"Men are strong as long as they represent a strong idea; they become powerless when they oppose it. Psycho-Analysis will survive this and gain new adherents in place of these others. I can only conclude with the wish that fate may grant an untroubled ascension to all who have been discommoded by their sojourn in the underworld of psycho-analysis. May it be vouchsafed to the others to carry that work in the depths peacefully to an end". (1)

S. Freud, Feb. 1914.

The history of psycho-analysis, like that of religion, philosophy, art, and politics, is scarred by fanaticism, defection and schism. Writing in 1914 about the secessions of Adler and Jung, Freud ruefully points out that psycho-analysts, no less than their patients, are limited by their own repressions. Ernest Jones, both in his biography of Freud and in his autobiography "Free Associations" was unsparing in his revelations about the extent and character of the opposition to psycho-analysis and wrote with feeling about several particularly unpleasant experiences in which he was involved. Less attention was given to the fact that opposition is seldom a one-sided affair. This is not hard to understand since it is, of course, often very difficult to determine exactly who struck the first blow and why. The biographical material now available, however, illuminates brilliantly the dramatic interplay between the founders of psycho-analysis and those who opposed them. It is apposite that Ernest Jones, who struggled so vigorously to make psycho-analysis an objective science, should bequeath such a lively source of biography.

The opposition to psycho-analysis provides a rich field for study which deserves more attention than it has so far received. Ernest Jones, although the target for a considerable measure of hostility, was able to write of his experiences with almost scholarly detachment. "Freud" he said, "lived in a period of time when the 'odium theologicum' had been replaced by the 'odium sexicum' and not yet by the 'odium politicum'". It will be for the future to assess which of the three should rank as the most disreputable phase in human history. For ethical reasons, and also because he feared reprisals in kind, Freud himself disdained to use analytical material as ammunition against his opponents. Instead, in his polemics, he relied, almost entirely, on logic and an unshakeable conviction in his own infallibility. Jones, being of another age, race and faith, was both a part of and apart from the "old guard"*. His unique position, as a participant observer, with a Welshman's frankness and fervour gave him advantages denied to Freud. He saw the opposition as being essentially due to human frailty and as a regrettable but inevitable reaction to an idea in advance of its time. It is perhaps mainly for this reason that Jones, at the cost of what undoubtedly would have been a brilliant scientific career, devoted his life to interpreting Freud, building up a strong inner-circle of disciples and establishing on a sound foundation an international organization. But for Ernest Jones, psycho-analysis might well have foundered long ago on the reef of internal dissent.

Perfidy, weakness and defection among the pioneers of psycho-analysis, has its parallel in the history of other such innovations. New ideas, particularly those which challenge traditional atti-

* The "Committee" consisting of Ferenczi, Rank, Abraham, Sachs, Eitingon with Jones as Chairman was established in 1912.
tudes, are threatened by inner, as well as outer, stresses. Outwardly there is always the inexorable conservatism which resists change, except when it is gradual and inevitable. Then there is among some exponents of new ideas a noisome excess of enthusiasm which rarely fails to vex even the most amiable of men. Often there is also an aggressiveness which in effect, at least, is not unlike the threatening noises animals make to protect their young from real or imagined attack. In humans this form of paranoia is not only defensive and compensatory, but it is at the same time self-aggrandizing and a means of display.

In recent, as well as in ancient times, religious and political movements have deliberately exploited persecutory ideas and extreme provocation to gain attention. New movements also attract to themselves a lunatic fringe of sensation seekers. Although they may embarrass the more stable elements, their extreme attitudes and provocative behaviour are not without value, at least in the beginning. History teaches us that such individuals and such artifices consciously used are often devastatingly effective and invariably malignant. Freud certainly knew this and had more cause to fear his over-zealous followers than the opprobrium of his adversaries.

Extremist elements in new movements are easily identified. Usually they lack tenacity and prove only a temporary embarrassment. Identification with a movement as a means of self-display, however, presents a peculiarly different problem. With such individuals the need to gain attention may actually be inseparable from the elements of militant and unselfish devotion. It may, in fact, be virtually true, as Freud indicated in the quotation with which this paper begins, that without a cause man suffers a loss of identity. In this sense belonging is synonymous with being. That this may have been particularly true for Ernest Jones, is suggested by some otherwise puzzling aspects of his behaviour as a young man.

Speaking of his youth, in the Second Volume of his biography of Freud (2), Ernest Jones reveals with disarming frankness that among others he was deprived of his means of livelihood because of his adherence to psycho-analysis. "I was," he writes, "forced to resign a neurological appointment in London for making inquiries into the sexual life of patients". He continues, "Two years later (1910) the Government of Ontario ordered the Asylum Bulletin to cease publication. It had been reprinting all papers written by the staff, and my own were declared unfit for publication", even in a medical periodical. Since all those involved are dead, the first assertion that he was forced to resign cannot be challenged, though it will be commented on later in this paper. The second statement, that this publication was suspended, presents less of a problem. It was easy to ascertain that Dr. Jones was wrong and that the "Bulletin of the Ontario Hospitals for the Insane" was in fact published continuously from 1907 to 1916, that is, from one year before he arrived in Toronto until three years after he had returned to England. This lapse of memory and retrospective error is, of course, entirely understandable in a man of seventy, writing about events of forty years before. It is, however, unlikely that Ernest Jones, who was meticulous in the extreme in his regard for scientific facts, would have accepted such a feeble excuse. Instead, he would almost certainly have searched for some less convenient but more exacting explanation of his mistake. This in effect is the main purpose of this fragment of biography of the early days in the life of a great pioneer.

In his own partial biography,(3) Ernest Jones, looking back to his younger days, remarked on his truly prolific literary output during his six years in Toronto. It was at this period that he made his most enduring contribution to
psycho-analytical theory with the publication of "Hamlet and Oedipus" and "On the Nightmare." Before the age of thirty-five he had produced no less than thirty papers on a wide range of medical and scientific topics. He not only wrote papers, but also presented them extensively to Medical Societies in North America. During this period he occupied a number of posts on the University of Toronto staff. Between 1909 and 1913 Dr. Jones was Demonstrator in Pathology and Medicine, as well as Associate in Psychiatry and later Associate Professor. He was also Pathologist to the Toronto Hospital for the Insane and Director of Toronto's first Psychiatric Out-Patient Clinic. None of these posts were sinecures. In addition to all this Ernest Jones was co-editor with C. K. Clarke of the Ontario Hospitals Bulletin. As will be seen later, this last fact is of some importance in the context of this paper.

At this point it needs to be made clear that Ernest Jones was unhappy in Toronto, and attributed his remarkable industry to this fact. He remarked, "However enterprising I might be intellectually, I was not intended for a pioneer's life in a new country". He found that Englishmen were not particularly popular. They were known as "broncos" because of their habit of "kicking", criticizing their new environment. In face of this attitude, Jones fell back on his Welsh origin and "resolved at all events not to be a 'bronco' for sensitiveness to criticism was plainly a national characteristic". How far he succeeded can only be surmised but it seems that he made few Canadian friends and on the whole found them naive and unimaginative. He admitted also to a homesickness for Europe which he indulged by dashing there at every opportunity and by joining the German Club in Toronto. The weather did not suit him either. "More serious", however, said Jones, "was my attitude toward the intellectual atmosphere. It was not merely that I found myself back in the Biblical and Victorian atmosphere of my boyhood—that would be bad enough to someone bent on emancipation—but it was the dead uniformity I found so tedious; one knew beforehand everyone's opinion on every subject, so there was a complete absence of mutual stimulation or exchange of thought".

It can be assumed that his feelings for Canada and Canadians were largely reciprocated and that, despite or possibly because of his industry and brilliance, Ernest Jones was not popular. "Toronto the Good" prided itself and still does on the high moral tone of its city and the virtue of its citizens. Ernest Jones, came from the "old-country", like so many before him and possibly since, with a reputation, however undeserved, for sexual excesses of the worst kind. Worse still, he set up house in Toronto with his elder sister and "Loe", who was his mistress for a number of years. Such behaviour was hardly wise in a public figure and a champion of a new cause. Not surprisingly, Freud personally ended this affaire by taking "Loe" on for treatment in Vienna and sending Jones off to Italy for a holiday. Freud's treatment was eminently successful and eventually both were happily married but not to each other.

This excursion into Jones' private life helps to outline the background against which the man and his ideas were judged. Curiously enough his writings, possibly with a single exception to be mentioned later, give no indication of unconventionality or erratic brilliance. Their prodigious quantity impresses one with his industry and erudition. Of his numerous articles reprinted in the "Bulletin of the Ontario Hospitals for the Insane" only four refer to Psycho-Analysis. None of these was originally prepared for a Canadian audience. The first, *"She took my name, and we would frequently visit our respective families as a married pair."*  
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in chronological order, “Psycho-Analysis in Psycho-Therapy”, a remarkably restrained paper was read by Dr. Jones at a symposium on Psycho-Therapy, under the auspices of the American Therapeutic Society, New Haven, May 7th, 1909. Far less cautious was his “Psycho-Analytic Notes on a case of Hypomania”, first published in the American Journal of Insanity, Oct. 1909, p. 203. As will be shown later its reprinting in the “Bulletin” in Oct. 1910 probably aroused a great deal of indignation in Toronto. The next paper “Freud’s Theory of Dreams” was presented to the first Annual Meeting of the American Psycho-Neurological Association, Dec. 29th, 1909. “The Therapeutic effect of Suggestion” was presented to the first Annual Meeting of the American Psycho-Pathological Society in Washington, May 2nd, 1910. In this unassumingly pedagogical paper Ernest Jones traces the development of hypnotism and describes the work of Bernheim, Sidis, Charcot, etc., as precursors of Freud.

Ernest Jones was not always, however, the most tactful of men. For example, as co-editor of the “Bulletin of the Ontario Hospitals for the Insane,” it might have been considered prudent of him not to monopolize its pages. We find, however, that Bulletin No. 3, March 1909, Vol. II contains three articles; the one by Jones on “The Cerebro-Spinal Fluid in Relation to the Diagnosis of Metasyphilis of the Nervous System”, occupies twenty-four of the fifty available pages. No. 4, March, 1909, Vol. II contains ten articles, eight of them by Jones. In No. 5, April, 1910, Vol. III, seven out of ten articles are by Jones. Bulletin No. 1, October, 1910, Vol. IV, unlike earlier editions, does not include the names of the editors but carries ten articles, three of them by Jones. However, his name is singularly absent among the contributors to subsequent issues. Conceding that all his articles were of undoubted value and their reprinting fully justified, it is clear that Jones’ virtual monopoly and extravagant output would hardly have endeared him to his colleagues, contributors and subscribers. This error of judgment, however, is in itself hardly enough to warrant the Ontario Government’s intervention and one must look elsewhere for the cause of this exasperation.

Without access to Provincial Government archives it is not possible to say with certainty which particular incident, if any, lead to Dr. Jones being removed from his position of co-editor. Indeed apart from his own erroneous assertion that the publication was banned and the fact that his name does not appear in Bulletins after 1910, there is no obvious evidence of interference of any kind. Yet, it would be artless to assume that Dr. Jones’ reproach was altogether without foundation. The most plausible explanation is that there was no single insult but that one article alone gave the authorities the opportunity they were seeking to reprimand Jones, whose attitude and opinions they found repugnant. This belief is supported by the fact that with the single exception to be noted, all the publications by Jones in the Bulletin conform to the highest standards of propriety in that reference to sex is obscure and circumspect.

The paper in question, “Psycho-Analytic Notes on a case of Hypomania” departs from Ernest Jones’ usually high standard of scientific objectivity. Psycho-Sexual concepts are introduced to which, even today, many professional people will take strong exception. In his introduction, Jones points out that although fifteen years old the psycho-analytic methods developed by Freud have been singularly neglected outside of German-speaking countries. “These methods”, he writes, “are unquestionably destined to have a far-reaching influence, not only in the case of the psycho-neuroses but in much wider fields and particularly in that of insanity”. Referring to the monograph by Jung (4), “The Psychology of Dementia Praecox,” Jones describes it as a brilliant success.
which should greatly encourage workers
in this and allied fields of investigation.
But up to that time, said Jones, no
psycho-analysis of a case of manic-
 depressive insanity has been recorded.
The one published under that name by
Otto Gross (5), as Jung among others
pointed out, was almost certainly a case
of dementia praecox. Dr. Jones goes on
to note that the same objections may be
raised in regard to his paper but that in
his opinion the evidence seems to point
against that diagnosis.

The case was first described on clas-
sically Kraepelinian lines. Three possible
diagnoses were considered, “manic-de-
pressive insanity”, “dementia paranoides”,
and “hysteria”. The last was excluded
because of the absence of expected phy-
sical signs or symptoms. The diagnosis
of dementia praecox was weighed care-
fully and finally discarded because no
evidence of the peculiar “shut-offness”
or loss of contact with the immediate
environment was present. Nor were
there any somatopsychic perversions,
such as stereotypies, verbigerations or
mannerisms, etc. On the other hand, he
argues, “there was marked alternation of
depression and excitement, logorrhea,
suggestibility during the excited period,
retained insight, association reaction and
typical manic flight of ideas which
strongly support the diagnosis of manic
depressive psychosis”.

The presentation along Kraepelinian
lines was then criticized on the grounds
that it gave a conception of the disease
as seen from the outside, from the point
of view of the clinical observer. “It does
not pretend”, says Jones, “to lead us to
an appreciation of the mental phenomena
as seen from the inside”. The advantages
of the psycho-analytic method were then
discussed. “We are”, he says, “for the
first time beginning actually to penetrate
into the patient’s mind and to learn some-
thing about the patho-gnomonic mechan-
isms by means of which the different
symptoms of the disorder are brought
about.” He warned that the psycho-
analysis of an individual case of any
psychosis was so difficult that it was rare-
ly complete. The present case was then
considered on the basis of a few associa-
tion tests. These revealed a high per-
centage of superficial association, mostly
clang and motor—speech forms and a
markedly erotic assimilation shown in
regard to most of the stimulus words.

Of particular interest was the striking
similarity between the result of the two
examinations given a month apart.

In the first examination sexual orgasm
was provoked by the stimulus “spent”,
“come”, “spirit”. In the second, orgasm
was provoked only by “spent”. In the
third a similar effect was achieved by
“spent” and also by “mount”, a stimulus
not previously included. On the basis of
these association tests and the patient’s
association reactions which will be refer-
ted to again, Ernest Jones made the fol-
lowing case synthesis.

“A woman, of passionate temperament
and strong religious training, had at the
age of sixteen been seduced, and at the
age of nineteen had married another man
by whom she was already pregnant. After
bearing one child she had a miscarriage,
which she attributed to a gonorrhoea
contracted from her husband, and under-
went a number of gynaecological oper-
ations and other treatment for the relief
of subsequent pelvic complications; her
ovaries were removed at the age of
twenty-three. As the years went by, her
desire to have more children was strong,
and her sexual inclinations increased in
intensity; at the same time her husband’s
capacity to gratify these grew less, and
she contrasted him unfavourably in this
respect with her former lover. She thus
blamed her husband twice over for her
lack of children. She had illicit relations
with other men, which caused her much
remorse. Religious appeals to forsake her
evil ways and lead a new life she inter-
preted as a revelation indicating the
error of her past sexual life and advocat-
ing a new form of sexual life. For a
number of reasons this idea of a new
sexual life took the form of the fellatorism perversion. She tenderly loved her husband, so that there arose in her mind an intense conflict between this feeling of love and duty, and the forces impelling her to turn from him to a new kind of life. The compromise between the two sets of forces was found in identifying, for a number of reasons, the act of fellatorism with the partaking of the holy sacrament. A number of abnormal mental processes were the direct outcome of this; such were delusions of poisoning, refusal to take food, intense excitement evidently of erotic origin, belief that various ministers were in love with her and eager to lead her into the “new way” of sexual life, etc. These abnormal processes clinically constituted recurrent attacks of mania.

Between the association tests and the concluding case synthesis Jones speculated, albeit rather dogmatically, on the sexual etiology of the patient’s illness. Sparing none of the finer details he describes her seduction at the age of sixteen by a music teacher, who, Dr. Jones gratuitously reports, on several occasions had sexual intercourse with her over a dozen times in one night. After marriage her sexual demands reached nymphomaniac proportions, by far exceeding her husband’s capacity to satisfy them. Since she could not be adequately gratified by her husband, she turned to the Church. Interpreting very literally appeals from the pulpit to forsake her evil ways she assumed that she had been indulging in sexual gratification the wrong way. In veiled language one Minister revealed to her that the true way was to admit the male organ not into her vagina but into the mouth. “The seed was in this way to enter into the body—had not Christ said “Take and drink”?—where it would perform its function of creating and nourishing the child”.

Dr. Jones continues in this vein:— “When speaking of religious observances, particularly of Holy Communion, the patient broke off, and slowly and reverently went through a perfect pantomine of the whole ceremony. This culminated in her taking a glass of water, which she had placed on a Bible, and gradually raising it to her lips, where she beatifically sucked the rim, slowly revolving the glass as she did so. During the latter part of the performance a complete and exhausting orgasm took place. I pointed to the glass, and asked her if it was the communion cup; she answered: “Do you call it a cup? It has another name”, and later remarked: “This is the Way, the Truth and the Life”, etc.

Among the cognoscenti, interpretations of this kind may be meaningful, but it is not difficult to imagine the degree to which the medical profession in the Ontario of 1910 was scandalized by them. Apart altogether from the obvious dangers of being regarded as the author of a lascivious work the interpretations themselves can be criticized on the grounds that they are based more on predilection for a certain order of explanation than an impartial judgment of facts. To say the least, the symbolic interpretation in this case of the Holy Sacrament as a perverse sexual act is arbitrary. No attempt appears to have been made to consider the merits of possible alternative explanations. Other similarly dogmatic formulations are equally contentious. Referring to the patient’s orally erotogenic proclivity, Dr. Jones says that with some people the mouth is the equivalent of the vagina and continues:—“This is, of course, as a rule, accompanied by marked sucking movements, and the earliest source of this abnormality has been clearly traced by Freud to the sucking movements of the infant at the nipple. Children destined later to show this abnormality are morbidly fond of sucking various objects, particularly their own toes or fingers.”

It may be argued with good reason that, however unpopular his methods or findings, Dr. Jones had the right, even a duty, to pursue whatever line of enquiry he desired. This even in a case which
from the outset he knew to be extremely difficult and impossible to complete. Accepting this, the very tentative conclusions which resulted seem suitable only for discussion with like-minded colleagues or at best for brief notice in a psycho-analytical publication. In fact, the article first appeared in the American Journal of Insanity, Oct. 1909. It is more difficult to understand why Dr. Jones, as co-editor, allowed it to be reprinted in the Bulletin of the Ontario Hospitals, thus exposing himself to the contumely of his peers and superiors. It certainly was not that he lacked experience of such difficulties, for in 1906, although undoubtedly innocent, he was actually charged with indecent assault on two young girls*. Afterwards he referred to the “ineffaceable stain” and said that he would never be the same as before that most disagreeable experience of his life. Again in 1908 there occurred a similar painful episode with a girl of ten. Shortly after her interview with him the child boasted to other children in the ward that Dr. Jones had been talking to her about sexual topics. As a result Ernest Jones was called upon to resign from the hospital staff.

With these two fearful experiences behind him one would expect Dr. Jones to have been far less intrepid. This imprudence raises questions such as, was his judgment impaired by an excessive enthusiasm for psycho-analysis? Was it an unconscious desire to provoke hostility? Or was it simply a determination to seek emancipation from a way of life which he found narrow and constricting? No answers are offered and at this point it is possible only to formulate these tentative questions. In all probability, Dr. Ernest Jones would have considered this to be not an unimportant first step.

Freud described Jones as an “unflinching and steadfast” champion of psycho-analysis, and it seems appropriate to conclude with a quotation greatly admired by Ernest Jones. It aptly describes his unique contribution to the good of mankind:

“Happy is he who can search out the causes of things, for thereby he masters all fear, and is throned above fate.”
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Résumé

Le Dr Ernest Jones, ami de Sigmund Freud et pionnier de la psychanalyse, quitta l’Angleterre, où il était en proie à beaucoup de difficultés, et vint travailler à Toronto. Il fut nommé au personnel de l’Université de Toronto comme démonstrateur en pathologie et en médecine, associé en psychiatrie et plus tard, comme professeur associé.

D’après ses propres dires, son séjour ici de 1909 à 1913 lui procurera peu de satisfaction. Ce fut toutefois, la période la plus créatrice de sa vie. Avant l’âge de 35 ans, il avait déjà rédigé pas moins de trente communiqués traitant de toute une série de sujets médicaux et scientifiques.

A Toronto, Ernest Jones éprouva de nouveau toutes sortes de difficultés et beaucoup d’opposition à ses opinions. À l’époque, il était corédacteur en chef du Bulletin of the Ontario Hospitals for the Insane. Donnant un exemple de l’hostilité manifestée envers la psychanalyse, le Dr Jones déclara que la publication de ce Bulletin avait été suspendue par le gouvernement ontarien parce qu’il y avait des articles qui “ne convenaient pas à la
publication même dans un périodique médical".

L'article ci-dessus examine ces faits et démontre que le Dr Jones se trompait. De fait, la publication ne fut pas suspendue. Il semble cependant qu'un article du Dr Jones intitulé "Notes psychanalytiques sur un cas d'hypomanie" ait fourni aux autorités l'occasion qu'elles recherchait de le réprimander.

On passe brièvement en revue l'article en cause, et on laisse entendre que le Dr Jones était beaucoup moins prudent qu'il aurait dû l'être. De fait, il semble y avoir des indices que l'auteur, de propos délibéré, cherchait à provoquer les gens. On en conclut que l'opposition à la psychanalyse dont parle le Dr Jones revêtait deux aspects: une antipathie naturelle envers les idées nouvelles, et aussi l'excès irritant d'enthousiasme de la part des protagonistes d'idées nouvelles. Freud avait plus raison de craindre ses disciples trop zélés que l'opprobre de ses adversaires.
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