Freud read Schopenhauer, very late in his life. Yet some of Schopenhauer's ideas have striking similarities with Freud. Emphasising Freud's relation to Schopenhauer, and Nietzsche, Thomas Mann draws attention to the similarity of Freudian 'id' and the 'will' of Schopenhauer. Psychoanalysis in Mann's view reveals itself as a translation of Schopenhauer's metaphysics into psychology. In his words:

"Now, Freud, the Psychologist of the unconscious, is a true son of the century of Schopenhauer and Ibsen — he was born in the middle of it. How closely related is his revolution to Schopenhauer's, not only in its content, but also in its moral attitude! His discovery of the great role played by the unconscious, the id, in the soul life of man challenged and challenges
classical psychology, to which the consciousness and the psyche are one and the same, as offensively as once Schopenhauer's doctrine of the will challenged philosophical belief in reason and the intellect."

At the centre of Schopenhauer's metaphysics the two key-concepts are will and idea. Life is will in its inner content; its essence is the idea. The irrational will has the dynamic character of a blind striving force, which not only is the reigning force of the universe but also conducts man:

This whole external world is simply the construction of the intellect, and the intellect is simply the instrument, that arises in the service of that inner reality which each of us experience as the desire, which he is aware of in his own body, in his physical tension, in his unconscious strivings, in his Will. That Will, which alone is immediately known to us, is recognised too, in Nature ...., the inner nature of things is not that world which the intellect knows, but that Will which the individual experiences in his own blind impulses and which he finds exemplified and repeated on a cosmic scale in the inner process of Nature."

The will essentially is the body of instincts. It ceaselessly strives and suffers and remains the primary experience to man. The domain of id; Freud says, is the dark and inaccessible part of our personality, the little that we know of it; we have learned through the study of dreams and the formation of neurotic symptoms. Freud by his own testimony admitted to other similarities with Schopenhauer. "The large extent to which psychoanalysis coincides with the philosophy of Schopenhauer— not only he asserts the dominance of the emotions and the
supreme importance of sexuality but he was even aware of the mechanism of repression — is not to be traced to my acquaintance with his teaching."

Basically, there are three main points in common between Freud and Schopenhauer. They are an irrationalistic conception of man, the identification of the general life-impulse with sexual instinct, and a radical anthropological pessimism. Schopenhauer's irrational will consists of two instincts: the instinct of conservation and the sexual instinct. The sexual instinct is of prime importance to him; man is sexual instinct incarnate. Sexual instinct is the highest affirmation of life because it goes along with the procreation process and continuation of the race. The main difference between the two on sex is rather a matter of ascribing importance on the one hand to procreation and on the other viewing the instinct in itself. Repression is another important aspect where Freud finds similarity with Schopenhauer's philosophy. The cause of repression as observed by Schopenhauer is: "The Will's opposition to let what is repellent to it, come to the knowledge of the intellect is the spot through which insanity can break through into the spirit." To put it precisely, the will can compell the individual to prevent the intrusion of thoughts that are unpleasant in nature. Because experience, contrary to our wish, involves the problem of comprehension. Thomas Mann found the most profound and mysterious point of contact by placing Freud's writings in opposition to Schopenhauer's essay "Transcendental Speculations on Apparent
Design in the Fate of the Individual”. Schopenhauer's Psychology of dreams, his treatment of the sexual as "argument and paradigm", his entire mental construct in Mann's eye is an extraordinary anticipation of psychoanalysis.

Schopenhauer believed in a kind of determinism. Freud to a substantial extent shared that vision of determinism in relation to human existence. For this view Freud is often accused of being a pessimist, who attached more importance to negation. However, Lionel Trilling views Freudian perspective as positive.

"But Freud's positiveness, his belief that truth could actually be found, is also the sign of something particular in temperament, particular in his vision of the world. It is an aspect of the passion of his response to the pain of life; the mark of his moral urgency, of his deep therapeutic commitment to the human cause."

Freud's claim of reading Schopenhauer late in his life in no way hinders to conclude that there is strong affinity between their thoughts and temperaments. The tenents of Schopenhauer's philosophy have reached Freud through Von Hartman, one of the ardent students of Schopenhauer whose writings Freud has demonstratably studied. The essential difference between them is one of adherence to science and the other to speculative philosophy. Moreover, it was also through the intermediacy of Theodore Lipps, whom Freud considered to be the most clear headed of the philosophers that he came so much close to the ideas of Schopenhauer, particularly on the concept of the unconscious, which Hartman made the pivotal point of his
philosophy. Gunnar Brandel observes that there is significant similarity in the understanding of the \textit{unconscious} between Freud and Hartman. In his words:

".... (To) Hartman as for Freud, the unfolding of the unconscious ideas is governed by unconscious 'intensions'. In its effort to bypass the censorship the unconscious can even make use of intelligent ruses. What we have here, basically, is a legacy from Schopenhauer, who held that in man, as in the rest of nature, the will was unconscious. In the unconscious, Hartman wrote 'will' and 'ideas' (representation) as one — in contradiction what happens in the case of conscious reflection. It is entirely possible for the conscious to think about something without willing it, where as for the unconscious nothing can be represented that is not willed."

Hartman's concept of the \textit{unconscious} is an elaboration on Schopenhauer's concept of the \textit{will}. Freud keeping himself abreast of the available literature concerning the development of unconscious has come closer to Schopenhauer through Hartman. However, it is difficult to ascertain the exact extent of Schopenhauer's influence on Freud. At the same time it is significant to note that in the course of human thought a parallel concern for the so called negative aspect of mind was too clear and Freud like others has contributed to this stream in his own way.

Nietzsche is rightfully claimed to be the inheritor of Schopenhauer's philosophy. He has broadened the ideas of Schopenhauer on many ways. In his positive aspect Nietzsche is as important for his psychological as for his philosophical
concepts. Ludwig Klages goes so far as to call Nietzsche the founder of modern psychology. Freud of course, has disclaimed any direct contact with the ideas of Nietzsche. In his words:

"Nietzsche another philosopher whose guesses and intuitions often agree in the most astonishing way with the laborious findings of psycho-analysis, was for a long time avoided by me on that very account; I was less concerned with the questions of priority than with keeping my mind unembarrassed."  

Without disputing Freud's opinion about Nietzsche's ideas and his cautious avoidance of his influence on his work, it is evident that quite early in the history of psychoanalytic movement, Nietzsche had been a subject of immense attraction. It was Otto Rank who drew Freud's attention to Nietzsche. Freud's disclaimer of Nietzsche is disputable. Because there is direct evidence that in the Vienna psycho-analytic scientific meetings of April 1st, 1908, and again on October 28, 1908, Nietzsche had been the main subject of discussion. The participants in the discussion included Otto Rank, Alfred Adler, and also Freud himself. Recounting Nietzsche's relevance to psychoanalytic movement Jones records: "while at Weimar, Sachs and I took the opportunity of calling on Nietzsche's sister and biographer Frau Elizabeth Foster-Nietzsche. Sachs told her about the congress and commented on the similarity between some of Freud's ideas and her famous brothers!"

Nietzsche's concepts of Apo and Dionysus though derived from Schopenhauer's concepts of idea and will are cast differently
and presented in a somewhat different spirit. The world that is being presided over by Apidso is associated with Olympus, with mountain tops, sunlight, and with idealism. On the other hand the world of Dionysus is pictured in terms of lower forests, darkness, dynamic excesses, and drunkeness. Nietzsche's "headiest praise goes to Dionysus, the "genius of the heart", the God of dynamic existence, who reconciles man with nature, who is strong, evil, profound, and beautiful". Nietzschean, Dionysus is essentially the mythic god for Freudian unconscious.

In this understanding of the human mind Nietzsche came to realize that the unconscious is a system of drives. Human emotion is considered as a "complex of unconscious representations and states of the will". Robert Mayer's concept of the conservation and transformation of energy offered Nietzsche, the basic understanding about psychic energy. He believed that a quantum of dammed up (psychic) energy could wait for being utilized in a later period. While mental energy could be accumulated to be utilized for a higher purpose, it can also be transformed from one instinct to the other. The importance of such instincts, or drives, constitute the core of Nietzsche's philosophy. This has essentially become the focus of Freud's study on the functioning of the unconscious. Nietzsche's study of the human mind led him to the conclusion that every possible kind of feeling, opinion, attitude, conduct, and virtue are rooted in self-deception or in an unconscious lie. Thus, everyone is farthest from himself. However, the unconscious to Nietzsche was an
area of confused thought, emotions, and instincts, and at the same time an area of reenactment of the past stages of the individual, and of the species. A look at Freud's ideas seem to be in more ways than one, parallel of Nietzsche's understanding of the unconscious mind.

Psychoanalysis evidently belongs to the process of the "unmasking" of the unconscious for both Nietzsche and Freud; as Ellenberger observes:

"For both men (Nietzsche and Freud) the unconscious is the realm of the wild, brutish instincts that can not find permissible outlets, derived from the earlier stages of the individual and of mankind and find expression in passion, dreams, and mental illness."\(^41\)

The study of the instinct essentially provided the key to both Nietzsche and Freud who were aware of their vicissitudes, their illusory comprehensions, vicarious discharges, sublimations, inhibitions, and turning against oneself. However, like Freud, Nietzsche did not ascribe so much importance to the sexual drives, instead he was much more aware of the workings of an aggressive drive. The Freudian concepts such as defense mechanism, repression, and the factors associated with neurotic guilt were well conceived and discussed by Nietzsche.

The dream, as fulfilment provided ample scope for the understanding of the unconscious. Nietzsche believed in the dream work as a recollection of human past and a searching for excited feelings. In his words:

"When one sleeps the nervous system is constantly excited by manifold internal stimuli .... and all this
excites by its unusualness, the whole system, including the brain functions .... the dream, however, is the searching for, and the imagining of the cause of the excited feelings, i.e., the supposed causes ...., I suppose as man even now infers in dreams, mankind inferred for many thousand of years also when awake; the first cause that occurred to the mind to explain anything that required explanation sufficed and was considered the truth .... Dreams take us back again to distant conditions of human culture and put a means at our disposal for understanding them better."42

The two important aspects of Freud's study of the "dream as a royal road to the unconscious" and "Ontogeny recapitulating phylogeny" are in a way anticipated by Nietzsche. Freud's dream has a latent and manifest content. Among the many trivial incidents of the day the dream chooses the one that shows similarity with childhood memory and is a regression from the present to the past. Dream is essentially a symbolic and pictorial representation of the past buried in the unconscious. As Nietzsche puts it:

"In the outbursts of passion and in the fantasies of dreams and madness man redisCOVERS his own and mankind's prehistory."43

The concept of repression is the cornerstone of Freudian paradigm. Nietzsche talked about the repression in defining and developing his concept of the inhibition. The Nietzschean repression applies to perception and memory. "Oblivion is not merely a force of inertia .... on the contrary it is an active, and in the strictest sense, a positive capacity for inhibition,
Nietzsche observed." In this context Freud expressed his admiration for Nietzsche's aphorism: "I have done that, .... says my memory"I cannot have done that," says my pride, and remains inexorable. Eventually the memory yields." The turning of the instinct against itself led Nietzsche to the understanding of the concepts of resentment, moral conscience, and the origin of civilization. Christian morality, Nietzsche proclaimed, was a refined form of resentment. It is in the impossibility of the discharging of man's aggressive instincts that the concept of morality originates. As civilization makes its onward march, the aggressive instinct, instead of having its physical manifestation, turns inward.

Freud has reached the same conclusion on the premise that initially, because of the repression of sexual instinct, and later by sublimation of this instinct that civilization is possible. Moreover, the instinctual life has an indomitable urge for repetition. Freud attributed transcendental significance to the repetition compulsion. As Jones observes: "We might even wonder how far he (Freud) was influenced .... here by Nietzsche's doctrine of the eternal recurrence of the same' — a phrase Freud actually quoted in the book." The concept of sublimation is discussed in relation to the functioning of the instincts both by Freud and Nietzsche. Speaking of sublimation both Nietzsche and Freud tried to show how certain types of behaviour could be explained and how one striving instinct might often be transformed into others. Nietzsche
considered sublimation as an intellectual process. The instincts, however, retain their importance, even in their most sublimated forms: the degree and quality of a person's sexuality finds its way into the topmost reaches of his spirit. It is the concept of the superman — of Nietzsche which provided the ideal synthesis. Superman can be apprehended as a person who has overcome the conflict between the conventional morality and his instinctual urges. He is almost like a model neurotic who has been successfully psychoanalysed. It is needless to say that in Freud's writing one comes across countless scattered ideas and phrases of Nietzsche. Their position in the history of ideas have remained complementary. Hence, one is compelled to see in many ways a Nietzsche in Freud.

Freud is often identified with the romantic tradition. The gamut of Freudian thought at the outset, adheres to the tenents of romanticism. The critics often rightly treat him as an important pillar of German romantic tradition. Inspite of his claim as a rationalist, Freud occupies a peculiar position in the history of ideas.

As Phillip Reiff aptly puts it:

"To think of him (Freud) as a Romantic despite his ardent faith in science involves no contradiction, for though he insisted on the pre-rational core of human nature, Freud remained a rationalist. Indeed, there is a peculiar convergence of the two — notions of the scientific ideal of rational neutrality and the romantic debunking of nature."
The above observation makes Freud's position as romantic clear enough. Freudian romanticism accepts the superiority of the impulses or instincts over reason. Thomas Mann while trying to put Freud in the German romantic tradition notes that the romantic tradition is essentially anti-intellectual, and anti-reason. Freud testifies however, the subjective premise of romantic philosophy in his autobiography: I must of course be more interested in affective than in intellectual phenomena more in the unconscious than in conscious mental life. This itself is proof enough to define Freud's thought connoting Romantic philosophy.

The exploration of the hidden self of man has ever remained the most fascinating aspect of romanticism. "His (Freud's) god-term, the unconscious, is allied not to classical ontology but to the most recent German idealist notion of creative eruption and subsequent repression. Freud's concept is another version of the idea of primitive chaos that supplied Romanticism with its first cause and the last resort."47

Freud's empiricism gives way to the dilectic of romanticism. Indeed, the essential Freud is more than a romantic. As many critics believe, and their believe might be the right way towards resolving the Freudian debate, Freud belongs to the tradition of enlightenment.

The later part of twentieth century has witnessed both praise, and denunciation of Freud. Nonetheless, Freud has
remained as much a point of affirmation, as a point of departure. In the widening horizon of modern thought Freud is often compared with Marx, Baudelaire, and the existentialists. These developments signify the importance, that Freud occupies in the history of ideas. In the changing perspective Freud's image of man renews its meaning and relevance. Even the severest critics of Freud have not questioned the dynamism of his thought. "In the face of vast, unknown," E. Jones has observed, "Freud's attitude could not be other than Newton's with his pebbles in the beach of knowledge. He knew he had made "a few beginnings" and opened out a few paths, but where they could lead to he could not judge, and did not try to do so. He was not philosopher enough to imagine he had the capability for any finished systems of thought; beginnings are far removed from anything of the kind." 48
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