

Conversations with Linda: Freud and the Human Soul
Robert Allen Copyright © 2006

“You ended our last chat,” Linda began, “by asserting that Freud frequently spoke and wrote about the Human Soul – and that Freud’s speaking about the Human Soul has been mistranslated into English. Then you implied a hope – that Freud, clearly understood – continues to provide sign posts and maps into a human understanding of the Human Soul. Nevertheless, you also implied a reluctant resignation to the thought that even a century Post-Freud, little has changed in the bringing of this human understanding into the *Weltanschauung* of ‘civilized bourgeois’ living-rooms. Why is that?”

“The ‘why of that’ brings up a rather full can of worms You and I may certainly explore some interesting critters within this can ... but tell me, when you think of Freud or picture Freud – what readily comes to mind?” Bob asked, leaning forward in his rocking chair.

“I guess ... I see the picture of an old man, holding a cigar,” said Linda.

Springing from his chair, Bob approached the bookshelves, searching. “Like this picture?” he asked, grabbing a paperback copy of Calvin Hall’s *A Primer of Freudian Psychology*.

“Yes, that’s the Freud that I think of when I think about Freud.”

“I thought so – most folk have this picture in mind when thinking of Freud. He **is** an old man in this picture, suffering from ever-painful mouth cancer. I believe that this photo is taken in 1921 or so. For my self, I tend to see Freud like this,” said Bob finding Robert Byck’s edited collection entitled *Cocaine Papers of Sigmund Freud*. “This is a photo of Freud from around 1885 - about the time he received appointment as a *Privatdozent*.”

“Sheese ... a real looker ... for 1885. Those eyes, so intense, so forward looking.”

“Indeed,” said Bob rummaging around a few more books, “but look at this,” having found Peter Gay’s *Freud: A Life for Our Time*. “Here’s Freud at 16 with his mother, again, intense, real intense.”

“Positively dapper – he is ... and she’s beautiful.”

“Yes, for a 19th century woman, having had eight children – three boys and five girls – not only beautiful, but also apparently healthy. Remember, even in the last quarter of the 19th century, most birthing happened within the home of the birthing mother. Freud also briefly had a beloved nursemaid – so, as with some fantasy heroes in later life – Moses, Leonardo, and Oedipus, dear Oedipus – Freud experiences love from two mothers.

“You’re beginning to draw the picture of a human, oh so human, Freud.”

“That’s the fascinating ... and scary ... and intriguingly awesome story of Freud, the man, the friend, the father -- several fathers Hm – first-born son, has two mothers, becomes several fathers.... But first and foremost, a human father, having two sons gone for soldiers in the First World War – on the losing side, at that.”

“What’s a *Privatdozent*,” Linda queried.

“Something that we’ve never seen here in America that was rather ubiquitous in the German higher ed of Freud’s day. It’s an honorary position at a University, confirmed by the faculty, that allows one to advertise the confirmed position and even lecture at the University – without pay, of course – although charging private admission fees sometimes brought in revenue. All part of the path to obtaining a Doctorate professorship.”

“Similar to an unpaid university teaching assistant?”

“Similar – then as now, who you know or knows of you, counts.”

Leaning forward and picking up the book, Linda asked, “*Cocaine Papers of Sigmund Freud* – what do Freud and Cocaine have in common?”

“Why, cocaine and tobacco were drugs of choices for Freud – he gave up using cocaine (injecting it, rather than snorting or smoking it) rather easily after one of his friends became terrible addicted – while Freud was treating the friend with cocaine for the friend’s morphine addiction....”

“How did Freud get the cocaine?”, Linda interrupted.

“The dude was in medical school and became a medical doctor. Freud wrote a prescription for the friend to take to a pharmacy to obtain needle-ready cocaine. Like most addicts, the friend abused the prescription, taking far more intravenous cocaine than Freud prescribed.”

“Didn’t the pharmacist notice the abuse?”

“Who cared? Freud sometimes used cocaine himself, recreationally, to feel more comfortable in social situations. He even sent several vials to his *fiancé*, telling her that it was great stuff – later writing her a love letter, lamenting that although he was missing her, that he, as a cocaine intoxicated lover, would soon take her in his arms and hug and kiss her.”

“This is a Freud that I never knew about”, she said.

“This Freud is quite the surprise to his fiancé as well. She grows up in an Orthodox Jewish home - having a strongly Orthodox Jewish mother – who never found easy comfort with her future son-in-law, the doctor. Freud is Jewish as well - with a father who read, spoke, and thought in Hebrew as well as German – but this father raises his son to be a free and independent thinker. Most folk probably don’t have this image of the young adult Freud.”

“Are those some of the worms in the can that you spoke of?”

“Only some light weight worms – most of which are far heavier. In a Freudian sense, it’s significant that his recreational cocaine use happened early on in his career – before he had advanced very far into the first recorded psycho-analysis within the history of Western Culture!”

“But if Sigmund Freud is the first psychoanalyzed patient, who was his therapist?”

“Dr. Freud is the therapist – that pioneering scientist, exploring the emerging visualized structure and architecture of the Human Soul – *die Seele* in German. As Dr. Freud puts it, ‘*Die Psychoanalyse ist ein Stuck der Seelenkunde der Psychologie.*’ (Psychoanalysis is a part of psychology, which is dedicated to the science of the soul).

“Dr. Freud conducted psychoanalysis upon Sigmund Freud, the patient? Freud conducted a self analysis?”

“Hard work – extremely hard work – considering the Resistances. Not only did Freud need to recognize a resistance when it occurred – but then needed to do something *hard!* He needed to, as a Freudian would put it, ‘work through the resistance’ – which is *even harder* than just seeing the Resistance in the first place. While working through the resistance, Freud becomes consciously aware of, and needs to incorporate this awareness within his personhood of – **the what** - the Repressed Memory that the Resistance covers up and buries within the Unconscious – and **the why** – of the cover-up. Each and every human being in ‘civilized culture’ ends up covering up far, far more in their lives, than any scandal-ridden politician could ever attempt to accomplish!”

“That’s a lot of personal work,” she observed.

“But there’s more – and this is the genius of Freud. Dr. Freud, gaining awareness through his recorded notes – wherein he gathers cases, an accumulating number of cases – of both his and his clients’ Repressed Memories – begins to see an immemerging architecture for the Human Soul! Patterns appear within this architecture. Being a trained scientist, Dr. Freud begins to scientifically abstract generalizations from these emerging patterns. From these generalizations, Freud scientifically abstracts phenomena – clearing away obstructing residue (as a sculptor clears away excess stone, uncovering the art within the stone) – and begins to visualize the structure and architecture of the Human Soul.”

“I’m beginning to understand why you admire Freud.”

“Yet Freud is human, all so human. He never is able to kick the tobacco habit for many cigars each day – even when informed that cigar smoking exacerbates the cancer in his mouth – even when his doctor repeatedly admonishes Freud to quit tobacco. Freud, rebel as he was, tried several times – cold turkey. Freud discovers that he was in such a high state of *unlust* – that rather than dealing with the angst brought about through the *unlust*, Freud took the short-cut, returning again and again to his addiction to tobacco. And this pursuit of tobacco *Lust*, along with other aging issues, kills Dr. Freud.”

“*Unlust, Lust?*”

“Frequently translated from the German into English as *pain* and *pleasure*.”

“I like the German *Lust* much more than our English *pleasure*. There’s raw, sensualness in the German.”

“Freud thought so too!” Bob said. “More importantly, the German pair of *unlust/Lust* carries a relationship that the English pair of *pain/pleasure* lacks. The German pair demonstrates one of the simple problems in Symbolic Form – that of analogically expressing the simple negative.”

“You’ve just lost me again,” she complained.

“As with pictures, which tend to be likenesses, or analogs, the *unlust/Lust* pair needs to express the simple positive before being able to express the simple negative. *Lust* must be grasped prior to being able to grasp the simple negative of *unlust*. In English translation, the *pain/pleasure* pair expresses each aspect of the pair as separate and distinct from each other – without relationship. In English, one may experience pain without knowing what pleasure consists of. Not so in German, one can never experience *unlust* prior to experiencing *Lust*. *Unlust* is a simple negative – but hard to express without first conjuring the simple positive.”

“And this distinction is important?” she asked.

“Important in the sense that the Unconscious, as discovered (**not** invented) by Freud, tends to reveal itself through analogical likeness – through the process of Dreaming – radiating the ambiguities of all analogical communication – having a hard time expressing the simple negative without initially conjuring the simple positive – within psychic time, within psychic place. Freud deals with many of these and other difficulties abounding throughout ambiguous analogical Symbol Sets.”

“Symbol Sets?”

“Collections of Symbols that find relationship to and with each other. The English language is a Symbol Set. The German language is a Symbol Set. Mathematics broadly conceived, transverse a number of Symbol Sets. Abstract Expressionism in the Art world, contains a Symbol Set.”

“It sounds like almost anything that finds differentiation from anything else, may contain a Symbol Set – and that some Symbol Sets may be larger or smaller than other Symbol Sets. Am I following this correctly?”

“Right on, in fact. Symbol Sets comprise a great deal found within Symbolic Form and within the philosophy of Symbolic Form, which you and I began exploring in our last chat.”

“Let’s see if I’m able to construct an example of what I hear you saying.... If I take a Symbol – conveying the meaning “No right turn here” for a traffic sign – in this analogical picture – there is a broken black arrow, pointing to the right, displayed on a white background – surrounded by a bright red circle, with a red line slashing the red circle.”

“Excellent example, Lindy. This is indeed a great example of one way the Human Unconscious conceptualizes and communicates a derived understanding through using one or more given Symbols.”

“Ah, and this traffic sign Symbol is only one of”

“Thousands, tens of thousands of available Analogical Symbols – collected within various Symbol Sets – available to the human, oh so human.”

“Then the sky’s the limit with Symbol Sets and Symbolic Form.”

“Indeed, the Symbol Sets provide the building blocks upon which the architecture of Symbolic Form finds shape, construction, and definition. Another architecture, the architecture of the Human Soul – is what Freud passionately pursues throughout his professional life.”

“And the mistranslation of Freud into English? In fact, any translation from one Symbol Set to another Symbol Set, “ she began musing, “appears fraught with problems.”

“This is true,” he replied. “*Die Seele*, literally the human soul in German, finds frequent mistranslation into English as *mental, the mind, of the mind* – when in fact, the German *geistig* literally means *of the mind, of the intellect* – in the English sense of the phrases. This is confusing at best – until one really starts reading Freud – even in translation from Symbol Set to Symbol Set – in such a way that Freud’s *die Seele* strikes one as so much more than the mere English *mental, the mind, of the mind*. As Freud put it in a letter to Carl Jung – ‘Psychoanalysis is in essence a cure through love’ – the love of one human soul for contact with another human soul. Truly, this is the quality that makes one human, all so human – guiding others to a human understanding of the Self.”

“Bravo Bob, Bravo!” exclaimed Linda, clapping her hands. “This makes my ol’ Theistic Heart and Soul, jump with joy and gladness. I had no idea that Atheists are really this broad minded.”

“Indeed, the gladness experienced through touching human souls, anytime, any place, any where. My Non-Theistic human soul loves touching your beautiful Theistic human soul. It’s fun,” he smiled.

“Mmmmm Feels good.”

“Most importantly though, Freud’s human, all so human, expression, finds rather self-informed, honest writing!” he added. “That is why, then as now, over a century later, there is so much Resistance to the human message brought to ‘civilized’ Western Culture by the good Dr. Freud.”

“I notice that you capitalized the word ‘Resistance’ in your last sentence – and it appears that you are attempting to refer to your earlier capitalizations of this word, when you specifically refer to the psychoanalytic construct that you say Freud labels as Resistance. Am I reading this right?”

“Yes, you are. The science of Freud’s psycho-analysis is highly self-reflexive – both the conscious Self and the Unconscious Self – however – and this is what makes it science and not philosophy – there clearly emerge patterns of abstractions that find application against specific occurrences, yielding rather consistent interpretation – without the addition of epicycles.”

“Say what? You’ve lost me again.”

“I’m sorry; I was using a metaphor that I thought you shared. You know about Copernicus and the Copernican system, describing the motion of the planets around the sun?”

“Oh course.”

“Well, prior to Copernicus there was another system describing the motion of the ‘heavenly bodies’ around the center of the Universe – the motion of the ‘heavenly bodies’ in circular orbit – around the Earth. This system – in place for roughly **fourteen** centuries – known as the Ptolemaic system – is able to ‘predict’ the future location of the ‘heavenly bodies’ – **ordained** through placement in time and space – by the ‘creator of the Heavens....’.”

“I’ve heard a little about the Ptolemaic system – but obviously, the Sun doesn’t circle the Earth. It strikes me that the ‘circular orbit of the Sun around the Earth’ – couldn’t be all that circular.”

“But with the Ptolemaic System, the Sun and the other ‘heavenly bodies’ do circle the center of the Universe – the Earth – when enough epicycles are added to the circular paths, making it so.

“I’m still confused,” she commented.

“An epicycle is a smaller circle, the center of which, travels along the circumference of a larger circle. In Ptolemaic astronomy the observed path of a ‘heavenly body’ circling around the center of the Universe, needs epicycles and epicycles upon epicycles to reconcile the observed location of a ‘heavenly body’ with the Ptolemaic theory.”

“But, this doesn’t make any sense,” Linda exclaimed.

“Ah, but you’re missing an important understanding, as popular in Ptolemy’s day as it is today – the understanding that – *‘the Lord works in mysterious ways....’* This is where, what could be labeled as *‘the miracle of the epicycle’* happens – bringing to human consciousness – through an understanding within the Human Soul – the here-to-fore secret mysteries of the spheres, revealed to man through the proper understanding of Holy Scriptures.”

“Sheeees, Bob – ‘the miracle of the epicycle’ – and all of that other crap – particularly the reference to understanding of Holy Scripture! This is the most sarcastic that you have been in a long time! Laying it on a little thick here, aren’t ya?”

“I certainly understand why a Theist could see my last sentence, as laying it on thick. However, from a Non-Theistic perspective, my last sentence is a well constructed Post-Modern sentence. Images – slammed together – constructs of consciousness within the Human Soul – sacred text interpretation – spanning time, backwards, to the time of Ptolemy – in just one sentence. A Post-Modern sentence of few words, conveying a large picture – projected for a Post-Modern sensibility. Remember – from our last chat – ‘what is Epistemology for one, is Propaganda for the other and what is Propaganda for one, is Epistemology for the other.’”

“The Ptolemaic system sounds real cumbersome. The Copernican system is much simpler to picture and grasp.”

“But given enough epicycles upon epicycles, the Ptolemaic and Copernican systems are roughly equally predictive – for **explaining** the ‘observed’ position of a ‘heavenly body’. However, the charting necessary for the Ptolemaic system is much more complex (and time consuming in constructing the chart) than the charting for the Copernican system. Quite literally, the ‘miracle of the epicycle’ is what saves the Ptolemaic system, within ‘learned circles’ of Western Culture – for about **fourteen** centuries!”

“So, you’re saying that Freud’s science of psychoanalysis involving the structure and functions of the Human Soul is such that it doesn’t need additional epicycles to yield consistent interpretation,” she noted.

“Yes, that’s what I’m saying.”

“I get it, now. However, I still notice a twinge in my gut when I hear you referring to ‘the miracle of the epicycle’. I’ve noticed this twinge before, when I perceive you deriving pleasure from twisting a metaphor beyond its generally accepted meaning – into a meaning that tends to attack what you disagree with,” she said, touching his arm, holding direct eye contact.

“It’s certainly possible that I created a multi-layered Post-Modern sentence – containing that condescending double message that you bring to my awareness – as one layer among many. Indeed, the many layers of a Post-Modern sentence may contain layers that out an out contradict other layers – similar to the way that the Unconscious contains layers upon layers of diction and contra-diction.”

“I’m realizing how little I know much about Modernism, let alone Post-Modernism.”

“That conversation – Modernism – Post-Modernism – for another time and place. However, there remains the ever-current observation that Freud is a truly Post-Modern thinker – emerging, along with other Modernist movers and shakers within the Modernist movement of his day – into a Post-Modern world – while the Modernist world of that day, itself, is in a mid-formative stage! Quite an event kicking off the start of Western Culture into the 20th Century CE – during, what my more provincial readers may enjoy hearing expressed as, the ‘American Century’.”

“You big tease. OK, I’ll wait for that chat on Modernism and Post-Modernism – but your thought about Freud being a Post-Modern thinker during the mid-formative days of Modernism – the least you can do, is expand that thought, a tad.”

“Thanks for twisting my arm. Modernism, first and foremost is a label for a framework containing member parts of the Modernist whole. In our last chat, you and I spoke of groups and grouping of groups – even exploring, a tad, the Theistic orientation that God is the largest grouping of groups.”

“I remember that.”

“My bias places the beginning of Modernism with the Modernist painters, but others – can, do, and may be right in doing so – place the beginning of Modernism, elsewhere. It really doesn’t matter where or when one places a ‘Beginning’ for Modernism. As a legacy from the Enlightenment, Modernism demands a new way of looking at contents and boundaries – generally brought about through a different paradigmatic way of viewing Reality. For the Modernist painters, issues include: the two dimensional picture plain, subject matter, color, light, immediate impression, definition of ‘completeness’ – when does a point become a line, when does a line define a shape, when does a shape define a form. When does a **work of art**, even a Ready Made, **say** that it finds completeness?”

“I like exploring these issues in my drawing.”

“And that’s why folk do enjoy Modernism so much ... it just feels good to go with the flow. However, this is only one small area within Modernism – the ‘small’ area of Art. Modernism in other disciplines – deals with different issues – and has different focus. The young Professor Dr. Nietzsche, trained thoroughly as a German philologist – spends a good deal of his time over the issue of needing to re-value, values. The good doctor Nietzsche, expounds profusely upon the difficulties of knowing one’s self within Mass-Culture - particularly German – through the mythic symbolic notion of hubris – brought forward through the Imperialistic blunders of a lesser French Bonaparte – following the unseen hand of Otto von Bismarck, Master Nation-builder – in the French and German adventures of 1870.”

“What’s a philologist?” she asked – with a tone implying that Mass-Culture, a lesser Bonaparte, and Otto von Bismarck – have little in common, let alone a connection, with Freud.

“Roughly, in today’s terms, a psycho-linguist.”

“Oh – I’ve always thought that Nietzsche was a philosopher.”

“Folk often get the two confused. I suspect that this has a great deal to do with folk not being able to understand Nietzsche, but, a deeper discussion of Nietzsche – also for another time – another place. The focus needs to remain with Freud – doing his thing – mid-stream, within the flow of Modernism.”

“The Modernism in Art that you describe feels so right – so natural.”

“That’s because you and I were raised and indulged within a prosperous Modernist culture. Modernism feels quite natural – yet has only been around for a century or so – but even early Modernism – like Stravinsky, Mahler, and Vila Lobos – feels exciting to many 21st Century Human Souls.” Bob continued, “But Freud lives in late 19th Century Europe – in a place acutely aware of the rapidly expanding collapse of the Hapsburg Monarchy, ruling Austria-Hungary with the last rigid vestiges of Western Feudalism.”

“Didn’t Austria-Hungary have something to do with the start of the First World War?” she asked.

“Indeed. The heir to the Austrian-Hungarian throne of 83-year-old Emperor Franz Josef – Archduke Franz Ferdinand, decides to make a state visit to the rebellious hinterlands of Sarajevo on June 28, 1914 – a day of solemn memories for the Serbs, who on that day in 1349, found defeat at the hands of the bloody Turks. This state visit by the Archduke and his wife to the outskirts of the realm allows his wife to sit beside her husband at all state ceremonies.”

“That sounds odd, couldn’t the Archduke’s wife always sit with him?” Linda asked.

“Not in Feudal Austria-Hungary – at least not in locations where it really matters. The Archduke married outside of royal circles, definitely ‘beneath’ himself socially and economically – thus, forced to suffer the indignation of the royal class – not being able to have his wife even seen with him at state functions,” Bob continued.

“Certainly sounds Feudal to me. So, the Archduke goes to Sarajevo with his wife, just to share a little glamour of royal life with her – and finds himself assassination instead.

“The social embarrassment for Austrian-Hungarian royalty, having an heir apparent marrying below his station – finds solution through the assassination of the heir apparent – but the larger embarrassment of the assassination done by Serbs on Serbian territory! – Just too much for Royal Sensibilities to bear! In a strange sense, one could posit that the assassination that sets World War I in motion is the culmination of Feudal embarrassment meeting rapidly escalating Industrial Revolution – culminating in millions of deaths through launching ‘Modernist’ modes for massing killing.”

“So, are you saying that in Freud’s 19th century Austrian-Hungarian environment, that Modernism fails to get a start – because of the Feudalism?”

“Not at all. Modernism – within the realm of the Hapsburgs, also blossoms, exuding excitements – but blatantly threatens established *bourgeois* norms. The specter of 1848 revolutionary explosions fomenting throughout Europe – haunts the establishment – resulting in massive reactionary criticism directed at Modernist forces bursting into bloom near the end of the 19th century. Much of the criticism of Modernism and Post Modernism stems from this overreaction to a reactionary fear of return – to the revolutionary times of 1848 within Europe,” Bob commented.

“I’ve never heard of any of this before, particularly about European revolutions – plural, you say – in 1848. Is this important?”

“Only so far as understanding that much of the critique of Modernism and Post Modernism finds initial voice about issues arising from the forces unleashed in 1848 throughout Europe. Americans have little experience with any of these forces – largely because America never experiences European Feudalism first hand. The closest that America ever comes is that of having a healthy dose of Mercantilism – but this is definitely another large area for further discussion – at another time and place. Naturally, a great part of Freud’s soul vibrates synchronistically with the aliveness within the Modern – but his emotion comfort continues to reside within the embrace of the Hapsburg establishment – an anti-Semitic establishment at that.”

“I can relate to a split like that. I wasn’t raised to hate America – but the Viet Nam anti-war movement caught me up in the rightness of the cause – and the terrible wrong-ness – America erecting propaganda domino after propaganda domino – from South East Asia – throughout the world – only to knock the dominoes down – through the carnage of American democracy in action.”

“America is well known for spreading the carnage of democracy in action throughout the world – Barnum-ised with bigness and splendor – beginning with Teddy R’s Great White Fleet circumnavigating the world – putting America forever on the European Global Map – and going through George W’s crusade against the perceived pagans for the day. I believe that America’s version for this carnage in democracy begins even before the colonists move off the Eastern sea-shore, heading West,” he added.

“So, getting back to Freud being a Post-Modern man within the mid-formulation of Modernism....”

“Modernism never happens in all areas of development at a single pace – and most interestingly – Modernism, becoming aware of itself as Modernistic, crosses the boundary into Post-Modern reflective awareness. For example, let’s take the Modernist happening of Marcel Duchamp’s disgust with the trivialization of fine art, such as the *Mona Lisa* – finding reproduction upon everything from napkins to wrapping paper. Add to this his impish Modernist vision of being a little kid, running through an art gallery, and drawing mustaches upon famous work with a marker – and we have Duchamp’s famous addition to a *representation* of the sacred *Mona Lisa*. Part of the Modernist statement within Duchamp’s work on a *represented Mona*, is that of taking so-called sacred iconography, which already finds trivialization through current, popular, mass re-productive replication upon postcards, napkins, posters, wrapping paper – and trivialize the puppy even further, by adding a mustache to this sacred

icon. As soon as the mass re-production of Duchamp's Modernist work commences, this trivialization of a trivialization crosses the boundary into Post-Modern reflective awareness.

"So how does this relate to Freud?"

"Getting a tad ahead of ourselves in looking at the work of Freud – the simple answer is that as soon as Freud's Modernist **psycho-analytic** way of dealing with the architecture of the Human Soul – as a **treatment technique** - begins to change the larger culture around the Freudian system – **the art and practice of psycho-analysis**, crosses the boarder into Post-Modern reflective awareness. This Post-modern reflection has indeed changed *bourgeois* Western Culture – reflected and bounced around within the Mass of Western Culture. Psycho-analysis is Modernist and Post-Modernist concurrently – beginning during the mid-process of emerging Modernism within Western Culture. However, we're getting way ahead of ourselves here, speaking of a reflective awareness within psycho-analysis – before even having a beginning grasp of what psycho-analysis is," Bob pontificated.

"OK, take me back to a beginning grasp of psychoanalysis."

"You catch on quickly, Lindy – 'a' as opposed to 'the'. Modernist thinking changes the perspective away from the notion that there is 'a singular' beginning for anything – into a perspective that not only may there be more than one beginning, but that beginnings may begin in more than one space, and may additionally be separated by and through time. Modernist thinking additionally adds the perspective that not only is it hard, but sometimes impossible, to determine which, if any, different perspective precedes others – hard to determine which perspective is 'the right' perspective."

"I've heard this critique a great deal, though mostly directed at Post Modernism...."

"I'm **not** offering a critique – I'm **describing an orientation** in thinking...."

"But don't most detractors of Post Modernism raise the issue that the primary 'fault' with Post Modernism is that nobody knows who is right, thus one opinion becomes as good as another."

"Yes, yes – that critique easily drools from the mouths of anti-Modernist propagandists – but the very aliveness of Modernism finds nourishment through the souls of animals – in the Darwinian sense of the phrase – striving forward through the evolutionary effort of Being Human, all so Human."

"I love you Bob, for your passion for the Modern and Post Modern."

"I also notice and love the passion within your soul – however, you are not a Modern woman – not even a Post-Modern woman. You, my friend, are what I delight in being around – a Post-Post-Modern woman – *The* mistress of whatever strikes your fancy.

"This feels nice – thanks. I've never thought of myself in these terms."

"I find myself in total agree with Freud himself – that he, Freud, discovers psycho-analysis – as both a treatment modality and as an Explanatory Principle..."

"Explanatory Principle?" she asked.

"Explanatory Principles are essential for Paradigm construction and maintenance. Giving some examples here are worth their weight in gold. You remember the Inverse Square law as part of Newton's Explanatory Principle in explaining the 'Force' of Gravity."

"Vaguely."

"Or the Doppler Effect – when the sound of a car horn moves towards you or away from you. These occurrences fall within the realm of Explanatory Principles found within science."

"I get it. There must be hundreds, maybe thousands of those EPs out there."

"Yup, and they get placed out there pretty much through the art and craft of Paradigm construction."

"Paradigm construction?"

"Sorta a picture, under an encompassing umbrella, a large picture for a perception of Reality."

“And as you indicated above in your discussion of Modernism having many beginnings, it must be rather hard to determine if one Paradigm is ‘better’ or ‘worse’ than another Paradigm – Paradigms dealing with a collection of similar observations, but reaching far different perceptions of Reality.”

“Lindy, Lindy – you are a such a quick study – but there are ways of comparing and contrasting Paradigms, such that one is able to determine if one Paradigm is ‘better’ or ‘worse’ than another Paradigm. In a very real sense, the conversations that you and I engaged in, are a great example of a way to pursue a discussion of differences between Paradigms. The large theme running throughout these conversations is that of comparing the differences in perceiving Reality through the Paradigm of Theism versus perceiving Reality through the Paradigm of Non-Theism.”

“But you and I are not really out to prove that one of these Paradigms is better than or worse than the other Paradigm, are we?”

“There’s nothing to either prove or disprove – at this point in time. You and I are only in the beginning phase of beginning to explore some of the foundation Explanatory Principles in the larger discussion of differences in perceiving Reality – through a Theistic Paradigm – through a Non-Theistic Paradigm,” Bob soothingly said.

“That’s good cuz sometimes you’re rather clever at sneaking things in – only because you’ve been doing it far longer than I have.”

“That’s true – as far as my thinking about the differences between these two Paradigms in question. However, you’re sharp enough, quick enough, and have a rather well developed Bull-Shit detector in place – to be able and willing to question any and all assertions that I make.”

“Many of your assertions need to be strained through a BS detector.”

“As does everyone’s. As does everyone’s.”

“So let’s see if I’m following this discussion and also able to reason on my own through using some of the parameters introduced so far. Modernist and Post-Modernist BS detectors would always be in the Mind and Soul of the person doing the detecting – as part of being Human, all so Human.”

“Absolutely and positively – and every BS detector resides with a different Paradigm!”

“It’s all so relative,” she observed.

“Relative – but also concrete. Freud – through the scientific art of describing the architecture and the workings of the Human Soul – soon finds other thinkers able to replicate and verify his discoveries, producing similar results. Interestingly, Freud soon thereafter begins writing with a collective ‘we’ – indicating a growing awareness collected by this group of pioneering explorers – awareness of a collective conscious understanding of the depth and breadth of the Human Soul.

“I’ve never heard of Freud in this light before. Are you sure that you’re not fabricating?”

“Absolutely sure. Freud and his admirers clearly project this image through their writings.”

“But not everyone agrees with Freud. What about the detractors?” she asked.

“You bring up two issues here. One is the issue of disagreeing consciously and directly, with the Freudian Paradigm itself. The other is the issue of disagreeing unconsciously and non-directly with the Freudian Paradigm. Within the dialog of the first type of disagreement, the form of the dialog takes on the shape of comparing and contrasting the parameters of the Freudian Paradigm to other parameters of other Paradigms. Within the dialog of the second type of disagreement, the form, frequently labeled as Detraction, arises through the interactions of one or more unconscious layers of repressed or suppressed memories, usually not expressed directly throughout the dialog, and rarely addressing the parameters of the Freudian Paradigm in direct comparison to other paradigms.”

“It sounds to me,” she said, “that you are attempting to split some mighty fine hairs with what you are saying here.”

“Not really – not even close. This is what makes any discussion of any psychological system so difficult. Every psychology – by definition – contains within the parameters of its Paradigm – a definition of ‘Mental Health’ and a definition of ‘Mental Un-Health’. These definitions of ‘Mental Health’ or ‘Mental Un-Health’ are Self-Reflexive. Obviously, these statement of ‘Health’ and ‘Un-Health’, find filter through the personhood of the person making the statements.”

“In just a word then, Subjective,” she added.

“Thanks, Lindy. That’s a concise way of saying it.”

“This being so, then even your revered position of comparing parameters of the Freudian Paradigm to other parameters of other Paradigms, could certainly fall within the realm of the subjective, oh so subjective.”

“In a rather loose sense, this has the appearance of being somewhat right, however, there are safeguards built in to the fine art and craft of Epistemology – the knowing of *how* we know, what we know – and built in to the art and craft of comparing parameters between Paradigms – that protects one from these areas of Subjectivity.”

“I’m sure that you’re able to speak about at least one safeguard – but two or three would be even better.”

“OK, here goes. A biggy is that sense of direction in movement from the specific to the general and from the general to the specific that you and I chatted about last time. The example that I used for the sense of direction in movement for Epistemology was that of the three functions, and only three functions, performed by digital computers.”

“I remember that example. The three functions are moving something from one place to a different place, comparing something to something else, and adding numbers together – with adding being the only mathematical calculation,” she proudly responded, counting the three off on her fingers.

“That’s right. And the example that I used for the direction in movement for Propaganda was that of Nationalism – behaving like an ameba, swallowing the individual – to the point where the individual becomes lost in the mass undifferentiated ameba.

“I remember that too. Now, how about a second and third safeguard that protects one from Subjectivity when comparing parameters of one paradigm to parameters of another paradigm.”

“A second safeguard is what I would label as the ‘Simplicity of the Explanatory Principle’ – consistent with observations supporting both the Explanatory Principle and the parameters of the given paradigm involved. Given enough epicycles, the Ptolemaic Paradigm and the Copernican Paradigm are roughly equivalent in predicting the location of the planets and the Sun within our solar system. You and I agree that the Copernican Paradigm is far simpler in grasping the realities of multiple observations – particularly observations enhanced through using mechanical instruments – such as the telescope. However, even with enhancements helping to explain the **Why** of the Copernican system developed by Newton – using mathematical precision and adding an additional Explanatory Principle for explaining Gravity – observed and predictable behavior of the celestial bodies within the solar system were pretty good – for centuries – except the celestial path of the planet Mercury.”

“I’ve heard of that exception. Didn’t Einstein have something to do with explaining the exception?”

“Einstein actually introduces a new Paradigm – and a new set of Explanatory Principles that account for the observed path of Mercury. However, in doing so, Einstein addresses a serious problem within Newton’s Explanatory Principle for the operation of Gravity. Newton and many of his followers are acutely aware of this problem from the get-go, but are unable to find a solution to the problem. The problem is that Newton’s Explanatory Principle for the operation of Gravity is that Gravity acts at a distance. Einstein’s solution involves Gravity being a Local phenomena – never operating at a distance – but also involves motion and Time.”

“Bob, you’re using a lot of capital letters for words again – and I haven’t the foggiest ideas what any of this means. Slow down a tad, please,” she implored.

“OK. The place to start is in understanding that Einstein is never able to conceptualize anything as ever being in a state of absolute rest. Everything is moving – and every movement is relative to every other movement. Thus, when movement finds observation anywhere, the place from which this movement finds notice, is also in movement. The big issue then, is that with everything in motion – relative to everything else – how does one go about measuring any relative motion? This is where Locality becomes highly significant. In a grossly oversimplified perspective, when units of measure for distance – rods – and units for measuring time – clocks – become involved in measuring movement or motion – movement expressed as a ratio involving time – within the same Local environment, the units of measure and the clocks retain a constant state of definition within that Local environment.”

“What’s a capital ‘L’ Local environment?” she asked.

“That of course depends on who is making the definition and the purpose of the definition. In some cases, Local may include the Earth and the far reaches of the distant edge of the Milky Way galaxy. In other cases, this definition of Local may be much too large – with Local involving only the various relationships between the component parts within a single atom.”

“That’s quite a large range for a definition of what is Local.”

“The range of ‘what is Local’ is not nearly as important as the realization that units of measure and clocks never mean anything when ‘compared’ between Non-Local environments. Mathematical transformations – accounting for the relative motion between Non-Local environments – for both units of measure and clocks – find usage when discussion involves Non-Local environments....”

“And this is important because – ?”

“This introduction of Einstein’s orientation illustrates that although the Copernican System contains a far higher degree of ‘Simplicity of Explanatory Principle’ than does the Ptolemaic system, that when Newton introduces his further Explanatory Principle as to the workings of Gravity within the Copernican system – the anomaly of Mercury’s celestial path becomes readily apparent. Although the anomaly of Mercury’s path is only the tip of the iceberg of major problems introduced with Newton’s Explanatory Principle for Gravity – (for example, Newton is only able to deal with the interactions of two celestial bodies at a time, never able to deal with the interactions of three or more bodies concurrently) – this iceberg tip is enough to enable Einstein to pursue an even simpler explanation for Reality – contained within new Explanatory Principles. Einstein simply realizes that the Reality of the Universe involves more than just being able to conceptualize the Universe within a limited three dimensional framework.”

“I’d hardly call Einstein’s system as being simpler than Newton’s system. It sounds far more complex to me.”

“This appearance occurs to you for several reasons, I suspect. Both the Copernican system and Newton’s view of Gravity within this system, tend to view space as being rather flat – having only three dimensions. Einstein views the Reality of the Cosmos as curved – having at minimum, four dimensions – with the curvature of this fourth dimension – the space-time continuum – containing the simple explanation of Mercury’s celestial path.

“This still sounds complex.”

“Not nearly as complex as trying to explain the path of Mercury in three dimensions – attempting to account for pragmatics occurring within a minimal four dimensional space. To explain four dimensional pragmatics within a three dimensional frame of reference – requires a modern day equivalent for the ‘miracle of the epicycle’.”

“I think where I’m getting hung up in this area of the ‘Simplicity of the Explanatory Principle’,” she began, “is confusing a desire for being able to simply grasp a new idea with what you are referring to as an element of simplicity within the idea itself. Am I tracking this correctly?”

“I’m just as guilty in this area as you are, Lindy. Just because I fail to understand something because I perceive it as hard to understand, doesn’t mean that that something is necessarily complex on to itself. It just means that I’m not familiar with the parameters for the paradigm involved. This is a key element in exploring a major theme running throughout these conversations – which turns on an understanding of Epistemology – what is Epistemology for one is often Propaganda for the other and what is Propaganda for one is often Epistemology for the other. In short, the parameters for a paradigm make all of the difference between understanding what is Epistemology and what is Propaganda.”

“So I really don’t need to grasp what you attempting to illustrate with your example of Einstein’s system being simpler than Newton’s system, I just need to be able to grasp that when the frame of reference for Reality changes from three dimensions to four dimensions, that Einstein’s paradigm is simpler than Newton’s paradigm.”

“That’s it in a nutshell.”

“OK, you’ve given me two safeguards that protect one from Subjectivity – one, the direction of movement; and two, the simplicity of the Explanatory Principle. How about that third safeguard?” she asked.

“A third safeguard is what I would label as an ‘Integration of Explanatory Principles’. Although this Integration appears easy to do in principle, in practice, many difficulties present themselves. For example, when you and I were speaking about a range covering a definition for a Local environment, the range stretched from the far edges of the Milky Way galaxy to the behavior of sub-atomic particles. For close to three-quarters of a century now, physicists have attempted to Integrate the Explanatory Principles found within Einstein’s paradigm operating pragmatically on the far edges of the Milky Way with the Explanatory Principles found operating pragmatically within the paradigms of Quantum mechanics at the sub-atomic level. This Integration of Explanatory Principles from the macro and the micro finds search and exploration in a modern day quest known as the Grand Unification Theory. Einstein spent decades of work in this area of searching for commonality between the macro level of observations and the micro level of observations – to no avail.

“I’ve heard of that Grand Unification Theory, but I don’t quite understand the significance of needing to integrate both extremes into one theory,” she commented.

“One issue that drives the need for integration is the issue of Scale. At a large Scale, say at the edge of the Milky Way, observable physical pragmatics operate in concordance with a number of Explanatory Principles. On a very small Scale, say at the sub-atomic level, observable physical pragmatics operate in concordance with a number of different Explanatory Principles. The issue for Integration in the area of Scale is that the Explanatory Principles at the macro Scale and the Explanatory Principles at the micro Scale – appear to contradict each other. Both sets of Explanatory Principles deal with observable pragmatics of physical phenomena. The physical stuff is the same stuff at both the macro and the micro levels of Scale. The only variable that changes is that of Scale itself – and there is absolutely nothing within any Explanatory Principle, to date, to explain why physical stuff behaves differently at the macro level than physical stuff behaves at the micro level.”

“You make it sound like an exciting mystery to solve. However, you also say that awareness of this mystery has been around for three-quarters of a century. I haven’t noticed that my personal life has been effected at all by either the mystery or by the observation of pragmatics at the edge of the Milky Way or by observed pragmatics at the sub-atomic level – so what really is the big deal here?” she asked.

“This big deal actually deals with one of the Core Issues of Epistemology itself – it deals with the **How** we know, What we know. In this instance of dealing with Scale, Scale currently finds conceptualization as a single flow along one continuum from the macro to the micro. Scale, as we know it today, does not operate in accordance with some Explanatory Principles found within the study of Quantum Mechanics. Scale, as we know it, does not consist of discrete Quanta – allowing for the possibility of discontinuous ‘flow’ – or allowing for a ‘jump’ from one continuum to another continuum.”

“Is this important?” she asked.

“Only as an illustration as to how one may use various parts of Explanatory Principles to construct pictures of possibilities or impossibilities for different Explanatory Principles – when one thinks along Epistemological lines. This is the fine art of Integrating Explanatory Principles.”

“That’s good, because once again, Bob, you’ve wandered along another twisted, though interesting, path away from Freud and my question to you about Freud’s detractors.”

“Detraction is frequently in the Mind (and I *insist*, the Soul) of the detractor! As would be expected, I personally favor the Non-Theistic orientation to this observation. However, I do believe that within Christian Theistic thought, a similar, synchronic if you will, thought, finds expression through the notion that one should not look for a speck within a neighbor’s eye, when one’s own eye contains a log.”

“Aren’t you good ol’ Mr. Eveready? – eveready to show off a Christian metaphor while explaining a Non-Theistic interpretation.”

“Being raised within a Christian Evangelical family of origin, one certainly finds acute exposure to a plethora of Christian metaphor,” he responded, holding his hands together, as if praying.

“So, you don’t find fault with Freud?” she asked, quickly shattering that fantasy.

“I didn’t say that,” he said, quickly bringing his eyes in contact with hers. “In the area of Freud’s discovery of the basic architectural structure for the Human Soul, I’m in agreement with Freud. However, I believe that Dr. Wilhelm Reich’s further discoveries, based on small shifts of focus upon Freud’s work, more deeply resonate synchronistically within my Soul as a more accurate representation for Reality. By bringing Reich in so early though, I am definitely placing the cart before the horse. We’ll need to grasp the work of Freud first, prior to going on to explore the shifts in focus brought forward by Reich.

“So, where do you want to start?”

“Let’s start with the simple title of a book,” he muttered, while searching a library shelf. “Ah – *Das Ich und das Es* – frequently mistranslated into English as *The Ego and the Id*. The German literally means – the I and the It – and for German readers of Freud – far more personal than an English reader confronting a Latinized Ego and Id. For English readers, this Latinized confrontation removes a personal sense of self, thus allows one to ‘objectify’ both Ego and Id – not being directly related to a personal ‘I’, or personal ‘me’.”

“This makes a lot of sense to me,” Linda added, “because when I use the phrase ‘I’, meaning ‘my personal sense of self’, I have a deeper sense of who I am – as opposed to the phrase ‘my ego’, which sounds distant and not really a part of who I am.”

“The personal, oh so personal, is as natural as breathing for Freud – a German trained, college educated specialist within the discipline of *Wissenschaften*....”

“Say what?” she interrupted.

“Roughly, the sciences, in general.”

“Sciences?”

“Yes, plural. Within the German University tradition, there are roughly two classes of Sciences – *Naturwissenschaften* and *Geisteswissenschaften*. *Naturwissenschaften* is generally the Natural Sciences.

Geisterwissenschaften literally means *the sciences of the spirit*. Freud, Goethe, Cassirer, Einstein, Kant – all steeped in both of these fine German scientific traditions.”

“*Geisterwissenschaften* sounds like what I would call the Humanities,” she commented.

“But, being German, oh so German, *Geisterwissenschaften* is so much more than *just* the Humanities. Classification and Systemization being two major hallmarks, even found within stereotypes of Being German... (when Being German comes to mind, Herr Professor Dr. Martin Heidegger comes to mind – one of the two PhDs in Philosophy – from the early days of Nazism – staying the course. The other PhD is of course, none other than the good Dr. Paul Joseph Goebbles, Minister of Propaganda.).

“I see that you’re off and running again. I’ll just use my ol’ casting rod – make a cast – hook the sucker – an’ reel ‘em in. I notice, Bob, that every time that you use the word ‘psychoanalysis’ that you hyphenate the word so that it reads ‘psycho-analysis’. Why is this?”

“I’m trying to make up for the difference between the German *Psychoanalyse*, which has the accent (and focus) upon the first syllable, and the English word ‘psychoanalysis’, which places the accent (and focus) upon the act and practice of analysis. In German, the accent and focus is upon Psyche – the classical mythological personification of the Soul in the personhood of a beautiful woman, loved by Eros. My hyphenation forces the accent (and focus) back upon the first syllable.”

“Psycho-analysis – psychoanalysis – psycho-analysis. I see what you mean in your usage – and I like this shift in focus. I had forgotten that in Greek mythology that Psyche finds love with Eros – they create a child together, naming her Pleasure. Do you believe that Freud had this in mind?”

“Absolutely! Not only is Freud a word-smith in the best tradition of the word – it’s exciting to read Freud, even in less than adequate translation – Freud is also well versed in classical mythology and history – as are all well educated Germans of his day. One must remember that when Freud is in High School, he actually studies Greek and Latin. And, as you and I will explore later on in discussing the myth of Oedipus – and why Freud chooses this myth as a descriptive label – (multi-layered, some contradictory, thus Post Modern - using myth that ages from the times of the Pre-Modern Greek!) – as a label for a complex set of observations. Freud actually believes that his readers are equally well informed, equally well educated.”

“That assumption of well educated readers,” Linda observed, “is probably a mistake made by many,” she commented.

“Indeed. However, returning to ‘the I’ and ‘the It’, a further discovery that Freud writes extensively about in this book is the third major feature within his architecture of the Human Soul. This is the *Uber-Ich*, literally, the Super-I, frequently mistranslated as the Super-Ego. The word *Uber* within Freud’s context, means Above, Upper, Higher Authority – as in the higher authority in reference to lower and upper houses of legislative bodies. Probably the largest loss in translation vis-à-vis *Ich* and *Uber-Ich* is the loss of the sense of an individual, personal ‘I’ actually being responsible for creating the parameters through which the ‘Super-I’ functions. Every individual experience of ‘the I’ actually constructs a highly unique individual ‘Super-I.’” No two ‘Super-I’s are ever alike – as is true for the individual ‘the I’s.

“Catch me if I’m wrong here, but this sounds suspiciously like Louis Sullivan’s admonition, clearly expounded upon by Frank Lloyd Wright – That Form follows Function.”

“Right on, Lindy! Freud’s construct of ‘the I’ does, through it’s functioning – quite literally forms the ‘Super-I’. This Super-I then returns to haunt and rule over ‘the I’ – sometimes even ‘helps’ ‘the I’ deal with all of the unconscious stuff, referred to by Freud as ‘the It’.”

“Boy Bob, you sure speak with lot of concepts in quotes.”

“That’s cuz a concept in quotes merely serves as a label for a grouping of things. Remember, some of the stuff you and I chatted about last time dealt with issues of grouping, grouping of groups, and labels for a grouping not being part of the group itself.”

“Frankly, I don’t remember a lot of the details from last time. I remember some though.”

“The main focus remains on Freud. Now, where was I?”

“Lost focus, again, did you?”

“Let’s see – yes, Freud discovers that the architecture of the Human Soul is built around the three major components of ‘the I’, ‘the It’, and the ‘Super-I’. How Freud discovers this architecture – is an adventure on to itself.”

“Lay it on me – this adventure – of Freud discovering the architecture for the Human Soul.”

“I believe that Freud has it right – placing the start of his adventure with his traveling to France for three months – to study with Dr. Charcot at the *Salpetriere*. Freud reminds everyone of this start by prominently hanging a copy of Brouillet’s *La lecon clinique du Dr. Charcot* in his consulting room. You need to see this painting – a great example of grand heroics within the established Academic Art tradition. This painting is a classic example of what the Impressionists and other Modern artists find so staid and limiting in expressing why art lives, breaths, and sings.”

“I’m sure that you have a copy of the painting.”

Finding the Peter Gay book mentioned earlier, Bob excitedly finds a reproduction of the Brouillet painting. “Look. The Composition – attentive listeners dominate the left half of the painting – most in formal coat and tie. Lines of perspective frame the listeners and converge on the upright stance of Dr. Charcot – also in formal coat and tie – dominating the right side of the painting. The Good Dr. Charcot – making a theoretic point to his audience – stands slightly to the right of an upright, though fainted, attractive young woman. The young woman’s breasts find near exposure from an open bodice – while being held erect – with hands under the limp arms, close to the breasts – by a handsome male assistance, gazing at her neck... On the far right of the painting – an old crone – stretches forth both arms – ready to catch the young woman should she thrash out of the male attendant’s grasp.

“Here’s how Peter Gay describes the mid and endpoints of Freud’s studies with Charcot in France:

In January and February 1886, he [Freud] was invited to receptions at Charcot’s palatial house. Feeling awkward and uncertain of his spoken French, he fortified himself with a dose of cocaine, dressed formally, and went with pulses beating.... ”

“I’ll bet that those pulses were beating – with a kick from that dose of cocaine,” she interrupted.

“Remember, although sensational, Freud’s early uses of cocaine, soon ends – once he commences to seriously begin his lengthy and arduous self-analysis. And Charcot – we must never forget Charcot’s *bon mot* when we think of Freud. *La Theorie, c’est bon, mais ca n’empeche pas d’exister – theory is all very well, but this doesn’t prevent facts from existing* – guides Freud for a lifetime – as his Pole Start.

“Did you know anything about Charcot prior to knowing anything about Freud?” Linda asked.

“Not a thing. Then I started reading about Freud – and Charcot found frequent reference – but there wasn’t a lot of detail about why Charcot was very important to the world, or to Freud. Then, I began actually reading Freud – and Charcot comes brilliantly to life. Freud’s obituary for Charcot – written well before anyone takes notice of this young up and coming *Privatdozent* – finds rich notes of love, respect, admiration – in a well crafted, richly detailed love letter from a son about a beloved father figure.”

“Oh come on, Bob. This sounds much too transparent and mushy for anyone having Freud’s stature. No! – this is that runaway romantic inside of you, hoping, ever hoping to find a little peace in a rather troubled world.”

“But Linda, I’m not making any of this up! Here, let me show you,” he said, again looking for another book in the library. “Yes, the first volume of Joan Riviere’s translated *Collected Papers* of works by Freud. Yes, here it is, *Charcot*, written in 1893 – well lookie here, now I remember how I first gained this perspective of the way Freud nearly worships the ground that Charcot floats across....”

“You and your post-its – this book is just full of ‘em.”

“But Lindy, there’s a color coding system on the Charcot piece. I remember reading the puppy a third time and highlighting passages that I felt paints a concise picture of Charcot – how Freud feels about this view of Charcot – and why Freud ends this picture as he does. At this point, Freud is not yet a Post-Modern man, but rather, a sweetly naive Romantic student, inspired through the Enlightenment spirit – struggling to be heard – above the hordes of sibling-like movers and shakers within the broiling mass of Modernism in the making.”

“This is an interesting picture that you paint of Freud.”

Bob continued, “One must know that Freud matriculates through the German University world – as tradition-bound as any other University system – Cambridge, Oxford, Harvard, Georgetown. Most German professors prefer the formal ‘you’ rather than the familiar ‘thou’ – and most prefer the oh so Prussian formal address of ‘Herr Professor Doctor ...’. The only element missing in the German University system of Freud’s day is that Prussian heel click when one addresses a superior – and for students, that’s nearly everyone. Freud completes most of his University studies in this system prior to going to France to study with Charcot for three months,” Bob said before beginning to read:

He himself told us the following about his method of working: he was accustomed to look again and again at things that were incomprehensible to him, to deepen his impression of them day by day, until suddenly understanding of them dawned upon him....

He was heard to say that the greatest satisfaction man can experience is to see something new, that is, to recognize it as new, and he constantly returned with repeated observations to the subject of the difficulties and the value of such ‘seeing’....

For a long term of years Charcot held the chair of pathological anatomy in Paris, carrying on as a side-issue his neuropathological work and the lectures which rapidly made him famous abroad as well as at home....

During his student days chance brought him into contact with a charwoman who suffered from a peculiar form of tremor and could not get work because of her awkwardness. Charcot recognized her condition to be ‘choreiform paralysis’, already described by Duchenne, of the origin of which, however, nothing was known. In spite of her costing him a small fortune in broken plates and platters, Charcot kept her for years in his service and, when at last she died, could prove in the autopsy that ‘choreiform paralysis’ was the clinical expression of multiple cerebro-spinal sclerosis....

“Charcot did that? He kept the woman on – just so that he could do an autopsy on her after she died?” Linda asked.

“I remember one time listening to a third year surgery resident of an ER expressing delight when he found out that the Minnesota Legislature had just repealed the motorcycle helmet requirement.”

“Delight – at the repeal of requiring the wearing of a protective helmet while riding a motorcycle?”

“Yes, delight – because more motorcycle crashes would result in more head injuries – and more brain death – yielding more body organs attached to living bodies with dead brains – for more transplants.”

“But that’s so cynical.”

“But rather typical as to how many surgeons think. However, I don’t believe that Charcot suffers from this kind of cynicism. You’ll see what I mean as I read on,” said Bob as he began reading again:

As a teacher, Charcot was positively fascinating; each of his lectures was a little masterpiece in construction and composition, perfect in style, and so impressive that the words spoken resounded in one’s ears and the subject demonstrated remained before one’s eyes for the rest of the day. He rarely made a demonstration with a single patient, but was accustomed to present a whole group or a number of contrasting types which he then compared with one another. In the hall in which he gave his lectures hung a picture of the ‘citizen’ Pinal, causing the poor insane of the Salpetriere to be relieved of their chains; for after having been the scene of so many horrors during the French Revolution, the Salpetriere had also witnessed this most humane innovation....

There he examined cases quite unknown to him, risked all the chance occurrences of an interrogation, laid his authority aside and confessed at times that in one case diagnosis was impossible, and that in another appearances had deceived him. Never did he appear greater to his students than on these occasions, when he thus did his best to lessen the distance between teacher and pupils by giving them a complete and faithful account of his own train of thought, by stating his doubts and misgivings with the utmost frankness....

“I’ve had a few teachers like that in my life. I understand personally how refreshing and real a teacher like that is – compared to the norm.”

“Me too. Now dig this – how Freud describes the beginning of Charcot’s foray into setting Freud straightly on the path for discovering the architecture of the Human Soul.” Bob began to read again:

...he began to turn his attention almost exclusively to hysteria, thus suddenly focusing general attention on this subject. The most enigmatic of all nervous diseases...had just at this time come very much into discredit, and this ill-repute related not only to the patients but was extended to the physicians who treated this neurosis...hysterics found no credit whatsoever. First of all Charcot’s work restored dignity to the subject...she was no longer a malingerer, since Charcot had thrown the whole weight of his authority on the side of the reality and objectivity of hysterical phenomena. Charcot had repeated on a small scale the act of liberation commemorated in the picture of Pinal...the blind fear of being fooled by the poor patient which had stood in the way of a serious study of the neurosis was overcome....

How comes it that the hysteric is subject to an affect of the causes of which he claims to know nothing? ...the solution is forced upon us that the patient is in a peculiar mental condition in which his impressions or memories are no longer all linked up one with the other, and in which it is possible for one memory to express its affect by means of bodily phenomena without the other mental processes – the ego – knowing about it or being able to interfere...

...the Middle Ages...declaring possession by a demon to be the cause of hysterical manifestations... Charcot...drew plentifully from existing records of witchcraft trails and of possession in order to show that the manifestations of neurosis were the same then as they are now....

...it was found that hysteria was far commoner among men than had been suspected, especially among working-men, and that certain conditions which had been ascribed to alcoholic or lead poisoning were hysterical...the need arose to investigate the etiology of hysteria....

“Now that’s fascinating – that Charcot recognizes the existence of male hysteria.”

“Freud also. Ah, and now you and I arrive where Charcot makes one of those fortuitous clinical discoveries,” Bob said. Pausing a moment, Bob read on:

...the idea occurred to him to reproduce by artificial means such paralysis as he had previously carefully differentiated from organic disturbances; for this purpose he took hysterical patients and placed them in a state of somnambulism by hypnosis. He succeeded in producing a faultless demonstration and proved thereby that these paralyzes were the result of specific ideas holding sway in the brain of the patient at moments of special disposition...on this incomparably fine piece of clinical research his own pupil Janet, and also Breuer and others, based their theories of the neurosis which, while agreeing with the medieval view, replaces ‘demon’ of priestly imagination by a psychological formula.

Charcot’s application of the phenomena of hypnosis to hysteria enabled a very great advance to be made in this important sphere of hitherto neglected and despised facts, because the weight of his reputation put an end once and for all to doubts of the reality of hypnotic manifestations....

“Charcot certainly appears to be a huge mover and shaker in his day. I wonder why I was never taught this history in any of my Psych classes?”

“I’d bet that it has a lot to do with various folk making various connections – with these connections finding filter through the straining cloth of culture – finding their way into pedagic paradigms that form

the boundaries attributed to the wisdom and learning of and through Higher Education. As advertised, Freud ends his piece with:

...neither the passing of time nor the changing of ideas will diminish the glory of the man whom we – in France and elsewhere – are mourning to-day.

“Bob, you indicated that you failed to grasp an understanding of Charcot in books that you’ve read about Freud – books that reference Charcot.”

“That’s right. Freud in his writing brings life and significance to Charcot – for all of Western Culture – to understand the human and significant path traveled first by Pinal of the *Salpetriere*, later followed by Charcot of the *Salpetriere*. My bias of course, believes that Freud continues down the same path. It’s a truly Post-Modern tragedy when the history of beginnings finds easy forgetfulness, while aggressive pursuit of the ever-illusory future, continues to cloud human minds. In a further Post-Modern twist, Pinal and Charcot are names without substance and ‘Freud’ twists around fleeting images of Culture-Speak (with apologies to the double-think artist of all time – George Orwell).

“Freud has a great start in his adventure,” Linda observed. “I’m ready any time Bob, for the laying out of Freud’s discovery of the architecture for the Human Soul.”

“You and I have looked at some of it already. The Human Soul – the Psyche – consists of three major parts – ‘the I’, ‘the It’ and the ‘Super-I’. Consciousness is roughly every-thing that some clinicians would label as ‘Ego-Syntonic’ – everything that ‘the I’ knows about. Un-consciousness is roughly every-thing that ‘the I’ doesn’t consciously know about. Sometimes, there are things that are real close to becoming conscious, that some could label as being ‘Pre-Conscious’. In all human cases, ‘the I’ goes about constructing parameters for ‘the Super-I’. In all human cases, the emergence of ‘the I’, and the parameter building for ‘the Super-I’ happen within the on-going dynamics of systems, already existing, already thriving – the Family, the Society, the Culture, and the existing dynamics within a Philosophy of Symbolic Form.”

“I’m almost afraid to ask, but is there any more?”

“Nope, that’s about it – a rough overview of Freud’s discovery of the architecture for the Human Soul. Freud presents this rough overview of the architecture for the Human Soul in the book that puts him on the Intellectual Map – *Die Traumdeutung* – published in 1900. Literally, ‘an attempt to grasp a deeper sense of the meaning of dreams’, the title is frequently translated into English as *The Interpretation of Dreams*.”

“There’s a hell of a big difference between a literal translation of *Die Traumdeutung* and what the standard English translation of *The Interpretation of Dreams* says.”

“Indeed. I need to take you back for a moment to those two major branches of German science mentioned earlier – *Naturwissenschaften* and *Geisteswissenschaften*. *Naturwissenschaften* – or the Natural Sciences – are Nomothetic by nature. That is, a science that ought to permit mathematical and statistical analysis, and permit exact predictions. *Geisteswissenschaften* – or the Sciences of the Spirit – are Idiographic by nature. That is, a science where events never recur in the same form, never find a case for exact replication, nor are ever precisely predictable. Recognizing an individual occurrence and being able to generalize into larger patterns – this *is* the key in grasping Freud.

“You indicated earlier that *Geisteswissenschaften* comprises so much more than *just* the Humanities. I’m getting a far broader picture of what you mean by this,” said Linda.

“Yes, psycho-analysis is plainly Idiographic, thus by definition, will never be an ‘exact’ science – but always a rich and deep science, a science retaining the spiritual enlightenment of a Goethe,” he said. “This is why mis-translating Freud into ‘precise’ language, making things clear and definite, really misses the boat with Freud’s intended meanings – idiographic meanings. Although Freud is exceeding

concrete in differentiating psycho-analysis from the work of Adler, Jung, and a host of others, Freud's idiographic work remains fuzzy, warm, accepting, and human, oh so human."

"Prior to now, I've never conceptualized Freud as being warm and fuzzy," she said. "I don't believe that it will ever be easy for me to see Freud as warm and fuzzy."

"Freud is definitely warm and fuzzy – in the Fuzzy Logic sense of the term. I suspect," Bob began, "that there are several reasons presenting an obstacle from being able to see Freud as warm and fuzzy. For starters, I'll be that you have read far more about Freud, than actually reading Freud."

"That's true. Pop Culture splurges periodically on reviving Freud. I've read stuff about Freud – but the stuff that I've read certainly doesn't present the picture of Freud that you present, Bob. And whenever there are pictures of Freud, they're always the pictures of the old man with the cigar – with the painful mouth cancer that I never knew about before."

"Yes, I'm convinced that the picture I have of Freud in my mind – of the up and coming *Privatdozent* young Freud – makes a great deal of difference in how I view Freud as different from the Pop Culture view of Freud.

"Bob, I know that I'm still missing something in putting this all together. You indicated earlier that, roughly speaking, Freud's discovery of the architecture for the Human Soul – consists largely in recognizing 'the I', and 'the It', and the "Super I" – and then attempting to grasp the deeper meaning of Dreams. And then, you've just let me hang out there, in the breeze – by saying, again roughly speaking, that this *is* the sum total of Freud's discovery of the architecture for the Human Soul."

"You do present a rough picture of the sum total of Freud's discovery of the architecture for the Human Soul. And yes, you are missing bunches of stuff – most importantly with stuff dealing with the energy flows between 'the I' and 'the It' and the 'Super I' – about stuff dealing with the massive amounts of energy involved in the conscious act, yes, **conscious act** of Repression and Suppression."

"I thought that Repression and Suppression were unconscious acts."

"That may be stated as the case in some schools of psychology. However, as Freud shapes the art and craft of psycho-analysis as a *treatment* modality – Freud recognizes that Repression and Suppression are initially conscious acts – quickly passed on to the 'Super I' for Repression and on to 'the It' for Suppression. Freud recognizes that Suppression consumes far more energy than Repression. Freud also recognizes that Repression demands energy consumption for constant monitoring and occasionally masking, blocking, rationalizing, what ever – that which the 'Super I' 'protects' 'the I' from Knowing – consciously within the individual Human Soul."

"This makes so much sense, Bob – but did Freud really discover *this* architecture – or could this merely be a Bobby Post Modern interpretation?"

"This is the basic Freudian architecture – and some of the major Functions within the Form of this architecture. This is why Freud is exceeding relevant within a 21st century Post Modern 'civilized' society. This is why we are the Human, all so Human – that we are today. This is why 'the Haves' have and the 'have-nots' find constant exploitation at the hands of 'the Haves'. However, I'm getting ahead of myself, again, by bringing Reich into the picture before understanding enough about Freud – so that we may gaze with wonderment upon the contributions from Reich.

"I get the idea that you admire Reich as much as you admire Freud," Linda said

"I admire Freud as Freud and Reich as Reich. Both were great men and both trained in the strong German tradition for higher Education in obtaining Doctor of Medicine credentials."

"I've heard of Freud, but haven't heard anything about Reich. Why do you think that is, Bob?"

"That question, my friend, takes you and I right to the heart of Freud and Reich – interacting! This is such a rich topic Lindy, that you and I need to have that conversation at another time. For now though, I'll warn you that the dynamics of a Freudian *Weltanschauung* encountering a Reichian *Weltanschauung*

promises to be one of the most interesting intellectual roller-coaster rides that you've ever taken, Here, let me find what I'm looking for," said Bob, getting up once more, heading for the books.

"Yes, here it is," said Bob, "one of the more interesting books about Reich." Bob retrieved Robert S. Corrington's *Wilhelm Reich: Psychoanalyst and Radical Naturalist*. "This book was given to me as a gift by my Art Teacher of many years. She is passionate about making marks upon various media. She and I discussed many issues throughout the years – and she knew that I would enjoy this read about Reich. I enjoyed the read. Corrington begins this interesting read with the dedication reading: 'To my friends and colleagues at Orgonon' – and warning the reader in the opening first two paragraphs of his preface to the book.

Wilhelm Reich (1897 – 1957), the brilliant psychoanalytic theorist and protégé of Sigmund Freud, is one of the most restless figures in modern thought. His outer journeys led him from his native Austria to Germany to Denmark, to Sweden, to Norway, and finally to the United States (partly because he had to flee the Nazi government after Germany's annexation of Austria in 1938, which automatically made him an inhabitant of the Third Reich). He was persecuted by the psychoanalytic establishment, by the Communist Party, and by the Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, and U.S. governments, and died in a U.S. federal prison, where he was held on trumped-up charges made against him by the Food and Drug Administration. His life had genuine tragic components, many clearly self-caused, but not all. He had a turbulent personal life with three marriages and many love affairs. Unlike his one-time mentor and father figure, Freud, he remained fully sexually active until his imprisonment and felt he could not endure to live without fairly regular sexual connection.

Reich is rarely written about these days, let alone read by serious students of psychology or historians of ideas. The standard view is that he had some promising ideas about character formation, emotional armoring, the latent negative transference, stasis anxiety, orgasmic potency, the formation of the fascist personality, and defense mechanisms, but that by the mid- or late 1930s he had succumbed to a latent psychosis (probably paranoid schizophrenia) and strayed from psychoanalysis into pseudo-scientific terrain with his explorations into so-called bions, the cancer biopathy, and cosmic orgone energy.

"Geese Bob, you warn me about a roller-coaster ride when Freud and Reich find placement together – and Corrington certainly starts his book with a forceful shove – starting a roller-coaster ride of his own. Sounds like Reich is one hell of an interesting guy."

"Interesting to some – but a windy loony-tune to others – many more others.

"Bob, you indicated earlier that while Freud was perfecting his treatment of the neurosis through insights derived from his discovery of the architecture of the Human Soul, that the culture was being influenced by his insights and changing concurrently."

"Yes, this is true. We no longer find fainting couches in middle class dwellings, nor do we find clothing confining shape to that of hour glasses or men's collars forcing heads to retain rigid positioning."

"Do you think that it's even possible to get a feel for the culture at large prior to the impact of Freud upon the culture?"

"I'm aware of only one area in Western Culture as experienced by Americans, which comes even close to mimicking the inhibitions dominating the Culture of Freud's day. This one area is the strict taboo about speaking about the traumatic sexual abuse that lies behind every case of *Anorexia Nervosa*. This taboo is so strong and so prevalent that even trained therapists find great reluctance in speaking to the issue. The popular perception within the Culture for *Anorexia Nervosa* is that it's an 'eating disorder' brought about by messages within the Culture that 'thin is in' – and other similar crap. Lindy, you're a mom – raising both a daughter and a son through what Freudians refer to as the psycho-social development stages – roughly, the oral, anal, and genital stages of development."

"Some of the best years of my life," she said smiling.

“Well, you remember the pleasure that Elsa and Billy had sucking on your breasts for nourishment....”

“Pleasure for me too.”

“And that during this oral stage, both children explored everything within their environment by placing many things in their mouths. Pleasure – *Lust* – and nourishment going together, hand in hand, so to speak. Another interesting aspect having great significance during the oral stage is that few, if any, children speak words, which we as adults would recognize as words. The oral stage is pre-verbal, pre-Symbolic. For Anorexics, something exceeding traumatic happens during this oral stage of development – something that is so damaging to this newly developing Psyche – newly developing Human Soul – that the experience of the trauma and related imagery becomes deeply buried within ‘the It’ – beyond recall – for years. Only during the teen years of emerging genital awakening, does ‘the It’ begin to connect the pleasure – *Lust* – of the here and now with the trauma that found initial burial during the oral stage of pleasure pursuit. This here and now connection is clearly within the sexual arena – which speaks forcefully to the issue that the original trauma contains a large sexual component within the trauma. The original trauma – where pleasure, nourishment, and trauma find engulfing mixture – remains unresolved. ‘The It’ continues to clamor for conscious recognition and resolution of the trauma.”

“That’s pretty heavy, Bob – I’m not sure that I buy this Freudian interpretation for the etiology for *Anorexia Nervosa* – but, as a mother, I’m sure that no mother could ever sexually traumatize a child like that.”

“I’m not generally speaking about mothers, although cases involving sons, exist. More likely, the trauma perpetrators are fathers, brothers, uncles, or grandfathers. All of this at a pre-verbal time for the newly developing Human Soul within the child.”

“I agree with you, that there is rarely any discussion of early sexual trauma when the subject of *Anorexia Nervosa* comes up.”

“And this is roughly similar to the cultural *milieu* surrounding Freud in the early years – prior to the influence that Freudianism made upon the culture. But, here’s a totally unrelated concept that will take you and I into some of the depths belonging to the wonderful world of Epistemological exploration.”

“Anything that takes me away from the creepiness that anyone in their right mind could sexually abuse a child that hasn’t even been potty trained yet! I’m all for a change in subject.”

“You and I have begun to explore how Freud discovers the architecture of the Human Soul. From Freud’s perspective, this architecture of the Human Soul is totally and unequivocally Non-Theistic. Decades after Freud first addresses his discovery of the Human Soul to issues involving religion, Freud creates a widely popular work, *The Future of an Illusion* (1927) – roughly positing that all religious belief systems are neurotic at best, containing residue from early culture-forming adventures in the saga of becoming Human, oh so Human.”

“You claim that Freud is a non-theist, but as a Theist myself, I have no problem understanding anything that you’ve said about Freud – so far.”

“Here’s a place where the differences between – What is Propaganda for one, is Epistemology for the other – and what is Propaganda for the other, is Epistemology for one – readily come to the fore. From a Theistic perspective, when does the Human Soul begin?”

“I’d have to say that for some Theists, it begins at conception – for other Theists, it begins at birth.”

“Does a Theistic Human Soul begin,” Bob asked, “wholly formed, or does it development through time?”

“Wholly formed – because the Spirit of God communicates with and through the Human Soul. But as the human being grows and develops, the Human Soul within that human grows and develops also – the Human soul grows into having a greater understanding and appreciation for hearing the Spirit of God.”

“You and I Lindy will now proceed to explore, compare, and contrast two paradigms here – the architecture of the Human Soul discovered by Freud as one paradigm – the other paradigm is that of a Theistic perspective of the Human Soul.”

“Sounds interesting – but you’re not going to turn this into, as a guy might say it, a pissing contest between paradigms?”

“Certainly not Lindy – a discussion of paradigms – in the Epistemological sense that I’m using here – merely addresses issues of ‘How does one Know, What one Knows?’. Would it be fair for me to refer to a Theistic architecture for the Human Soul?”

“Neither fair – nor, would it serve any realistic purpose. The Human Soul is a gift from God – which God entrusts to humans so that the humans may both nurture and cherish the connection with the Holy One.”

“Would it be fair then Lindy, from a Theistic perspective, to posit that Freud’s discovery of the Human Soul could contain this so-called ‘gift from God’ – within the architecture that Freud discovers?”

“Only as fair as saying that God uses Freud’s Human Soul to discover the architecture of the Human Soul. Bob, you clearly don’t understand how God communicates with Human Souls – and uses Human Souls to communicate with other Human Souls.”

“You’re right, Lindy. I have neither a concept nor an understanding of how it’s possible, or even how it might feel, to have a ‘God-construct’ in contact and communication with my Human Soul. As a Non-Theist, I see this as an asset in approaching Epistemological issues.”

“So Bob, how do you feel about the idea that God directed Freud to discover the Human Soul? For that matter, God directs all discoveries.”

“Since the full range of my Non-Theistic orientation to Life and Epistemology basically arrives at the conclusion that there just isn’t any room for a ‘God-construct’, I see Freud’s discovery of the Human Soul as ‘directed’, if you will, by Freud’s hard work – in understanding, through Symbols and Symbolic Form, the observations – that he Symbolizes through his writing and speaking.”

“So you don’t see God as directing Freud?”

“Neither Freud, nor Darwin, nor Newton, nor Einstein – *ad infinitum*. On the other hand, Symbols have both directed and stretched the work of all of these – and countless others. Symbols are not God, though – and Symbols and Symbolic Form, ultimately derive from the conscious act of being Human, all so Human.”

“I have no problem at all with the notion that God directed Freud toward his discovery of the architecture of the Human Soul – as only part of the full complexity of the Human Soul. I also have no problems either with God directing Darwin, Newton, Einstein – and a host of others.”

“This is one of those areas, Lindy that you and I briefly explored in the last conversation – the largest grouping of groups – with Theists holding that God is the largest group – and that for me, as a Non-Theist, my largest grouping of groups is the ongoing growth of my personal, conscious sense of Self. Being Human, oh so Human, I believe that the largest grouping of groups for other Non-Theists, likewise, is a personal Self-awareness – but I’m never sure about this until I go about asking individual Non-Theists what their sense of a largest grouping of groups entails. In my personal largest grouping of groups, there just is no room for a ‘God-construct’ – and remember, my grouping is large enough to include a Universe with a minimum radius of fourteen billion light years, or so; and small enough to include daily measurement of time in units of pico-seconds – one one-trillionth of a second.”

“So, how is this point of the discussion related to a largest grouping of groups?” she asked.

“Basically it boils down to the issue that in my largest grouping of groups, there is absolutely and positively no room for a ‘God-construct’ – and in your largest grouping of groups, as a Theist, God *is* the largest grouping of groups. There is no reconciliation between these two different paradigm perspectives. From my obviously biased perspective, a Theist’s largest grouping of groups is merely a statement of over-extended Ego-boundaries – or more accurately, over extended boundaries where ‘the I’ includes a sense of Self that includes a ‘God-construct’ – by definition, something larger than the Self.”

“In like manner,” Linda began, “I am able to posit that just because your sense of Self doesn’t recognize any ‘room for a God-construct’, that this does not affect God in any way, shape, or form. From my obviously biased perspective, non-Theists refuse to communicate with God – which, as an act of freewill, they have a right to do – but it’s such a shallow expression of right that it approaches the trivial.”

“I understand your perspective, thus understand the acute need to deal with the differences in perspective between these two different paradigms – Non-Theism as one paradigm – Theism as the other paradigm – from an Epistemological perspective. For the sake of clarification, I am momentarily willing to entertain that from a Theist perspective, that a ‘God-construct’ directs Freud through his Human Soul to discover the architecture of the Human Soul. There are, from my perspective, quite a large number of problems with this orientation that ‘God directs Freud’ akin to many similar problems experienced when Theists assert that ‘God directed Darwin’ in writing both *The Origin of Species* and *The Descent of Man*.”

“And those problems would be?”

“One of the biggies with Darwin’s work and with Freud’s work is that of Purpose. With Darwin’s orientation, Evolution has absolutely no Purpose – and when it comes down to it, there are no ‘higher’ or ‘lower’ species – and that ‘lower’ species never ‘evolve’ into ‘higher’ species. Evolution happens – but without purpose or direction. I believe that any Theist positing the position that ‘God directs Darwin’ into his discoveries, has problems with Darwin’s orientation that Purpose and Direction have no relevancy within Evolution. In our next conversation in which Reich takes on the focus in the Pinal, Charcot, Freud, Reich continuum – you and I will be able to explore the deeper parallels these similarities between Darwin and Freud afford in shattering the perspective that a ‘God construct’ directed anyone – Pinal, Charcot, Darwin, Freud, Reich, and a host of others’ – into discovering anything.