In the second volume of his monumental Freud biography, Ernest Jones covers what he calls the years of maturity. This is the period ranging from the turn of the century to the end of the first World War in 1919. Its main event is the emergence of Freud from relative obscurity to international fame and recognition. It also marks the further exposition and clarification of Freud's central ideas which were first elaborated in *Studies in Hysteria* and *The Interpretation of Dreams*.

Jones' analysis proceeds on two levels. On the one hand, he shows us Freud the man with his personal problems, his relations to his family, his friends and his enemies. Drawing on his many years of personal acquaintance and collaboration with Freud, and having access to many hitherto unpublished letters, Jones portrays vividly the humanistic side of Freud. He emphasizes his kindness and considerateness as opposed to the commonly held belief that Freud was an autocratic despot who brooked no opposition.

On the second level, Jones gives us a penetrating analysis of Freud's scientific contributions during this period. The emergence of the libido theory, the elaboration of the case history method, and the application of psychoanalysis to literature, art and mythology are described in detailed fashion. While never explicitly stating it, he definitely conveys the impression that some of Freud's theories have not withstood the test of time.

A large part of the book is devoted to the growth of the psychoanalytic movement. Jones describes in detail Freud's only visit to the United States and his negative reaction to this country. He reports fully on the various psychoanalytic congresses and on the leading personalities participating in them. It is inevitable in this context that the so-called dissidents are also mentioned. Unfortunately, Jones' analysis of the dissensions is marked by an incapacity for objective judgment and reasoning, by an extremely partisan tendency to blame the dissenters and to absolve Freud from any possible guilt.
On various occasions Jones is forced to quote rather positive opinions of Freud about the "dissident" Adler. Thus, Freud spoke of Adler's "honorable errors. Although one rejects the contents of Adler's views one can recognize their consistency and significance."1 But being more Freudian than Freud himself Jones cannot leave it at that. Commenting on Freud's belief that Adler's theory was more important than Jung's, Jones suggests that history showed the opposite to be the case. It is clear that more convincing proof is needed for such an assertion than the unsupported statement of a partisan observer. Posterity will decide not only the controversy between Jung and Adler but between Freud and Adler as well. To suggest that such judgment has already been rendered is a disservice to psychoanalysis which needs the stimulation of different conceptual approaches if it is to stay healthy and alive.

Perhaps the real clue to Jones' rather bitter animosity toward Adler and other dissidents can be found in his attempt to give a psychological explanation for the dissensions within the psychoanalytic movement. At one point, he suggests that the adherents to Freud have overcome their childhood complexes, while the dissidents acted out their childhood rebelliousness.2 This is a rather neat explanation. But inevitably it raises the question whether rebellion is not sometimes preferable to submission. Jones as well as other orthodox psychoanalysts frequently behave as if they were the "good" children who always remained true and loyal to the great father figure of Freud. Their loyalty is demonstrated by severe condemnation of everyone who disagreed with Freudian teachings. Perhaps they need this to convince themselves as well as others of the correctness of their position. Perhaps this also explains why they perpetuate a personal feud that has largely lost its meaning and significance at the present time, when the emphasis is on co-operation rather than on conflict, between the various psychoanalytic schools. Be that as it may, one must reject the subjective and hostile criticism of Adler and other dissenters in an otherwise excellent book that seems destined to become the standard biography of Freud for our generation.


This is an extremely readable, exciting book.

In 1934, Dr. Wortis, a New York psychiatrist, received a fellowship in psychiatry under the joint guidance of Havelock Ellis and Adolph Meyer which permitted study in London and Vienna, and it was at this time that

1 P. 132. 2 P. 363.
the account was written. His book is a day-by-day description of what transpired during a four months' didactic analysis with Sigmund Freud.

The reader is given an "on the scene" report of the interaction of the two men. One not only reads of the reaction of Wortis to Freud (with his thoughtful questioning and at times his disagreement), but also a vivid descriptive word-picture of the "father of psychoanalysis." Here one gets the feeling of Freud's personality and habits as well as his views on many subjects including the role of women in society, and the reaction of the Jews to anti-semitism. One may also read the actual correspondence that occurred between Wortis, Ellis, Meyer, and Freud on various aspects of Wortis' analysis.

The book includes several references to Alfred Adler and includes the reactions of both Ellis and Freud to the founder of Individual Psychology. Such material as is presented in the book brings to mind the biographies of Adler written by Hertha Orgler and Phyllis Bottome, as well as various articles which have paid tribute to the personalities of Adler and other great Adlerians such as Ferdinand Birnbaum.

No Adlerian should miss the chance to read this excellent work, and especially the final chapter, "Retrospect and Conclusion." It is a concise summary of Wortis' views based upon twenty years of psychiatric practice; of the strengths and weaknesses of psychoanalysis together with comments upon some of the problems of "the way ahead." On the latter point, Wortis has this to say:

"The correct antidote (to the sense of insecurity that isolated individuals must feel in a society that is at times too harshly competitive) is a consolidation of social feeling with those broad sections of our population that have the need for real social solidarity. The mere activity of participation in cooperative work for socially useful ends is therapeutic. It creates, moreover, the preconditions for the successful advance of our democracy to larger social objectives. It is only the realization of these social objectives that can secure full happiness and mental health to our people."


Reviewed by Irvin Neufeld, M.D.

This book represents a collection of thirty-two previously published articles on the role of music as therapeutic agent in the management of emotional disorders.

Although music has always been recognized as originating from and exerting potent influence on human emotions, the application of "music-therapy" as an accepted psychotherapeutic modality is still in an experimental stage. With such reservation in mind, this collection serves a useful
purpose by bringing together papers—more or less scientific—on the various phases and aspects of the subject and by compilation of a not quite complete bibliography. Among the authors of the papers we find psychiatrists, physicians, psychologists, occupational therapists, music therapists, music teachers, etc. From the papers compiled in this book it is difficult to determine how thorough is the musical knowledge of the medical authors and how thorough is the medico-psychological knowledge of the participating musicians. At any rate, this book should create positive interest and encourage objective research work in the subject which is still highly controversial. The omission of when and where the articles had originally been published and especially of an index is being felt by those who want to use the book as a reference.