

**1919: PSYCHOLOGY AND PSYCHOANALYSIS, CAMBRIDGE
AND LONDON – MYERS, JONES AND MACCURDY**

John Forrester, Cambridge, UK

‘The Ψ A ferment here is remarkable’, Ernest Jones wrote to Freud in early January 1919. This paper explores some of the consequences of this English ferment for the future direction of psychoanalysis in the period 1919–1926. It differs from more standard accounts of the early history of psychoanalysis in that it is deliberately not focused on the strategies adopted by Freud and his close disciples. This rather different picture of the development and reception of psychoanalysis in Britain arose as part of a larger ‘micro-history’ of the reception of psychoanalysis in Cambridge. Instead of being Vienna-ocentric, this picture is Cambridge-ocentric.¹ It might seem odd, perhaps even perverse, to take this view from the English Fens of the quintessentially central European urban creation that was Freud’s, but, as the cradle of the British elite and as the centre of its scientific institutions in the early twentieth century, its ‘High Science’, Cambridge turns out to be an ideal place to study the establishment of Freud’s ideas and practices (Werskey 1978). If one needs more persuasion, one has only to turn to a list of those early English analysts who had strong ties with Cambridge: John Rickman, James and Alix Strachey, Karin and Adrian Stephen, Joan Riviere, Susan Isaacs, Donald Winnicott and John Bowlby – and this list is by no means complete. As important as the backgrounds and experience of individuals are the development of institutions, in particular the foundation of the British Psycho-Analytical Society (BPsaS), the transformation of the British Psychological Society (BPS) and the development of psychological

1. This paper grew out of the research for *Freud in Cambridge*, written with Laura Cameron, to be published by Cambridge University Press in 2008. Part of the story told in this paper is covered in considerably less detail in that book. I would like to thank my co-researcher and co-author for the sustained common work and incessant discoveries of the 10 years since we began this research.

JOHN FORRESTER, Professor of History and Philosophy of the Sciences at the University of Cambridge, recently published a study of T.S. Kuhn’s relations with psychoanalysis (*Critical Inquiry* 33 No. 4, Summer 2007: 782–819) and an analysis of a case-history by Robert Stoller (‘The Psychoanalytic Case: Voyeurism, Ethics, and Epistemology in Robert Stoller’s *Sexual Excitement*’ in: Angela N.H. Creager, Elizabeth Lunbeck, and M. Norton Wise (eds), *Science Without Laws: Model Systems, Cases, Exemplary Narratives*, Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2007, pp. 189–211). Address for correspondence: [jpf11@cam.ac.uk]

medicine and teaching in psychoanalysis at the University of Cambridge. It is these developments that form the principal focus of this paper.

Psychology in Cambridge

Charles Myers and W.H.R. Rivers were the key figures in the development of psychology at Cambridge and both were to play, in very different ways, an important part in the reception of psychoanalysis in Britain from 1910 to 1926. Rivers had founded the teaching of experimental psychology, both at Cambridge and University College, London in the 1890s. One of his first students, Charles Myers, was to become the chief engineer of the development of psychology, not only at Cambridge but through the institutions he took charge of, notably the BPS (founded at a meeting in London by 10 assorted, university men, gentlemen of science and educationalists in 1901) and the *British Journal of Psychology* (which he edited from its foundation in 1904 to 1924). Equally important was the Cambridge Torres Straits Expedition of 1898, organized by Alfred Haddon, the founder of Cambridge field anthropology, who invited Rivers and Myers and others to join him (Herle & Rouse 1998). The expedition combined anthropological and psychological research projects and both Myers and Rivers would be equally at ease in these fields for the rest of their careers – indeed, it could be argued that for them they were never fundamentally distinct fields. Myers's interests were diverse, though centred on music. But it is the range of Rivers's scientific interests that made him a key figure in early twentieth-century British science: researches with Kraepelin on fatigue in the 1890s; the psychophysical studies of the Torres Straits islanders; his field study of the Todas in India, where he developed the genealogical method which was to be the foundation of British anthropological fieldwork; the first ever randomized pharmacological trial, employing a 'placebo', conducted on Cambridge colleagues in 1905; the long series of experiments on nerve generation conducted with his friend Henry Head, in which the influence of John Hughlings Jackson's evolutionary model of the nervous system, so important an influence on Freud as well, was experimentalized; his major study of Melanesia published just before the Great War (Slobodin 1978).

While Rivers was extending his scientific range in innovative ways, Myers was consolidating the institutions of psychology. He himself anonymously gave the money to build a laboratory for psychology in Cambridge, which he whisked through the usually snail-like administrative procedures and had opened in 1913. From 1908 on, interest in abnormal psychology – sleep, dreams, hysteria, hypnotism, multiple personality, insanity and other abnormal mental states – was an important part of the expanding remit of psychology, with Myers explicitly recognizing the importance of psychoanalysis in his formal speech at the opening of the Laboratory in

1913. At the same time, Myers set up a Diploma in Psychological Medicine (DPM) in Cambridge, where the new techniques of suggestion, hypnosis and psychological therapies were the principal topics of interest. So by the beginning of the Great War, a shift in direction of Cambridge psychology was already evident, away from a primary focus on the ‘brass instruments’ of experimental psychology towards clinical psychology and the ‘mental characters of normal and defective children, primitive peoples and animals’. By 1913, students were being asked to write an examination essay on ‘Dreams’ – so often the best index of the infiltration of psychoanalytic theories into a syllabus.

The Diploma was a clear indicator of Myers’s (and Rivers’s) intention to ally psychology more closely with medicine. This alliance took account of important shifts in the economics of medicine and science. Direct government funding for university research had begun in the 1890s, with agriculture, with Lloyd George’s ‘People’s Budget’ of 1909 introducing the era of state funding for science (Olby 1991). The University of Cambridge was to be, as we will see, completely transformed by the advent of state funding. But in its medical teaching, the University had already put itself at the service of the State, with the introduction of the Diploma in Public Health (begun in 1875 with a Certificate in Sanitary Science), which became popular, even an essential element of medical education, when the Local Government Act (1888) required Medical Officers of Health to possess a DPH (Weatherall 2000, p. 181). The Cambridge DPH thus became a national qualification, so much so that Ernest Jones, probably when his career plans were in crisis, acquired the qualification so that, if all else failed, he could become a practitioner of ‘State medicine’, as it was called.² Myers clearly envisaged that the DPM would become the same, making Cambridge the centre of the network of asylums. To do so would require Cambridge becoming the centre of research in England in abnormal psychology and also becoming an essential part of the movement for reform of the lunacy laws that so constrained the treatment of milder and early cases of mental illness. All this was part of the reorientation of psychology taking shape in Cambridge before the outbreak of war in August 1914.

As has been amply documented, British psychology was transformed by the Great War and Rivers and Myers were key figures in that transformation, in their habitual styles (Shephard 2002, pp. 21–168; Stone 1985). Myers took himself off to France, introduced the term ‘shell-shock’ into the language of the doctors hurriedly becoming experts in the management of the hordes of men being sent back from the Front with

2. None of Jones’s biographies record his acquisition of the Diploma, but he recorded it in his qualifications when applying for the position of Hon. Registrar and Pathologist to West End Hospital for Diseases of the Nervous System (which was almost certainly pre-War): ‘M.D., B.S.Lond., M.R.C.P.Lond., D.PH.Cantab’. See reverse side of draft letter to Brill, 15 Dec. 1919 (BPsaS CBD/FO2/04).

tremors, seizures, paralyses, anaesthesias and general acute sensory deficits. Myers became Consultant Psychologist to the British Army. Rivers joined the rapidly expanding team of psychotherapeutic enthusiasts at Maghull Hospital near Liverpool under the leadership of R.G. Rows, received a rapid education from the soldiers and from his colleagues, such as T.H. Pear, in the importance of the abreactive techniques derived from psychoanalysis and the wonders of dream analysis. In his subsequent work at Craiglockhart and for much of the rest of the war, he devoted much time to his own dream analysis, to the development of a Freudian-inspired psychotherapy for the war neuroses and to the rendering of psychoanalysis into an acceptable 'English' form.³

Enraged and disappointed by War Office resistance to his recommendations for the treatment of the war neuroses, Myers returned to England in 1917. Attending the War Office Conference in London in October considering the problems of dealing with the shell-shocked soldiers, he requested to be assigned to Maghull, which was taking primary responsibility for teaching and training special Medical Officers in psychological methods; for most of 1918 he took on the role of a roving inspector, sometimes being called in to apply administrative first aid when conflicts between Army and doctors, or within the medical staff arose (Culpin 1948, p. 146; Jones & Wessely 2005, pp. 36–7). Even before the end of the war, Myers was planning how to reposition his forces on the new map of psychology. Refused permission by the War Office to publish a record of his experiences and the conclusions to be drawn from them, he gave two lectures to the Royal Institution in April 1918 on 'Present-day Applications of Psychology, with special reference to Industry, Education and Nervous Breakdown' (Myers 1918). This was to be the high-water mark of Myers's sympathetic appraisal of psychoanalysis; the meeting at the Royal Institution was also life-transforming for Myers, since in his audience was Henry John Welch, a solicitor who had left private legal practice to become Director of Harrisons and Crossfield Ltd., a City of London firm that ran rubber plantations in the Far East. Welch and Myers both aspired to introduce the methods of psychology into industry. Within a short space of time they had concocted a plan to establish an Institute for the promotion of 'vocational selection and guidance' and to employ scientific knowledge to improve conditions of work in factories and offices.

Myers's lectures took stock of the broad responses psychology should take to the new developments, many associated with the War. An indication

3. The topic of Rivers's Freudianism has been much discussed but with no clear resolution. It is clear that it was a dominant, if not the dominant, preoccupation of his work from January 1916 onwards, when he had the 'Presidency' dream which fired his enthusiasm for dream-analysis along the lines outlined by Freud (and with which he opened the course of lectures devoted to the topic which became Rivers 1923, pp. 9–21). See Young 1995, 1999; Forrester 2006.

of the fundamental shifts away from the kind of psychology he had pioneered in London and Cambridge in the early years of the century was his account of how experimental psychology had recently realized 'the enormous importance of the study of feeling – alike in observation, memory, thought, decision and action' (Myers 1918, p. 28). The experiments that revealed the importance of feeling most clearly were the simple study of the 'free association reaction times' (i.e. Jung's classic experiments, though Jung was not mentioned by name), which Myers explicitly contrasted with the 'characteristic standpoint of the older academic, "abstract", Teutonic, experimental psychology' (Myers 1918, p. 28). Such experiments with free associations, when applied to soldier-patients, put Myers 'on the track of certain concealed fears and anxieties which required alleviation, before the patient could be cured' (Myers 1918, p. 30).

At each step Myers contrasted the poverty of the older experimental methods with new developments. Take forgetting:

The factor of feeling was expressly eliminated from our experiments on memory. The material learnt in the laboratory consisted commonly of meaningless numbers or of senseless syllables, so that all interest or other reference to past experience might be eliminated as far as possible. But now we begin to realize that what is learnt may *never* be forgotten In the cases of nervous breakdown, which have resulted in this war, it is astonishing how early emotional experiences may become revived (perhaps in some distorted form) and become responsible for protracting the emotional condition of the patient. (Myers 1918, p. 30)

The range of experiences of importance necessary for understanding memory is now far broader:

When we have seen some dreadful sight, heard some joyful news, fallen in love . . . such emotional experiences will obtrude themselves throughout the day; and if they are unpleasant we endeavour voluntarily to 'repress' them. But the forgetting of the unpleasant is not merely an affair of conscious intention. It is Nature's own method of getting rid of distressful experiences. (Myers 1918, p. 31)

The 'quite unconscious process of dislocation or "dissociation"' gives rise to the 'unpleasant "complex" . . . much as harmful pus becomes innocuous by becoming enclosed in an abscess cavity' (Myers 1918, p. 31). The process of dissociation may deprive the patient of much, even all, of his past experience; hypnosis may temporarily give access to these memories, but often they are lost again on waking: under such circumstances we are dealing with a dissociation of personality. Calling on his own experience with soldiers and giving an exposition of Janet's classic case 'Irène', Myers showed how these disturbances due to mental disintegration caused by 'a conflict of incompatible mental experiences or perhaps by sudden shock', should be treated by psychological methods: 'careful and painstaking talks, by the study of associations, by the policy of confession and re-education'

(Myers 1918, p. 38). Myers illustrated with a case of claustrophobia, tracing the symptoms to two childhood incidents when the boy was locked in dark cellars, to a recent occasion of being anaesthetized at the dentist and to a threat from his mother when he was very small of being taken away by a sailor. Clearly Myers had accepted without qualification the psychic causation of the avalanche of nervous cases; he accepted the basic Freudian model of repression, mixing it with the phenomenology of dissociation; he accepted the importance of repressed childhood memories. His exposition continued in fully Freudian fashion, outlining the modes of the return of the repressed:

Repression is often imperfect so that the incompletely dissociated experience finds its expression in various disguised forms. These have been especially studied in the case of dreams, where distortion, condensation, symbolism and other psychological processes working on the emotional experiences of the day-time have been identified and distinguished. (Myers 1918, p. 41)

Given the fact that, 'even in the strongest of us', self-control is no longer possible, exhortatory tactics are 'absolutely useless'. And Myers, like many a Freudian, connects these mental processes leading to physical pathology to more normal psychological processes based on profound emotional forces:

The only rational method of treatment is to unearth the repressed experience, to disentangle and to reveal to the subject the mental processes responsible for the distortion, and to get him to face squarely what he has been vainly endeavouring to shun. A man might as well be asked to forget his religion, his patriotism or his politics. These, like the troubles of the neurasthenic, are due to complexes. (Myers 1918, pp. 42-3)

Myers concludes his discussion of nervous cases by emphasizing the revolution that has taken place in psychology: the modern method of treatment's 'independence of the old psychology is absolute: it is intimately dependent on the more modern psychology with which indeed its very existence is bound up. The results can only be to revolutionize psychological theory and to stimulate further psychological experiment' (Myers 1918, p. 43).

Myers the Organizer-in-Chief takes over the story at this point: 'A new class of medical man, educated in the psychological theories and practice which I have described, is being trained. One centre of instruction [clearly Maghull] has already sprung into existence during the war and others must be instituted' (Myers 1918, p. 44). These patients, so akin to the ordinary psycho-neuroses of peacetime which are not 'confined to members of the wealthy classes or of the liberal professions', as his data from Swedish and German industrial sanatoria make clear, should never be confused with or even housed with asylum patients. The revolution in our view of 'functional nervous disorders' is complete: a programme of public education is necessary to dispel popular ignorance and prejudice

and to make clear 'the narrow line which separates mental good-health, mental disturbance, and mental disease... . The urgent need now is for institutes of applied psychology in each of our largest cities, which may serve as centres for attacking these practical problems with the help of experts' (Myers 1918, p. 47). Charles Myers may have been the driving force behind the establishment of elite experimental psychology in Cambridge before the War, but by the end of the War he looked with scorn on such a restricted theatre of operations for his science and had grand plans for its expansion the length and breadth of Britain, through three main channels: expansion of psychology in Cambridge in new directions; reform of the British Psychological Society and the creation of industrial psychology.

Ernest Jones

Freud's closest English follower Ernest Jones was as much a born founder and guider of institutions as Myers. The first meeting of what became the International Psychoanalytic Association, at Salzburg in April 1908, was his idea (Jung 1907, pp. 101–2); while based in Toronto from 1908–13, Jones founded both the American Psychopathological Association (May 1910) and the American Psychoanalytic Association (APA) (May 1911). In 1912, even before his return to England in 1913, he judged that the best avenues for the promotion of psychoanalysis would be a specialist psychoanalytic society working alongside the Psychiatry Section of the Royal Society of Medicine, disparaging the Psycho-Medical Society, of which Hart was a member, because it 'has mostly hypnotists for members' (EJ/SF 30.7.12, p. 145). But in 1913 he had changed his mind and found the Psycho-Medical Society more receptive and promising; by the end of the year he had arranged for Morton Prince's *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* to become the official organ of that Society, as it had become for the American Psychopathology Association in June 1910; this, he wrote to Freud, 'will help to bring a wider circle under our influence' (EJ/SF 3.11.13, p. 233).

Already by 1918 a veteran operator, Jones, however, had had a war apart. He had been back working full-time in Britain for less than a year at the outbreak of hostilities; the balance of his characteristic whirlwind of numerous activities was somewhat altered during the four years of the conflict. Having created the London Psycho-Analytical Society in late 1913 in haste, so that the Freudians would be able to outvote the Jungians at the next meeting of the International Psychoanalytic Association, Ernest Jones found several key members of the Society went over to the heretic Jung, amongst them his close friend and associate, David Eder. The London Psycho-Analytical Society went into abeyance during the War and Jones must have breathed a sigh of relief. Never one to have much time for ordinary social relations, he had nevertheless re-established himself on the fringes of bohemian circles (Jones 1959, p. 240). Through the Eders, he

ended up becoming the quasi-medical confessor and advisor to both parties of the stormy ménage of D.H. and Frieda Lawrence. He himself twice attempted to join the forces but was turned down, on the grounds of his arthritis (Maddox 2006, p. 119). When he attempted to become attached in a medical capacity to the Palace Green, Kensington, hospital for shell-shock patients, he found himself blackballed because of his past disgrace with the West End Hospital in 1908 (Jones 1959, p. 140; Kuhn 2002; Maddox 2006, pp. 31–2, 41–6). Intensely preoccupied with the course of the War, as he later confessed, he had no immediate outlet for his desire to serve the common good.

Not that he was not busy: he delivered a series of important papers, connected up with the principal psychologists, such as Pear and McDougall, encouraging and educating them in psychoanalysis (EJ/SF 7.7.14, pp. 290–2). In 1917 his whirlwind romance with a beautiful young Welsh singer, Morfydd Owen, led to their marriage in February. At the same time, Jones had permanently acquired the very English habit of spending the weekends at the cottage in the country he bought in the depths of the War. By now in his late 30s, he seemed to have settled down.

In early 1916, Jones had intervened in a debate in *The Lancet* provoked by a forthrightly psychoanalytic paper by David Forsyth, which had received a heavy pounding from the old guard psychiatrists reviving their pre-war dismissals of the Viennese doctrine just when they could perceive the tide amongst the RAMC doctors turning against them. To Mercier's assertion that the 'filthy thoughts' 'accomplished psycho-anal-ists' discover in their patients are only there once they have been 'instilled into his mind by insidious suggestions' (Mercier 1916, p. 154) and Armstrong-Jones's vigorous condemnation, based on personal experience, of 'the actual suggestions made of lewd, objectionable, and bestial thoughts to the moral feelings of an unsuspecting mind' (Armstrong-Jones 1916, p. 210), William Brown and Donald Core, both serving in the Army, offered a mild corrective, based on distinguishing the *method* of psychoanalysis, which they had found proved useful in some cases, from the 'particular *theory* as to the aetiology of the neuroses' (Brown 1916, p. 265), for which Brown found little evidence. Accordingly, Brown proposed to separate this useful method from the contentious theory by renaming the method 'autognosis' – self-knowledge – by which Brown meant 'a thoroughgoing analysis of the patient's mind, including analysis of his dreams and a pertinacious tracking down of the more important events of his past life'. A prime advantage to coining his own term was to pre-empt the unfortunate experience of being 'classified by anti-Freudians as the adherent of a cult to which the Freudians deny that one has been initiated' - which is of course exactly what Jones did in his letter to *The Lancet*. Intent on giving a clear definition of what should count as psychoanalysis – namely what Freud says it is – Jones specified the method, theory and the accompanying study of the subject-matter, but was

adamant in distinguishing the general study of dreams or the general use of free association from the true Freudian method. His response to the virulent detractors was loftily off-hand: he was certain they were not referring to psychoanalysts who had been properly trained (Jones 1916, p. 558).

Although Jones was *persona non grata* for the hospital system and the RAMC, his psychoanalytic practice had thrived during the War. He already had a reputation as the foremost and purest of English Freudians. Amongst his patients would be several who would be founder members of the BPSaS after the War, including Jack Flügel, a student of McDougall's from Oxford and the Secretary of the BPS. In the final year of the War, Jones became acting Chairman of that Society's governing Committee; he later recounted how he and Flügel set about reorganizing the Society during the War (Jones 1956, p. 193). But they were not to be alone for long in this enterprise.

With the cessation of hostilities in November 1918, key players in the development of psychology and psychoanalysis switched their attention to the business of post-war disciplinary reconstruction, Charles Myers in characteristic reformist mood. Having spent the War working with shell-shocked soldiers and the doctors who were drafted in to treat them, his vision of the future of psychology had been fundamentally altered. He set out to transform the institutions he had helped to create to make them fit for the transformed post-war landscape.

Myers, Jones and the Reform of the BPS

At the BPS Committee meeting on 12 December 1917, Secretary Flügel 'raised the question of the desirability of taking steps to increase the membership of the Society' (Lovie 2001, p. 99). It was decided not to change the membership rules but for Committee members to approach suitable persons and invite them to become members. At the next but one Committee meeting, on 20 November 1918 – a few days after the end of the War – Colonel Myers was in attendance, and

brought before the Committee the question of the desirability of extending the membership of the Society with a view to obtaining such advantages as (a) permanent headquarters, an increased library, a paid librarian, the establishments of definite sections for the study of special aspects of psychology... The question was discussed at length & at the conclusion of the discussion a Subcommittee consisting of M^{SFS} Ballard, Jones, Myers, & Rivers – was appointed to investigate the matter further, with particular reference to questions of finance & to the possibility of co-operation or fusion with certain other societies, this Subcommittee to report to the Committee of the Society before the next Annual General Meeting of the Society. (Lovie 2001, pp. 99–100)

The identities of the members of the Subcommittee presage the eventual outcome and indicate the active powers shaping the future Society:

P.B. Ballard, District Inspector under the L.C.C. and pioneer educational psychologist (Wooldridge 1994, pp. 65–7), Ernest Jones, psychoanalyst, and the two Cambridge men, Myers, organizational fixer and soon-to-be industrial psychologist, and Rivers, intellectual doyen of psychology and anthropology. What did this group have in mind: with what other societies might the BPS co-operate or fuse?

It should not be forgotten that these weeks after the end of the War were amongst the most turbulent and revolutionary in European history. In November alone, the Czechoslovak Republic came into being, a Republic was declared in Vienna on 11 November and the Hungarian Republic on 15 November. At the same time, the influenza pandemic swept Britain: it peaked in the City of Cambridge in early November; in London a first peak in July 1918 was followed by the largest in November; February and March 1919 also saw large numbers of deaths: over 17,000 died in London from June 1918 to May 1919 (Johnson 2001). Approximately a third of the world's population was affected. It ranks alongside 1348, the year of the Black Death, as possibly the worst year in human history. The entire old order, political and biological, was teetering on the brink. And yet peace had come at last. But this was not a happy peace; it was a bitter and exhausted peace, above all, for the defeated nations. All nations were defeated by 1918. Even the United States, on the eve of its emergence as the dominant world power for the century, lost more to influenza in 1918–19 than in all the wars she fought in the twentieth century. Ernest Jones was also a heavy loser in 1918: his beloved new wife died in an operation for appendicitis on 7 September. Bereft and dazed, he wandered from friend to friend, from the Trotters in London to Bernard Hart at Maghull Hospital and then on to the Flügel in Yorkshire (Jones 1959, p. 246).

In a report he submitted to its Committee under the chairmanship of Jones on 8 January 1919, Myers outlined the threat to the pretensions of the BPS to represent psychology in Britain. The principal source of its early claim to scientific hegemony had come from the German methods of experimental psychology that its founders had done so much to promote: their ideal had been represented by the discipline of laboratory methods, most obviously located in universities. By 1919, taking pre-war developments in the psychology of animals and children together with the enormous changes in the management of industry and the approach to abnormal psychology wrought by shell-shock, there were at least three new fields – non-university fields – threatening to develop autonomous institutions and draw interest away from old-fashioned experimental psychology: in medicine, education and industry. Myers already had a very clear idea of the numbers that scientific societies catering for these groups would attract, estimating that the BPS members, even if they remained faithful and were not drawn away, would be outnumbered four to one. Myers's solution to this threat would turn the dangerous situation into a blessing for the BPS: he recommended

that special sections of the Society be established to cater for their specialized needs and, in addition, an essential change in the Constitution be implemented, so that instead of the old condition of a prospective member being 'engaged in psychology', as required under the old Rules, a new, more relaxed condition would require only that a prospective member be 'interested in psychology' (Edgell 1947, p. 11; Lovie 2001, pp. 100–1). The BPS Council, meeting on 8 January, referred Myers's Report to an Extraordinary General Meeting to meet on 19 February 1919 under the chairmanship of Professor Percy Nunn, the eminent educationalist. This rule change would make the Society an open forum rather than a restricted club, more like the British Association, less like the Royal Society. In the process, however, the field of psychology underwent a sociologically unusual change. Instead of moving steadily towards stricter closure, with ever heightened concern over qualifications for entry and a general distrust of enthusiastic amateurs and outsiders, which is the classical pattern of professionalization, it shifted from exclusive beginnings to a more expansive, more outward-directed regime, one which lasted until after the Second World War. This shift of direction for psychology, managed by Myers in the extremely fluid conditions following the end of the Great War, is in significant part attributable to the advent of psychoanalysis: as noted by Edgell, contemporary and historian of this era, psychoanalysis dominated much of the BPS discussions throughout the 1920s (Edgell 1947, p. 14).

The BPS and the Foundation of the British Psychoanalytical Society

Throwing himself into his work to forget his troubles, Jones like Myers was caught up in the spirit of reform and fresh beginnings that the Armistice brought. Knowing he would not be able to meet up with Freud and the other leaders of the psychoanalytic movement in Europe because of the draconian restrictions on travel still supplementing the rigorous sanctions designed to force the Central Powers to accept any Treaty the Allied Powers agreed on, he nonetheless urgently sought advice from Freud in a letter written the day after the Committee heard of Myers's radical proposals for reform of the BPS:

The Ψ A ferment here is remarkable, and the desire for more knowledge, lectures, literature, etc. very widespread and pressing. I am in doubt whether to wait till I can see you before formulating plans, or to put myself at the head of the movement and guide it now. The immediate question is that of reconstituting our society, which has not met for two years and from which I must expel the Jung 'rump'. Now I beg you to write at once and state your views as to the new lines along which this should be done. It will of course be a branch of the International. Do you think it expedient to have two classes: members, who have sole control of

the business, and a fringe of Associates, who will learn, attend, and discuss? It is essential that we have an official journal in English, here or in America—I think better here. If it is not established officially, all arrangements have already been made for an unofficial one, which would be a great pity. (EJ/SF 9.1.19, pp. 328–9)

Freud's immediate and speedy response, given the lag time of the post-war disruptions, gave him a green light:

Regarding your question 'how you should' arrange matters in the re-born Ψ A Society I venture to say, your plan seems pretty reasonable, as you work on fresh soil and must throw out the majority of former members. The associates will have the chance or undergo the obligation to be turned into members after due time? (SF/EJ 24.1.19, p. 331)

What Jones did not tell Freud was how he was involved in other reformist moves through his Chairmanship of the Committee of the BPS. And this was not the only Society he had his sights set on. At successive meetings on 15 and 22 January 1919, Jones attended meetings of the British Society for the Study of Sex Psychology. This Society had begun life as the British Society of Psychiatry⁴ in London on 12 August 1913 and became the BSSSP on 8 July 1914 at a meeting attended by magistrates, doctors, homosexual law reform campaigners and those interested in the study of sex following the lead of Havelock Ellis, Edward Carpenter and their Continental counterparts (Hall 1995). From its beginnings, the early British psychoanalysts had shown their interest in the BSSSP, with Jessie Murray, Director of the Brunswick Square Clinic, amongst its most active members, Barbara Low joining in 1915 and Ernest Jones in 1916. As might be expected, the membership included prominent socialists, Fabians and free thinkers; they could often be found, along with the pacifist-leaning Bloomsburyites and Moptops, at the 1917 Club in the latter stages of the War. For a brief period there was even a local branch of the BSSSP in Cambridge. So, at the two January 1919 meetings, Ernest Jones proposed that the Society, like all other institutions in tumult following the end of the War, disband and merge with the BPS. His proposal was rejected by the Society (Hall 1995, pp. 670, n. 19).

4. The use of the term 'psychiatry' as essentially an equivalent to the study of sex indicates two things: firstly, at this date, 1913, 'psychiatry' was not a stable term in English and was certainly not accepted as equivalent to 'alienist' or 'asylum doctor', which it would soon become, eventually displacing them entirely; secondly, that the path by which 'psychiatry' as a term entered English (from the Continent, principally from German-speaking countries) was not via the asylums but via the larger circles associated with the study of sex, of criminality and 'deviance' in general. The model psychiatrist, one might conclude, is Krafft-Ebing, forensic psychiatrist, pioneer sexologist as well as university Professor and asylum physician rather than Flechsig or Kraepelin. There is a complex history of the introduction and vicissitudes of the term in English (and specifically in Britain as compared with the USA) which is comparable to that outlined by Fauvel 2006.

At the BPS Extraordinary Annual General Meeting on 19 February, all went as planned: the meeting endorsed Myers's plan, including the proposal that individual sections could nominate members who would become full members of the BPS. The very next day, 20 February 1919, as if awaiting the signal from these larger developments, Ernest Jones convened a group of nine at his lodgings at 69 Portland Court: Dr Douglas Bryan, Dr H. Devine, Mr J.C. Flügel, Dr D. Forsyth, Mr Eric Hiller, Miss Barbara Low, Dr Stanford Read and Dr W.H.B. Stoddart.⁵ The first act this group performed was to erase the detritus of the past:

Dr Jones ... explained the objects of the meeting. He mentioned that about two [*sic*] years ago a Society called the London Psycho-Analytical Society had been formed, of which he had been the President. Owing to the fact that certain members of that Society had adopted views which were in contradiction to the principles of Psycho-Analysis the objects of that Society were negatived. As some members of the London Psycho-Analytical Society were present it was decided that the following resolution should be sent to the Secretary of that Society. Resolution that some members of the London Psycho-Analytical Society suggest that the Society exist no longer, unless any other members make a contrary suggestion. (Anon. 1920b)⁶

Having disposed of the dormant and unpalatable London Psycho-Analytical Society, the meeting proceeded as follows:

It was moved by Dr Stoddart, and seconded by Major Stanford Read, that the British Psycho-Analytical Society be formed, and that application be made for affiliation to the International Psycho-Analytical Association. Carried. (BPsaS FAA/O)

5. Flügel was invited but could not attend due to illness. Several of these founding members have not been the subject of any historical discussion. Stoddart is a case in point: he was Treasurer of the British Psychological Society from 1918 onwards for many years and he performed the same function for the British Psychoanalytical Society from its foundation in February 1919 until 1930; he was author of the ground-breaking *The New Psychiatry* (1915), an outspoken psychoanalytic manifesto for psychiatry, taken up by his assistant at St Thomas' Hospital in the 1920s, John Rickman. He was also indispensable to the running of both BPS and BPsaS, since he hosted their meetings in the first half of the 1920s at Harcourt House in Cavendish Square, before they acquired premises of their own.

6. Note that the minute, presumably written by Dr Bryan who took over the Secretaryship of the new Society (but had also been a founder member of the London Society), inaccurately states that the London Society was founded two years previously, whereas it had been founded over five years before. The confusion may have arisen because the London Society had not met for two years; Jones records that the meetings had quite quickly become disputatious, particularly between Eder, the Secretary, and Jones, the President, so that he suggested they suspend the meetings and resort to more private and informal discussion. (Jones 1959, p. 229). Note also that the original name of the Society, according to Jones (EJ/SF 3.11.13, p. 233), was 'London Psycho-Analytic Society'.

Such was the foundation of the British Psychoanalytical Society. In the Minutes published in 1920 in the *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, it was recorded 'that the Society be governed by the rules of the Association'. The Society was not to draw up its own rules until May 1920, which were discussed at the AGM in October 1920. In the meantime, the rules of the IPA governed the Society, along with two broad principles approved at the first meeting: 'It was moved and seconded, that the membership of the Society shall be a limited one. Carried' (BPsaS FAA/O). What 'limited' meant under the circumstances of 1919 is unclear: was it explicitly to be contrasted with the opening up being undertaken by the BPS? Did it attempt to impose a condition of 'commitment' to psychoanalysis upon future Members? Was this a legacy of the trench-warfare with the Jungians, a coded declaration that only Freudians were welcome? It seems most likely that this 'limitation' was an implicit and therefore still informal requirement that members have had experience of analysis themselves with an approved analyst. At this stage, Ernest Jones clearly felt that the best way to control the Society's future direction was by restricting membership to those who had analysis with him – as he indicated to Freud two weeks after the founding meeting: 'I have analysed 6 out of the 11 (*sic*) myself, so am in good contact' (EJ/SF 5.3.19, p. 336).

Almost as if to counter any such restrictive exclusiveness, that first meeting immediately introduced the category of 'Associate Member', who would be distinguished from the full Members only in that they could play no part in the business affairs of the Society and that their membership needed to be renewed annually, by nomination of the Council and a vote at the AGM. No specification of the difference between Members and Associate Members was attempted. None of the other Psychoanalytic Societies which were affiliated to the IPA had this second category of member, the 'Associates', yet. Jones's suggestion to Freud of 'a fringe of Associates, who will learn, attend, and discuss' was a specific response to the ferment around psychoanalysis in England in the weeks after the end of the War, which manifested itself in many areas, not least in its overlap with the general ferment in psychological – and, less identifiably, in wider intellectual – circles in which he, as a core member of the BPS, the BSSSP and other shifting groupings, was thoroughly caught up. Like the other entrepreneurial spirit at large, C.S. Myers, Jones could see that the landscape had changed: existing institutions, or the traditional templates for new institutions, needed to be transformed. The introduction of the novel category of 'Associate' does much to explain the fact that the BPsaS grew more rapidly than any of the other Psychoanalytic Societies in Europe and America in the first five years of the 1920s: by 1926, there were 27 Members and 29 Associate Members (Anon. 1926, pp. 146–7) and the British Society was the largest in the world. Their interest in joining was simply the result of the 'Ψ A ferment' of which Jones was so aware. But

back in 1919, Jones was not thinking clearly along the lines of expanding the Society too far into the general scientific culture of the moment. Whereas Myers's axis of mutual power and influence ran, as we shall see, from London to Cambridge, Jones's thoughts were always focused on the axis London – Vienna, as indicated by the fact that the very first decision of the newly constituted Psychoanalytical Society was to submit itself to the rules of the IPA.

In the short-term, the strategy of Myers would prove to be far more effective than that of Jones's: opening up to a wider public worked marvellously for the BPS. Within two weeks of the 19 February Extraordinary meeting, the names of 109 people (that is, 11 more than there were in the Society at the end of 1918) were nominated for membership of the revamped Society, and at meetings in April and May a further 145 were proposed, seconded and then forwarded to the BPS general meetings.⁷ Myers was intent on importing wholesale into the BPS many of the doctors who had made up the Conference of RAMC doctors who, at their first meeting in October 1917, had constituted a vigorous lobby-group within the Army (they were later called the Neurological Advisory Committee); Myers presented himself as engaged in the delicate balancing-act of hunting with the hounds of the 'wilder spirits' of this 'mixed bag of psychiatrists, psycho-therapists, psychologists and "pure" neurologists' (Myers 1940, p. 134) while he ran with the War Office and the minor changes they were willing to implement. Come the Armistice, he had endeavoured to get the training centres where psychotherapy had been taught and promoted during the War continued, 'so that the knowledge of the methods so successfully carried out in these "centres" by the Army during the war might not lapse during the period of transition, before instruction on the subject could be taken up by the Universities or Medical Schools in civil life' (Myers 1940, pp. 137–8).

There were clear signs that a similar surge of interest could add to the new Psychoanalytical Society. However, Jones's initial choice of founder members erred on the side of professed orthodoxy, with the ability to get along with Ernest Jones, a rare enough trait, at a premium, rather than more general intellectual distinction; for the most part, these founding members were fringe members of the medical profession. But at the second meeting of the new Council and the Society, on 10 April 1919, when five new members, including Cyril Burt and Joan Riviere were elected, 'the Secretary reported that Dr G [*sic*].W. Mitchell, Dr Bernard Hart, Dr W.H.R. Rivers and Prof. Percy Steven [*sic*] had asked to become Associate Members. This

7. Lovie 2001, p. 101. The Minute Book shows that many, perhaps most of the new members elected over the next year were nominated by Myers, Rivers, Jones, Stoddart and Brierley (i.e. the later Susan Isaacs). Brierley in particular was active in having elected up to 20, mainly women members of the Brunswick Square Clinic.

was agreed to.⁸ These four individuals – the last of whom was in reality Prof. Percy Nunn – were of considerable standing in different wings of psychology. They had not been approached by Jones, but had *asked* to be elected. Yet the category of Associate Member, the penumbra of those more generally interested in psychoanalysis, would shift its function considerably over the years, fatefully for the future of psychoanalysis. In its original 1919 form, it answered to the same urge as Myers's reform of the BPS: the recognition that the War had profoundly transformed the landscape of psychology and that psychoanalysis was a crucial part, if not the only motor, of that transformation (see Cameron & Forrester 2000, pp. 211–13). However, the complexion of intellectual forces was to change radically in the course of the next few years.

The Medical Section of the BPS

The new sections of the BPS were convened with Presidents who offered Addresses to their opening meetings: at the end of May, the very junior Cambridge acolyte of Myers, Frederic Bartlett, was shoe-horned into leadership of the General Section, offering a paper, with Miss Emily Smith, whom he was to marry the next year, on sounds of minimal intensity, the fruit of work they, together with Myers, had been doing for the Navy during the last stages of the war. Before then, on 11 April, Percy Nunn gave a talk on 'Psychology and Education' to the Education Section and on 25 April, Myers inaugurated the Industrial Section. Jones reported to Freud on 2 May:

Next week I am lecturing at the University of London on *Alltagsleben* and before a society of shell-shock doctors on how to use dreams in the analysis. Things are very alive here in psychopathology. At present I am acting as chairman, and Flügel as secretary, of the committee of the British Psychological Society, which is being re-organized. A group has been formed for medical psychology, with over a hundred members, who are shewing great interest. Naturally psycho-analysis is well represented in the discussions, as you may imagine, and it is taking good root. (EJ/SF 2.5.19, pp. 344–5)

The first meeting of this Medical Section was on 15 May 1919, when Rivers spoke on 'Psychology and Medicine'. As they had done for so many years in Cambridge, the double act of Rivers and Myers revealed its institutional power: the organizer Myers had created a broad public, responding to intellectual needs of the moment, and his friend and colleague Rivers now provided the intellectual overview and *raison d'être* for the new dispensation in psychology, which amounted to a revolution, which he,

8. BPSaS Minute Book. These errors are in the original Minutes: the persons elected were Dr T.W. Mitchell and Prof. Percy Nunn.

the founder of experimental psychology in Britain, could survey from an unchallenged position.

First he surveyed the old introspective psychology, then the experimental variety (which he judged 'has proved unfruitful as a direct means of increasing our knowledge'), then industrial psychology and educational psychology, which he justified on the basis that 'No one can use modern methods in the clinical investigation of psychoneurosis without having forced upon him the vast importance of the mental traumata and faulty trends of thought and conduct which occur or come into existence in childhood, often in its very early years'. Acknowledging that most of his audience had been engaged during the War in the treatment of the war neuroses and it was this that had led to their interest in medical psychology and the work of the new Section of the BPS, he argued that what characterized the war neuroses was their simplicity, on account of which they are 'well adapted to illustrate the essential characters not only of the pathological states, but also of the normal balance between controlled and controlling forces'. Turning next to the psychoneuroses of civil life, it was psychoanalysis which should now constitute the focus of their work, with the characteristic Rivers balance between intense interest, defence of its appropriateness and maintenance of an objective frame of mind:

You all know how the most prominent school of students of the psychoneuroses believe that the instinctive tendencies which stand on one side of the battleground belong exclusively to the instinct of sex. However repellent this may be to the traditions of the medical profession, we must be prepared to face this problem honestly and without prejudice. In turning from the practice of war to that of peace we must expect to find a great increase in the part taken by the sexual instinct, for the simple and obvious reason that the conditions of our civilization make this instinct the special object of its repressions and taboos It should be our working hypothesis that any instinct which needs repression in the interests of society may furnish that occasion for conflict which forms the essence of neurosis. (Rivers 1919, p. 892)

Rivers concluded his address by pointing out the advances that had also been made during the War into the organic foundations of the neuroses, with the researches of Head, Sherrington and others into the functioning of the brain and nervous system; but he hoped that these researches would not be separated off into yet another specialism, but would be engaged in under the auspices of the experimental (which is how he regarded the new 'General' section) and medical sections.

The new Medical Section was, as Myers intended, self-consciously gathering together those interested in psychological approaches to the neuroses, and, as Jones and Rivers both recognized, psychoanalysis was a, if not the, key approach whose significance was at the centre of the new group's attention. 'The Reconstruction Committee of the Council of the

B.P.S. on 17th Dec: 1919 reported to the Council that there should be a separate Journal for the Section and on 21st Jan: 1920 asked the Medical Section Committee for suggestions of names suitable for the position of Editor. Dr. T.W. Mitchell was the nominee of the Medical Section Committee.⁹ Inviting Mitchell to be Editor was an astute political move: in 1906 a group of medical enthusiasts for hypnotism founded the Medical Society for the Study of Suggestive Therapeutics, choosing its name after the translated title of Bernheim's important book (the same work the young Freud had translated into German in 1888); they soon changed the name to the Psycho-Medical Society. Dr T.W. Mitchell, an enthusiast for hypnotism and experimental research into hypnotic states (Gauld 1992, pp. 420, 431, 455), was instrumental in setting up a Medical Section of the *Society for Psychical Research* in 1911, which published a special medical number of the Proceedings in November 1912 – to which Freud was invited to contribute, accepting and writing in English a key paper on the concept of the unconscious¹⁰ – and a special medical supplement in 1914. During the War, this medical section disbanded and merged with the Psycho-Medical Society under Mitchell's leadership. So inviting Mitchell to become Editor of the new journal to be published by the Medical Section of the BPS was a way of encouraging Mitchell to bring his own group into the fold – which duly happened. The journal announced itself as edited by Mitchell, published by Cambridge University Press, 'with assistance of William Brown, Ernest Jones, Constance Long, George Riddoch and W.H.R. Rivers'. In the style favoured by the BPS, Symposia were often organized on themes and three or four of the papers delivered were published in the journal as a result. Such a symposium had taken place on 6 July 1918 on the theme 'Why is the "unconscious" conscious?', with contributions from Jones, Rivers and from Maurice Nicoll, one of the founders of the London Psycho-Analytical Society and an enthusiastic supporter of Jung's. Similarly the first number of the new *Journal* opened with a piece by Janet, followed by four contributions to a discussion at a meeting of the Medical Section of the BPS

9. Rickman Papers, British Psychoanalytic Society Archive, 'British Psychological Society, Medical Section File: Rickman's Drafts for reforming Med Section, 1945', p. 8: '(27) British Journal of Medical Psychology'.

10. This paper, 'A note on the unconscious in psychoanalysis' (*Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research XXVI, Part LXVI*, Nov 1912, pp. 312–18), was an attempt, Freud told Jones, to try 'to explain our point of view to English readers in English words' and was 'mildly corrected by one of the Society's members', probably Mitchell, who was the instigator of the 'special medical part' of the *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research* in which Freud's paper appeared (Cerullo 1982, pp. 162 ff.); one of Mitchell's papers in the journal included an account of his treatment of a long-standing hysteric with his own adapted version of Freud's psychoanalytic technique (Mitchell 1912). Freud's paper is an interesting source of information concerning Freud's own choice of English terms for his key concepts, so that Mitchell may have played a hitherto unrecognized part in establishing English-language psychoanalytic terminology; see Steiner 1991, esp. pp. 352–6.

held on February 18, 1920, with a position paper by William Brown, with responses from Myers, McDougall and Brown, on the topic 'The revival of emotional memories and its therapeutic value'.

With papers by Stoddart in December 1919, followed by Ernest Jones on 21 January 1920 on 'Recent advances in psychoanalysis' and Jones again in March on 'A linguistic factor in English characterology', it is clear that the Medical Section and its journal was as much of a forum for psychoanalytic ideas as was the fledgling BPsaS. As Jones was to proudly proclaim in his biography of Freud:

In the years after the world war there was a great deal of talk about Freud and his theories in intellectual circles in England. There was in fact a considerable cult or vogue which was by no means welcome to serious students, and we did our best to confine ourselves to our scientific work – even at the cost of being labelled sectarians or hermits. The British Psycho-Analytical Society was reorganized in February 1919, with twenty members; the change of name from London to British was part of a decision I had proposed for all Societies, so that 'Berlin' became 'German', 'Budapest' became 'Hungarian' and so on. The British Psychological Society also was undergoing an extensive transformation; Flugel was Secretary and I was Chairman of the Council that was carrying it out. One outcome was the founding of a special Medical Section, which proved an invaluable forum for the discussion of our ideas with other medical psychologists. To heighten its prestige we got W.H.R. Rivers, the distinguished anthropologist, to act as its first President, but the next seven were all psychoanalysts, as have been many since. (Jones 1957, p. 12)

Which is not to say that relations between the institutions were always amicable. Almost as soon as Mitchell had become Editor, he and Jones were at loggerheads over the copyright of psychoanalytic papers in the new journal, which Jones tried to resolve tactfully, given that he had had Mitchell made a member of the BPsaS.¹¹ Jones had been telling Vienna that the new journal (from its first publication in 1920 simply called *British Journal of Psychology. Medical Section*) was the *British Journal of Psychotherapy*, which may have been his preferred choice of name; on 22 February 1922 the Medical Section Committee received a Council minute 'subject to the approval of the Editor of the *British Journal of Psychology (Medical Section)* and that of the Medical Section Committee that the title be altered to *British Journal of Medical Psychology*' - a conservative choice which, surprisingly, managed to survive until 1999. The incipient rivalry or overlap between the two institutions was still visible in December 1922, when Ernest Jones cancelled a meeting of the BPsaS because it coincided with a meeting of the Medical Section of the BPS.¹² The presence of a committed psychoanalytic guiding hand was finally secured a few years

11. BPsaS, *Rundbriefe*, Jones to Rank, 18 January 1921 and 2 February 1921.

12. BPsaS, Minute Book, 6 December 1922.

later: 'On 22nd April 1925 an assistant Editor was appointed on nomination from the Medical Section Committee'. This assistant Editor was the tireless John Rickman, who would watch over and do the donkey-work for the journal until after the Second World War, including rewriting the constitution in 1946 – a task he was often performing for the BPsas, to which he was equally indispensable, from his conceiving and writing the constitution of the Institute in 1924 on.

Rivers's inaugural address in May 1919 as the new President of the Medical Section of the BPS was the foretaste of a series of lectures he gave in Cambridge in the summer of 1919: undergraduates had flooded back from their military units and the academic year effectively began in January 1919, with extra lecture courses scheduled over the summer, amongst which were Rivers's. Before delivering these lectures, he took part in a BPS Symposium on 12 July 1919 on the theme 'Instinct and the Unconscious'; the other participants were C.G. Jung, C.S. Myers, J. Drever, Graham Wallas and W. McDougall. Having decided to become psychoanalysts a few weeks earlier, Karin and Adrian Stephen moved to Cambridge for the summer to attend Rivers's lectures; she wrote to her mother on 9 August 1919:

I dropped in to see Goldie [Goldworthy Lowes Dickinson] and found Roger Fry and Paula with him. We had a jolly evening talking about psychoanalysis. Next morning I went to Dr Rivers to explain why I had missed his first lecture – he lent it to me. He dined here on Friday with Roger and Paula and they talked on all sorts of subjects, hypnotism, art. Ethnology is his principal interest.¹³

Even Rivers's ethnology was deeply entangled with his preoccupation with psychoanalysis: on 22 November 1919, he gave a talk to the CU Anthropological Club on 'Ethnology, its aims and needs' (Anon. 1919, p. 116) the 'overriding theme was the assimilation of Freudian concepts within anthropology and psychology' (Crampton 1978, p. 111). The lectures he delivered in the summer of 1919 were of considerable importance for the reception of psychoanalysis in Britain. He published them early in 1920 as *Instinct and the Unconscious*, adding to them a series of papers he had written during the War on the war neuroses and Freud's psychology so that the book became a record of his own intellectual journey and an important provisional statement of the place of Freud's work in psychology – written just as Freud was radically revising his theory of instincts, completing his first draft of *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* in that same summer of 1919.

The Cambridge Clinic

Myers had two immediate and urgent reform projects for Cambridge in mind: the Laboratory and the Clinic. Let us turn first to the Clinic.

13. BPsas, KS/40, Karin Stephen to Aunty Low and Mother, 9 August 1919.

At the end of December 1918, Myers conferred with Lady Ida Darwin (wife of Charles's fifth son, Sir Horace, the founder of the Cambridge Instrument Co.), who was the President of the Cambridgeshire Voluntary Association for the Care of the Mentally Defective, who then convened a Special Meeting to consider a Memorandum Myers had prepared entitled 'Early treatment of functional nervous and incipient mental disorders'. Amongst those attending in the Cambridgeshire Council Chambers were W.H.R. Rivers, Richard Rows, Director of the Maghull Hospital, and Sir Clifford Allbutt, the 82-year-old Regius Professor of Physics (and 50 years previously the model for Lydgate in George Eliot's *Middlemarch*). Myers proposed that the gains in psychological medicine of the War, associated with the treatment of shell-shock at the special hospitals and the training programmes developed there, especially at Maghull, be translated into a new nation-wide initiative for the treatment of those suffering from the early stages of mental illness. The starting-point would be a clinic in Cambridge, attached to Addenbrooke's Hospital and benefiting from links with the University in order to conduct research and develop teaching. Myers recommended his Memorandum to the Meeting with an impassioned speech about the possibilities opened up by the development of psychotherapeutic methods during the War:

During the past four years the treatment of 'nervous breakdown' has been almost revolutionized in this country... it is now recognized that 'nervous breakdown' is rather commoner among the 'working classes' than among the 'well-to-do,' that it demands mental, rather than mainly physical treatment, and that psychotherapeutic measures should be generally adopted which consist essentially in unravelling the conflicting, more or less repressed, experiences of the patient's past and in getting him to face them and to understand the chain of mental processes responsible for his condition.¹⁴

Myers underlined the parlous condition of the asylums in Britain, where the load of 200–300 patients per physician entailed the complete absence of proper treatment; what is more, the immovable stigma of the lunatic asylum prevents adequate treatment. Hence the need for 'complete administrative separation of the Clinics for functional nervous and incipient mental disorders from the Asylums' (Myers, CRO/SM 4). Myers and Lady Darwin had been warned before the meeting by Mr A. Tabrum, Clerk of Cambridgeshire County Council, that present legislation did not allow for such a scheme, although even he, in the administratively unstable state of febrile excitation following the Armistice, noted: 'The proposal would require legislation, but in these days of "reconstruction" that is no longer

14. [Charles S. Myers], 'Scheme for the treatment of early mental disorder', specially printed document attached to specially printed copy of 'Provision of early treatment for functional nervous and incipient mental disorders in adults and children', SM.

the obstacle that it was.¹⁵ Myers proposed that they seek legislation to allow a State grant but in the meantime he made reference in his mysterious, insider's style to 'a promise that favourable consideration would be given by a certain Committee to a request for the grant of £600 or £800 a year to a medical officer for the purposes of research':

Would you get enough patients? Unquestionably, for neurasthenia and similar disorders are extraordinarily common. It is true of course that there are few factories in this area that would provide cases of nerve-strain, but even so I am confident that you would have no lack of patients, and it would be possible to ward off lunacy, just as phthisis is now staved off, by early treatment followed by improved surroundings. (Myers CRO/SM, pp. 4-5)

However, Myers's call to arms was immediately countered by Allbutt's dash of cold water: agreeing that the asylums had been dreadfully managed in the last 30 years – ever since his recommendations for reform as Commissioner for Lunacy in 1889–92 had been ignored – but he saw little use in a clinic attached to a hospital: 'Continuous appropriate treatment could hardly be managed'. Although he agreed that mental rather than drug treatment was what was needed, he had in mind not Myers's analysis of the 'chains of mental processes' but 'music, daily walks, entertainment, sympathy' or, as he put it in a clarifying letter to Lady Darwin, 'immediate "suggestion" and... reglorifying', dependent entirely upon 'a moral ascendancy over the patient'.¹⁶

Rivers, as was his wont, was too eager to take the bull by the horns; he immediately informed Allbutt that 'he had not quite understood the proposal made by Colonel Myers'. Such clinics:

exist in several European countries and in America and before the war a movement was on foot for their establishment in this country. The war had stopped this movement for a time, but has had a most important effect in bringing the treatment of functional nervous and mental disorder prominently before the medical profession and in greatly increasing our knowledge of the subject. The war has also been the occasion for systematic instruction in this branch of medicine, especially under Colonel Rows at Maghull... The proposed clinic would therefore have two aspects, (i) the treatment of functional nervous disorders and incipient insanity, and (ii) research upon these subjects and the education, especially post-graduate, of students of medicine. Cambridge now has the chance of being first in the field in this most important movement. (Rivers CRO/SM 7-8)

Rows then gave a powerful address, showing how the new views about the nature of the unconscious ('patients are entirely ignorant of the nature and mechanisms of mental processes and therefore they are unable to

15. Mr A. Tabrum, Letter to Lady Darwin, 31 December 1918, CRO.

16. Sir Clifford Allbutt, SM 5-6, and Allbutt to Lady Darwin, 27 January 1919, CRO.

understand their disturbed condition') had made possible the effective treatment of the functional nervous diseases: the opportunity to do so under peace conditions must not be lost. Rows combated Allbutt's scepticism with the authority of the Board of Control's call for such hospitals or clinics to be attached to universities and medical schools; what is more, 'recently also the Medico-Psychological Association has considered some modifications of the Lunacy Law of 1890 so that Clinics may be developed in close contact with the Universities and Medical Schools without any legal restrictions' (Rows CRO/SM 10).

The meeting passed a series of resolutions calling for the establishment of a clinic 'in the interests of humanity' funded in part by the State, in part by local authorities. To implement these resolutions, a Mental Hygiene Committee was established which included all the Cambridge great and good: the Vice-Chancellor of the University, four Masters of Colleges, Myers, Rivers, Lady Darwin, Mrs Keynes and C.R.A. Thacker, Fellow of Sidney Sussex, who was another early member of the BPsaS. (Cameron & Forrester 2000, p. 191, n. 4). On 4 February this Committee met in Rivers's rooms in St John's College, in order to implement Myers's plan to transmute war-service Maghull into peace-service Cambridge. Myers reported that 'Dr Rows might be willing to take the post of Physician to a Cambridge Clinic when released from his military duties'¹⁷ at Maghull. Myers intended to link the new clinic closely with the Psychological Laboratory and muster support from the State, the Council and the University. But over the next few months, the plans ran into the sand. Myers and Rivers met with the Ministry of Pensions, the Medical Research Committee, and with Addenbrooke's Hospital, but public support for the initiative was not forthcoming. By the end of July, Rows had moved on to other projects; the County Council and Borough reminded Myers that no expenditure of local government money was permitted other than on those compulsory expenditures connected with maintaining lunatic asylums under the 1890 Act; even more mortifying was the lack of support from the University, no doubt because Allbutt opposed the use of the new-fangled psychological treatments for incipient mental illness. So in July 1919, all Myers could do was call on the funds he had rustled up from the Medical Research Council to pay the salary of Dr E. Prideaux for one year as the founding physician attached to the clinic set up within the Department of Psychological Medicine, itself newly founded, at Addenbrooke's Hospital (Crampton 1978, p. 173).

Under these straitened circumstances the Psychological Clinic never became the national centre for the clinical investigation and teaching in the psychoneuroses. Its activities did get drawn into the increasingly heated

17. *Memorandum for Members of the Cambridge Mental Hygiene Committee, appointed 1919*, drafted May 1925, p. 3, CRO.

discussion of psychoanalysis in medical and alienist circles, when the work of an equivalent clinic at Oxford came under scrutiny. Thomas Saxty Good had been appointed Medical Superintendent of the Littlemore Hospital, close to Oxford, in 1906. Working without a close group in support, he began to use psychotherapeutic methods from 1908 on, and 'analytical methods' in the period 1911–15. According to his own retrospective account he 'treated my first case by analysis in the beginning of 1915' (Good 1930, p. 606). William McDougall, the Wilde Reader at Oxford, taught him hypnosis, and late in 1917 the two of them proposed to set up a clinic which was formally opened as the Clinic for Nervous Diseases in April 1918, operating one afternoon a week (Good 1922, p. 17). This was the period of turmoil and excited discovery, with each patient requiring its own vocabulary and the doctors putting together their own novel jargon – 'complexes', 'amnesias', 'dissociation' and so forth.

Good reported on the work of the Oxford Clinic to the meeting of the Royal Medico-Psychological Association in July 1921, listing the forms of treatment employed: 1. Persuasion; 2. Suggestion (either waking or hypnotic); 3. Hypnosis; 4. 'Analysis... the hardest, the most scientific and thorough of all methods of psychotherapy, though I think in order of merit it should come first' (Good 1922, p. 22). He illustrated with a case of a suicidal young woman, in whom her early love for her father was overlaid by unconscious contempt for him because of his submissiveness towards his wife, all brought to a crisis by setbacks in her love life and the death of her sister. Good's purposeful avoidance of the words 'psychoanalysis' and 'Freud' did not prevent him being savagely attacked in the discussion that followed his paper: psychoanalysis was a topic of immediate controversy amongst the psychiatrists, with critics and proponents equally passionate. Prideaux, 'speaking as one connected with a kind of rival clinic to Dr Good's namely that at Cambridge' (Anon. 1921, p. 528) sallied forth to aid his colleague, describing that, despite it being almost impossible to carry out psychoanalytic treatment in an out-patient clinic, he had psychoanalysed half a dozen patients in the previous 16 months. Claiming the Cambridge Clinic was far more ambitious than that at Oxford, he pointed to five alliances that underpinned its work: firstly, the Voluntary Association for Mental Welfare, which provided visitors to develop social services in association with the clinic, investigating home conditions, developing family histories, finding work for patients when cured; secondly, the clinic was proving of extreme value to the general practitioners in the area; thirdly, the schools were able to pass difficult cases straight from the School Clinic to the Mental Clinic; fourthly, 'Magistrates have taken to referring cases to the clinic for an opinion as to the mental condition of alleged criminals' (Anon. 1921, p. 529); and finally, the clinic functioned as a 'Research Centre', whose material passed direct to the University's Psychological Laboratory.

Prideaux's account of the new-fangled clinics, aside from his compulsive rivalry with Oxford, was very much in the spirit of Myers's vision of what Nikolas Rose has called 'the psychological complex' – the network of alliances and epistemico-practical formations suddenly possible in the post-war atmosphere. On the other hand, Good took the passions unleashed in the discussion more personally – he thanked the discussants for the 'attacks, which is what they are' on him – and defended those like Freud and Jung who are 'trying to get to the bottom of something': 'Freud was, in his opinion, a genius'. A physician who ignored psychology was like:

a man, who looked after the wires of a telephone, but did not understand the mechanism of the instrument. Some members of the Association seemed like the people who said, 'Yes, there is a telephone but there is no voice at the end of it'. He maintained there were a telephone and a voice and he and many more were out to discover what the voice had to say. (Anon. 1921, p. 532; Westwood 1999, esp. Chs. 6 and 7)

Both the Oxford and Cambridge Clinics went into decline and then became effectively defunct over the next few years. The Addenbrooke's Clinic was obliged to revert to more traditional patterns of medical patronage, with the medical superintendent of Cambridgeshire Mental Hospital at Fulbourn offering his services as physician on an honorary basis. Less and less was heard of the bright new dawn to be brought in by the pioneering psychotherapeutic methods. The Medical Superintendents of the period were rather traditional asylum doctors, although Dr Mervyn A. Archdale, taking over after the scandalous dismissal of his predecessor in 1917 and initially a firm believer in the virtues of rest and the management of toxins, had been a solid supporter of Myers's initiative and had himself taken the DPM in the University in 1921, leaving in 1922 to be replaced by his Deputy, Dr Arthur Francis Reardon, who died suddenly of a heart attack in 1925. From 1925 until 1953, Dr H. Travers Jones and Dr J.G.T. Thomas ran the asylum; Travers Jones 'was famous for his shooting parties. He reared partridges and pheasants in the corn-fields surrounding the hospital and was reckoned to have one of the finest partridge shoots in the Eastern Counties. The patients regarded the day out beating as a rare treat. Dr Thomas, a genial giant, knew all his patients by name. He was devoted to the hospital cricket team of which he was captain for 30 years; he was also a most capable conjuror, and wrote, produced and acted in many Christmas pantomimes' (Clark 1987). This environment was not going to be the seed-bed for a national revolution in the psychotherapeutic treatment of patients with incipient mental disorders.

However, the establishment of the Psychological Clinic at Addenbrooke's, with links to the Psychological Laboratory, to the Cambridgeshire Voluntary Association for the Care of the Mentally Defective (renamed in 1921 the Cambridgeshire Association for Mental

Welfare) and to the Mental Hospital at Fulbourn, helps explain the appointment to Fulbourn in 1919 of a very different sort of doctor from Archdale or Travers Jones: Dr John Rickman. Why Rickman, Quaker pro-Bolshevist (Ramsey 1920; King 2003), already under the tutelage of Rivers, inspired by psychoanalysis, would take up such a position now becomes far clearer: he was intended by Rivers and Myers to be part of the team of progressive psychotherapeutically inclined doctors they hoped to establish in this innovative nexus between laboratory, general hospital and asylum. Some idea of what John Rickman thought could be made of a mental hospital can be gauged from this proposal, almost certainly made by him when seeking jobs (unsuccessfully as it turned out):

In 1921 a proposal was made to the Governing Body of a world-famous Mental Hospital by a candidate for the post of Medical Superintendent that the patients should be put in a 'climate' or 'social field' where everyone had been analysed, i.e. all the persons in contact with a patient (not only the doctor in charge of his analytical therapy) would be in a position to recognize and not be unduly reactive to the deeper sources of conflict which heavily influence the behaviour of the patient; thus the expression of the patient's troubles would be less hindered by lack of understanding and he would not feel so socially rejected. To begin with, the experiment would be confined to a single ward, much later perhaps to the whole hospital. It may be worth noting that the candidate was not given the post for other reasons than his enthusiasm for psychoanalysis; indeed about twenty years later the unsuccessful candidate was asked by a member of the Governing Body of that Hospital if he had been able to carry out the project elsewhere—the idea had certainly not been forgotten. (Rickman 1951, p. 222)

Rickman drew up this proposal fresh from his analysis with Freud in Vienna, which he had begun following his departure from Fulbourn in April 1920. On his return from Vienna to Cambridge in the summer of 1921, full of these schemes for hospitals, he envisaged becoming a psychoanalyst to Cambridge, where, as his friend Roheim told him, 'there is always a chance of some Professor getting neurotic and converted when analysed by you' (BPsaS 6.12.21, CRR/FO8/25). One could not have expected even Rivers to be particularly enamoured of so radical a conception – although in the period after the War, one would never know with Rivers. He was a new man, planning to attend the IPA Berlin Congress in 1922; a few weeks after his death, Rickman confessed, 'I always had hopes that he would come into the psychoanalysts' camp and thought that if he met Freud at Berlin he might change a little' (BPsaS Rickman to Roheim, 12.6.22, CRR/FO8/01).

Why did the innovation of the Psychological Clinic at Addenbrooke's fail? Rivers and Myers may have used all their undoubted weight in elite circles, in government and with the local municipal authorities, but the problem of money and the inflexibility of the law beset any such project at this time. The Lunacy Act of 1890 required local authorities to provide for the certifiably mad, but this had a strange consequence: the mad who were

not certifiable received no help at all and projects for their treatment were treated as illicit luxuries which were prohibited by law from receiving public money. Much of the energy of late nineteenth-century reform had gone into defining the boundary between the certifiably mad and the non-certifiable as clearly and as fairly as possible: there was great fear, for good reason, of the iron hand of the law ripping the peculiar or the bothersome from their place in ordinary civil life and confining them for indefinite, sometimes life-long, lengths of time in the cloistered asylums which had become custodial warehouses for the forgotten insane poor. In interpreting the law concerning the support for insane asylums, thinking was dominated by the rule that anything that was not compulsory was forbidden. As an index of how inflexible the legal framework for mental illness was, consider the fact that, in order to set up the Maudsley Hospital admitting only voluntary patients, in 1915 the London County Council found itself obliged to obtain powers under a private Act of Parliament for the reception and treatment of 'any person suffering from incipient insanity or mental infirmity who is desirous of voluntarily submitting himself to treatment'.¹⁸

Against such bureaucratic restriction, the pre-war R.G. Rows had combined his sudden enthusiasm for Freudian ideas with a zest for reform of the lunacy laws, so that urban clinics, on the model of those to be found in Germany and the United States, could be set up for the early treatment of mental disorders, thus avoiding 'the disaster of committal' (Shephard 1996, p. 437). After the War, this movement gathered pace with the added impetus stemming from the psychotherapeutic enthusiasts Rows and his Maghull group had trained. What Myers, Rivers and Rows were attempting to do was set up in Cambridge the country's first modern psychotherapeutic clinic. But it was only in London that these initiatives were to be in any sense successful, with Hugh Crichton-Miller's Tavistock Clinic founded in September 1919, the foundation of the Cassel Hospital, also in 1919, and the long-delayed opening of the Maudsley Hospital in 1923.

Rebuilding the Psychological Laboratory in Cambridge

While doing battle with the traditional practices in lunacy and the mental hospitals, Myers was starting the slower and seemingly more predictable process of reform in the University of Cambridge. He was not yet demobilized when he put wheels in motion: on 5 February 1919, just when he was completing his palace revolution at the BPS in London and the day after the new Mental Hygiene Committee met under the guidance of Sir Hugh Anderson and Lady Darwin to implement the Clinic proposal, the Board of Moral Science received a letter from Myers 'expressing his

18. See <http://www.mdx.ac.uk/www/study/mhhglo.htm#voluntary>, accessed 21.9.07 and Allderidge 1991, p. 87.

wish that the Special Board should apply for the institution of a Special Board for Psychological Studies' (BMS 5.2.19). On 25 October 1919, the Board of Moral Science agreed to support a case for a separate Board of Psychological Studies, with two dissenting voices: Keynes *père*, who, unlike his wife, was ever the conservative by nature, and McTaggart. (BMS 25.10.19). The strongest elements in Myers's case for an independent Board of Psychological Studies were the new developments in the field of mental disorders and in applications to education and industry. Unlike the Moral Sciences, which would of necessity be preoccupied with philosophy, Myers argued that psychology needed to reach out to new students wishing to connect psychology to other areas of study, in particular, economics, physics and medicine. Psychology was now advancing into new areas: the physiological, aesthetic, social, religious and also into animal behaviour. What was more, the establishment of a new Chair in Psychology at Manchester – occupied by Myers's former student Pear, whose teacher remained a mere lecturer – represented clear competition to the dominant position of Cambridge in British psychology established by the early initiatives of Ward, Rivers and Myers.

The proposal was received positively by the University and the Board was set up by a University vote on 12 March 1920. With the Royal Commission on Oxford and Cambridge now meeting, each Board of Studies was asked to present its list of priorities to the Commission for transmission to the Commission; the Board of Psychological Studies requested Lectureships in Industrial, Abnormal and Educational Psychology. At the same time, Myers led the Board into a campaign for a 'Readership in Psychology' to which Myers would be appointed (Crampton 1978, pp. 171–2). On the face of it, it looked as if Myers was angling for his own promotion. Far from it: he had already decided to leave Cambridge to found and direct the National Institute for Industrial Psychology (NIIP). The plan to create the Readership was a typically politically adept way of securing his legacy in Cambridge on his departure. Myers had never been dependent on the University for his income; it was rather the other way around: the University was dependent on Myers for all the substantial developments in psychology, whether it was bricks and mortar, financial support or research initiatives. This new Readership was no exception.

In 1912, the University had asked for, and eventually been given, Government funding for medicine. This request was extremely controversial; the independence of the University from Government was a proudly defended shibboleth, emblem of its freedom. (Weatherall 2000, pp. 196–8). Critics, and not only critics, feared that this would be the thin end of a wedge whereby government grants would influence and thereby change the character of the University. With the end of the War and the clearly parlous state of the University's finances, this fear was realized. The only way for the University to sustain itself was to seek major funding from

Government. This was the principal reason for the Royal Commission on Oxford and Cambridge: Parliament now sought to ensure that public money would be properly spent (Brooke 1993). The upshot of the Commission was, in short, to push the two ancient Universities down the path to becoming what Britain so urgently needed: two top-class German research universities. Naturally, in the wake of the War, nobody would mention the German ideal of research quite so brazenly as it had been bandied about in the decades before. As a result, in 1926 the present system of faculties and departments was created, to which lecturers were attached, thus creating stable, indeed unchangeable, intellectual groupings; a salary scale and compulsory retirement was introduced; there was a decisive shift of powers from Colleges to the University.

The Medical Grant Committee established in 1914 was the means by which the annual government grant was distributed; inevitably, given the political stranglehold of the scientists on such Committees and their very elastic interpretation of 'medical', the long-term shift in power and activity towards the sciences and away from clinical medicine was being enhanced rather than redressed by this Committee. With his habitual talent at such politicking, in 1919 Myers secured permanent funding from the Medical Grant Committee for the proposed Reader in Psychology. One imagines that the role he had played, at the height of the Somme, as Consultant Psychologist to the Army and the emphasis he placed on the importance of psychological approaches to functional nervous disease, to which he had devoted so much of his war work, were importantly persuasive arguments in securing this funding. Thus the text of the University's proposal in 1920 to create a Readership pointed out that, up until then, Myers as Lecturer in Experimental Psychology (the post created for him in 1907 by splitting Rivers's post in two) was paid £50 from the 'Common University Fund' and £250 from the 'Medical Grant Committee'. The new proposal was to 'assign to the position of Director of Psychological Laboratory the position of Reader with an annual stipend of £650 from Medical Grant committee'. In other words, the creation of the Readership would save the University £50 p.a.! Linking the Readership permanently to the Directorship of the Laboratory ensured that when Myers resigned, which he was privately intending to do very soon, the next Director – and there would have to be someone appointed to watch over the bricks and mortar he had given the University – would also be a Reader. But not, it now turned out, a Reader in Psychology.

The University acceded to the Board of Psychological Studies' request and published its report in late November 1920. On 11 December 1920, the large group which would become the Scientific Committee of the NIIP met in London, where they resolved that posts in industrial psychology should be established in the universities (Stansfield 2005). But the University's Report did not entirely fall in with Myers's plan; instead of a Reader in

Psychology, the University, at the behest of the Board of Moral Science, stated that 'the term "experimental" should be retained, or alternatively that the Readership should be styled a Readership in Applied Psychology'. The term 'retained' referred to the fact that Myers's Lectureship was in 'Experimental Psychology' – the first post at Cambridge in psychology, no doubt named by Myers back in 1907, but always twinned with Rivers's Lectureship in the Physiology of the Senses (a proposal then vigorously supported by the Board of Moral Science, including a younger James Ward, in 1889).

At a discussion of the Report in the Senate House on 2 December 1920, there were two speakers: Mr W.H.R. Rivers and Prof. James Ward. In the autumn of 1920, Rivers must have known of Myers's intention to leave Cambridge; he rose to the occasion to give him moral support, addressing the question of the place of 'experiment' in psychology:

The experimental method took a relatively unimportant place in the science of Psychology, and to those acquainted with modern opinion it seemed calculated to bring this University into ridicule that the scope of a new post should be limited to the experimental aspect of the subject. It was possible that the General Board had been influenced in their decision by the fact that the funds for the post were provided by the Medical Grant Committee. If that was so, they had been misinformed, for the most important branches of Psychology in relation to Medicine depended on observation rather than experiment. . . . The title of his post would certainly not deter the new Reader from dealing with all aspects of Psychology, but it was perhaps well that there should be a protest against the out-of-date nomenclature adopted by the General Board. (Anon. 1920a, p. 396)

Rivers clearly knew this field better than anyone: he had personally founded the first two psychological laboratories in Britain; he had formally promoted and worked with the experimental methods of his teacher and colleague, Kraepelin; he had participated in the famous five-year studies of nerve regeneration with Henry Head; and he had engaged in methodically ground-breaking studies, the first ever randomized clinical trials, of the effects of drugs on fatigue. It is a measure of the transformation that ethnography and the War between them had effected in the vision of the future of psychology proclaimed by the foremost English experimental psychologist that he could declare that experiment was 'relatively unimportant' and that restricting the scope of the post to experiment by adopting 'out-of-date nomenclature' would 'bring this University to ridicule'. That this was Rivers's considered view, and not simply a response to an academic spat, is clear from his survey of the whole of psychology he had delivered in May 1919, when he had declared:

There is now a widespread, and in my belief well-founded, opinion that this [experimental] movement has failed to come up to the expectations of its founders and has proved unfruitful as a direct means of increasing our knowledge, at any

rate in so far as it confines its attention to the experimental investigation of the normal human adult. It cannot be said to have done much more than provide suggestions and clues for investigation on other lines. (Rivers 1919, p. 890)

Despite his poor hearing, the 77-year-old James Ward responded to Rivers's speech of 1920 to the Senate House, re-asserting the claims of the moral sciences over 'psychology *simpliciter*, Psychology in the old sense, Psychology in short as part of Moral Science': they had only supported the proposal for a Board of Psychological Studies it being 'understood that such Board was to deal with *Applied* Psychology only'. What Ward meant by 'applied psychology' was psychology with instruments, the old psychophysics, renamed physiological psychology: for Ward, there is only one pure psychology, that derived from introspection. By definition, the mental is only accessible to the mental. All other sorts of psychology are 'applied', including the experimentalism he had done much to promote in Cambridge from the 1870s on. The psychology Ward had once encouraged might begin with experiment but it had to arrive back at consciousness and must along the way never lose contact with it. So the new psychologies that took as their objects animal behaviour, reactions, test scores, therapeutic effects, abreaction, post-hypnotic amnesic retrieval or efficacious interpretation were moving further and further away from 'psychology *simpliciter*'. Rivers was right to recognize this vision as 'out-of-date'.

But there was criticism from another quarter of the University that also wished to see Myers and the other psychologists restrict themselves solely to 'experimental psychology'. In his Presidential Address at the BMA meeting in Cambridge on 29 June 1920, Sir Clifford Allbutt had launched a wholesale attack on psychoanalysis: 'The reader... may think he sees in them (the psychoanalysts) loose thinking, vague outlines and formless pseudo-scientific verbiage'. The reader, Allbutt concluded, is quite right. As he reiterated in another address in 1922, psychoanalysis has 'no units, no measurements, no way to any controls, no precise definition, no separation of objective and subjective evidence... . Even pickpockets were now appealing to their judges to regard their cases from the psychological point of view. It was the fashion at present to analyse everything... Such people were ready to analyse a dung-heap' (Anon. 1922). This style of criticism was by no means new to Allbutt and he was clearly well up on the latest psychoanalytic trends; in his authoritative *System of Medicine* updated in 1910, he had written:

To me, possibly from personal prejudice, the recent introspective and confessional methods are odious; if so, this prejudice may disqualify me from equitable judgment, as it certainly repels me from exact perusal, of certain modern books... . We are hearing enough and to spare of suggestion – but what about the

doctor's suggestions to his marionettes, these morbid women and effeminate men, enticed to heat up sophisticated autobiographies, egotisms, and fictions? ... For these secret introspective dramas, inflamed by reminiscent curiosity, are more than half factitious If the human heart is deceitful above all things, if before the Father of Spirits we all dissemble, what conceits will not these disconsolates, craving even for scientific sympathy, imagine before the self-ordained confessor of the flesh? Is this by precept and example to develop self-command, to regenerate the faded self-respect? ... If then, medical influences are to be kept sweet and wholesome, we must consider the wiles of the human heart, conscious and half-conscious, with a decent reserve and in general terms, and in general terms brace the patient to rise superior to them; but this is not to be done by dabbling in them. The sickly person who analyses his sentiments for exhibition to his doctor begins inevitably to pose. (Allbutt 1910, pp. 759–60, 788; see Oppenheim 1991, pp. 307–8)¹⁹

So in 1920, speaking to the BMA, he concluded: 'I am thankful to know that it does not fall to my lot to seek for pearls in that sty'. The conclusion for those in the University was clear: 'We must use much circumspection in straying beyond the strand of experimental psychology' (Allcock 1920, p. 317).

So when his junior colleague James Ward insisted that Myers's Readership be confined to 'Experimental Psychology', a covert criticism of all the non-experimental psychological developments, especially psychoanalysis, could be clearly discerned behind his words. This 'rather silly little dispute' (Crampton 1978, p. 172) over a name, as Myers later called it, had as its consequence that the principal post in psychology in Cambridge would now be identified, much against its founder's wishes, with 'Experimental Psychology'. There was, as we shall see, to be more than one irony of history in this end-result.

So Myers took up his post of Reader in Experimental Psychology. He was teaching much less and was preparing for his departure from Cambridge to work full-time at the NIIP. Rivers was lecturing on his own interests – a course on 'The Psychology of Dreams' offered in Easter Term 1921 (12 p.m. on Saturdays, cost: 10s 6d.) and lectures on 'Social Organization' for the Archaeology and Anthropology Tripos in 1921–22. Myers's protégé at the Addenbrooke's Psychological Clinic, Dr E. Prideaux, took over teaching Rivers's lectures on 'Abnormal psychology'. Myers's shopping list for psychology in submission to the Royal Commission was not surprising, reflecting the new structure he had created for the BPS: Lectureships

19. To my mind, this passage indicates that Allbutt was aware of psychoanalytic theories and therapies in 1910, although he may not have been a reader of Freud. It indicates what this study repeatedly reveals: the early infiltration of psychoanalytic ideas into professional and other circles, particularly in Cambridge and similar locations, in the years before the First World War.

in Industrial, Abnormal and Educational Psychology. At the same time, he wanted a definitive divorce from Moral Sciences and a close alliance with the Natural Sciences Tripos. In January 1922, Myers handed in his resignation as Director of the Psychological Laboratory, to take effect on 11 June 1922; the University Lectureship in Psychopathology came into existence on 19 May 1922. On 4 June 1922, Rivers died suddenly, of a strangulated hernia, having been stranded and in immense pain in his College rooms over the week-end.

Within one sunny week in June, the week of rowing and high jinks, psychology in Cambridge had lost its two principal architects. One would expect that 30 years of painstaking institution-building would leave a solid legacy, but in fact they left the state of psychology in the University in a more fluid state than it had been in for many years. Responding to the tumult of the post-war years, psychology was potentially open to all manner of networks and avenues of development, which these two men had in large part encouraged. Myers and Rivers had jointly declared in no uncertain terms that the initial foundation of empirical psychology, experimental psychology, was barren and a dying discipline. They had pointed towards wider horizons for psychology's internal development – towards abnormal, educational and industrial psychology. They had set up potential alliances with other local institutions, both within and without the University: in particular, through the DPM and the clinic for nervous cases at Addenbrooke's, through Rivers's incessant roaming of the borderlands between ethnology, sociology and psychology. Psychology, for both of them, in their completely different styles, was an open thoroughfare and psychoanalysis offered an important new vision, not welcomed without misgivings, but indubitably recognized – a force to be reckoned with within this new, broad-scaped dispensation for psychology.

It was the achievement of their successor, Frederic Bartlett, to close down all these avenues, to stabilize the discipline, against the grain of his very own inclinations and scientific judgement, around a narrowly conceived core of experimental programmes by a consistent strategy exorcizing all the possible new spirits of the age. From one point of view, this was an historical opportunity lost; from another, it made Cambridge psychology into the powerhouse of an academic discipline still struggling to establish itself. In contrast to Germany and the USA, British psychology was decades late in establishing itself with numerous, as opposed to isolated, academic centres; when eventually it did, Cambridge was imprinted on it. As Eric Trist, the only student to get a starred First in Psychology between the Wars, remembered about the 1930s, 'I knew Bartlett had control of all the appointments in psychology in England' (Trist 1993). But it was only after the Second World War that the strategy bore fruit: in 1939, there were only six professors and 30 lecturers in psychology in British universities; by 1957,

there were 16 professors, of whom 10 had been trained by Bartlett and Myers. As Boring wrote in 1950:

As the scene recedes into perspective it becomes clear that the Cambridge laboratory and experimental psychology at Cambridge contribute a full half of the history of British experimental psychology. The efforts, successes and failures of Ward, Rivers, Myers and Bartlett at Cambridge provide a continuity against which the extent of British progress in this line can be measured. McDougall's role at London and at Oxford was important but peripheral. Other persons, laboratories and events enter the history, but they appear as symptoms of what was going on. (Crampton 1978, Epigraph)

The structure of Psychological Studies at Cambridge had been decided by a University review once Myers announced his departure: Bartlett's post of Assistant would be abolished and Bartlett would replace Myers as Reader and Director of the Laboratory at the same salary of £650; the £175 p.a. freed up would be used for a new Lectureship in Psychopathology 'to ensure the future of the Diploma in Psychological Medicine' (Crampton 1978, p. 174). The intent of Myers's manoeuvrings was clear: he wished to expand psychology away from its experimental past into the broader fields of industrial, educational and medical psychology. The spat over the name of his Readership makes this absolutely clear; so does the renaming of the only lectureship in the Department at that time, the Lectureship in Experimental Psychology, as the 'University Lectureship in Psychopathology in connection with the Special Board of Medicine' (Anon. 1923). This move had a double purpose. The founders of Cambridge psychology, Rivers and Myers, had medical qualifications, acquired at a time when they were a useful back-stop allowing the gaining of guineas if other sources of income were unavailable and when, before the advent of the Ph.D. in the 1920s, they were the standard path for laboratory scientists in biology. Myers's designated successor as Director of the Laboratory, Frederic Bartlett, had no medical training, though he had acquired medical experience helping shell-shocked soldiers in Cambridge during the War using what he had picked up from talking with Rivers and Myers – 'like all psychologists of the period I had read everything I could get of the work of Sigmund Freud' (Crampton 1978, p. 168). With Myers's departure and Rivers's withdrawal from the Psychological Laboratory, the link to medicine would be cut. The new Lectureship in Psychopathology, attached to Medicine, was intended to secure the field in which Myers and Rivers had laboured during the War, in which they had tried and failed to make Cambridge the national leader with an out-patient Clinic immediately after the War; in this field, psychoanalysis was a key element. Myers had wished to eliminate the term 'experimental' from all the official designations associated with psychology, in order to leave the field free to expand in the very different directions so apparent to all active in the field just after the

War. The teaching of the Department in the early 1920s indicates as much: in 1920–21, in addition to Rivers's lectures on dreams, Prideaux lectured on abnormal psychology; Bartlett lectured on psychology and industry and Miss Lucy Fildes lectured on 'The psychology of the backward child'. The 1921 examination questions reflected the broad approach:

How far is 'wish fulfilment' an adequate principle for explaining dreams?

Consider the relation of impulse, emotion, and instinct. Is it psychologically accurate to speak of a 'religious instinct'?

Is religious conversion rightly regarded as psychopathological?

To what extent have the phenomena of 'multiple personality' thrown light on the nature of self?

Consider the view that all our experience is organized on a basis of different chronological levels. Has this view any special bearing upon the psychology of dreams?

In the essay paper, one of the questions was: 'Affective-tone in dreams'. So a student in 1921 might not have been foolhardy by braving the examination equipped solely with a detailed knowledge of contemporary dream-theory, i.e. Freud and Rivers. The mainstream of the syllabus was just as clear in the DPM, where of the six questions on the Psychology Paper three were:

3. Describe what you mean by suggestion. Discuss its relation to the gregarious instinct.

4. Give a short description of the place of interest in psychology, and consider its relation to the 'Libido' of Freud and Jung.

6. Discuss the value of the distinction between the latent and the manifest content of the dream.²⁰

In 1922, the exam questions yielded, 'The Unconscious' for the elementary course essay, 'Discuss the meaning and value of the term "*libido*" on Paper IV alongside:

Distinguish the various meanings of the terms 'unconscious' and 'mind' in the phrase 'unconscious mind'. What evidence is there for the existence of unconscious mind in each of these senses?

But the *pièce de résistance* was a question set on Paper III, Friday, 2 June 1922: a transparent attempt, set by Rivers, to ferret out from his

20. Examination for DPM, Paper on 'Psychology', 13 October 1920, CUA.

undergraduates an answer to the besetting problem of the model of mind-body relations he had posed as an alternative to psychoanalysis:

‘The process of suppression by which elements of conscious experience pass into the unconscious is of the same order as nervous inhibition on the sensorimotor and reflex levels.’ How far does this analogy hold good?

Rivers was dead by the Sunday without reading the answers.

The death of Rivers met with widespread consternation in English university circles – prospective Parliamentary candidate for the Labour Party in the University of London, President of the Royal Anthropological Institute, unchallenged leader in both psychology and anthropology – the English Freud who would, in the 1920s, have made a fitting companion to Keynes in moving easily between the academic world and the world of public affairs.²¹ In Cambridge, they had to find someone who could fill in for both Myers and Rivers. Bartlett would take on to perfection the organizational functions of Myers, and moved into both the office of Myers at the Laboratory and Rivers’s rooms at St John’s College – a fine piece of symbolism. But who could fulfil Rivers’s role of intellectual leader and bring to fruition his project of making psychology and anthropology pay sufficient attention to psychoanalysis, extracting from Freud’s doctrines the useful, the English, essence? The perfect saviour seemed to be on hand.

John T. MacCurdy

MacCurdy was born in 1886, first son of Prof. James Frederick MacCurdy, Professor of Assyriology at the University of Toronto (Banister & Zangwill 1949). He studied biology at Toronto, graduating in 1906, and then pursued medical studies at Johns Hopkins University, gaining his M.D. in 1911. Elected to a Fellowship in Pathology at Johns Hopkins, he, like most aspiring scientists of the pre-war era, took it to Germany. In the previous year he had been a founder member of the American Psychopathological Association, another of Ernest Jones’s creations; before leaving for Germany he had spent two months in Toronto with Jones, who reported to Freud that MacCurdy was ‘taking up the work well’ (EJ/SF 8.2.11, p. 89) and regarded him as an important presence in Baltimore,

21. Bartlett’s many moving encomiums to Rivers’s memory include a final story, first revealed in the *College Magazine* in 1968: ‘A fortnight or so later [after Rivers’s death] I met him again, for the last time. I was in the Combination Room... There was one vacant chair. Then he came in, alert and quick as usual. He went to the empty chair and sat down. He had no face. Nobody else knew him, but I knew him. I tried to say, “Rivers! It’s Dr Rivers!” ... Then I woke up. I was in bed, at home. It was pitch dark. For what seemed like several minutes I was absolutely sure that he was there, in the deep darkness, close to me. It was a dream. We had talked many times about death. He had said that if he should die before me, as seemed likely... he would try to get through to me.’ (Bartlett 1968, p. 160)

which Jones hoped Adolf Meyer, Trigrant Burrow and MacCurdy would make a 'stronghold' of psychoanalysis. That stronghold became the location, on 9 May 1911, for the founding meeting of the American Psychoanalytic Association, with Putnam as President and Jones as Secretary; MacCurdy was one of the eight charter members at that meeting.²²

While in Europe, MacCurdy worked for a time in Alzheimer's laboratory at Munich but also made contact with other prominent German psychiatrists, including Jung. On his return to the USA in 1913, he was appointed Lecturer in Medical Psychology at Cornell and Assistant to August Hoch at the Psychiatric Institute of New York. He was still close to Jones, who relied on him – 'an excellent friend' – to administer the 'daily pin-pricks' to tip the balance in the struggle with Jung 'for the possession of Hoch's soul' (EJ/SF 8.3.13, p. 195).²³ By November 1913, the struggle with Jung for the soul – and the institutions – of psychoanalysis was even more pressing; Jones was now resident in London, had just founded the London Psycho-Analytical Society and was counting the small number of faithful in America on whom Freud could rely – in his view, only Brill and MacCurdy were unequivocally to be trusted. He approvingly quoted to Freud a letter from MacCurdy, which reveals the extent of MacCurdy's enthusiastic participation in the politicking besetting psychoanalysis:

Jung is bound to blow up sooner or later and it is my fervent prayer that he won't be too firmly bound to the *Internationale Vereinigung* when the eruption occurs. (McC. considers J. to be mentally disordered.). It certainly behoves us all to have a sane President for the next Congress. (EJ/SF 11.11.13, p. 237)

Jones failed to quote to Freud the final phrase of MacCurdy's paragraph concerning Jung; the whole sentence ran: 'It certainly behoves us all to have a sane president for the next congress and one who has some scientific Kudos outside of Ps-an.' This theme – of the standing of psychoanalysis in relation to other sciences – would bulk large in MacCurdy's later work.

Yet at the same time, MacCurdy was closely integrated into the private life of Jones's complex ménage. The principal matter of MacCurdy's letter to Jones whose excerpt Jones then transmitted to Freud had been their different moral visions of honour and relations between the sexes raised by news of the break-up of Jones's 'marriage' to Loe Kann, which had taken place during her analysis with Freud in the winter of 1912–13 (Appignanesi & Forrester 2005, pp. 226–39). MacCurdy, it was clear, was close to breaking off relations with Jones on account of 'the more overt

22. There is conflicting evidence whether MacCurdy did attend the first meeting – contrast Anon. 1938, p. 14 and Grinker 1995, p. 160.

23. Hoch had visited Jung in 1909, as documented in Trigrant Burrow's Letters; thanks to John Burnham for the clarification.

side of your *Liebesleben*²⁴ of which his friend Herbert Jones, who was now involved with Loe and would marry her in June 1914, had recently fully informed him (MacCurdy to Jones, 2.11.13, BPsaS CMB/FO3/02). Recalling that Ernest Jones had often pointed out his 'purity complex', MacCurdy responded with pride in his own moral posturing: 'As I have not had the advantage of an analysis, as you have had, I have insight but no cure visible'. MacCurdy reflected:

Our relations will not be essentially different from what they were before. . . . Ps-a. was always both the *raison d'être* and the *modus vivendi* of our companionship. And the interest which each of us has in our science cannot be altered by these ephemeral incidents.

Even before receiving this letter, Ernest Jones felt it wise to warn Freud that he might be approached in this connection:

MacCurdy also, who is strongly homosexual, is doing all he can to prevent the marriage, from motives of jealousy both of Loe and of Herbert, and has composed several letters to you asking that you use your influence against it, though I don't think he has been foolish enough actually to send any of them. He has not written to me at all, being gravely shocked at the revelations Herbert has made to him of my character. (EJ/SF 27.10.13, pp. 231–2)

It appears the Loe affair and the behaviour of the two Jones were putting MacCurdy under some strain; six months later, in May 1914, Ernest Jones wrote to Freud that 'MacCurdy, on whom I had built much hope, seems to have shewn a bad side in the Herbert Jones business (surely out of jealousy, for he is very homosexual), and this augurs badly for his $\Psi\alpha$ activity where character is at least as important as intellect' (EJ/SF 13.5.14, p. 278). Too true, one might reflect. Be that as it may, Freud clearly did some tidying up on Jones's behalf. In 1914, MacCurdy was in Vienna and, together with Loe Kann and Herbert Jones, attended a meeting of the Vienna Psycho-Analytic Society on 22 April (Nunberg & Federn 1975, p. 256); then or later he must have had meetings with Freud, since in July 1914 Jones wrote to Freud: 'I was amused to hear about your talk with MacCurdy, who seems to have crept into the background ever since' (EJ/SF 27.7.14, p. 296).

The exact details of MacCurdy's strong feelings about Jones's character and how these affected his attitude to psychoanalysis are unclear. But the principal factor affecting these relations must surely have been MacCurdy's marriage in these years, probably in 1914, to his close friend Herbert Jones's sister, Winifred (1889–1965). Herbert teamed up with Ernest Jones's partner Loe Kann at roughly the same time as MacCurdy proposed to his sister. No wonder MacCurdy's feelings about his psychoanalytic mentor Ernest Jones were complex! The MacCurdy marriage produced two children, Nora and

24. MacCurdy to Jones, 2.11.13, BPsaS CMB/FO3/02.

Thomas (born 13 December 1916); in the 1920 census the family resided on East 80th Street, with four servants.²⁵

On his return to the USA from Europe in 1913, MacCurdy's new mentor was August Hoch, Director of the Psychiatric Institute of the New York State Hospital System located on Ward's Island, having taken over from Adolf Meyer when he left for Johns Hopkins in 1909. Hoch followed Meyer in his eclectic encouragement of psychoanalytic ideas, and, obviously in part because of his poor relations with Brill (EJ/SF 3.6.10, 60), proposed with MacCurdy to form a Ward's Island Psychoanalytic Society attached to the International, independent of the newly formed New York Psychoanalytic Society.²⁶

Hoch was forced by ill health to retire in 1917; MacCurdy remained his devoted disciple, rushing to visit him in California as soon as he returned from the War in 1919, so that they could work on Hoch's magnum opus, a monograph on benign stupors and involuntional melancholia. In the event, Hoch died before its completion; MacCurdy, in a true labour of love, edited the mass of notes and cases and published it in 1921. Hoch had succeeded Putnam in 1913 as President of the American Psychoanalytic Association, with Jones as Secretary. With Jones's departure from North America, MacCurdy took on that position and would hold it from 1914 to 1920. It was during 1913 and 1914, MacCurdy later wrote, that he and Hoch 'spent some hundreds of hours together in reading critically what Freud had written' (MacCurdy 1923, p. xi).

With America's entry into the War in 1917, MacCurdy became the Assistant to Thomas Salmon, formerly in charge of psychiatric screening at Ellis Island, the gateway to America, and, since 1913, working at the National Committee for Mental Hygiene, founded by Clifford Beers, an ex-mental patient, to reform psychiatric institutions and advocate early, non-institutional treatment for the mentally ill, and now appointed to the American Expeditionary Forces (Shephard 2002, p. 124; Shorter 1997, p. 161). Salmon and MacCurdy travelled to England, where MacCurdy spent considerable time at Maghull, then Craiglockhart and in London with Maurice Nicoll; by mid-1918, Salmon's proposed elaborate preparations and precautions against making the mistakes of the British were in place. And then the War came to an end.

MacCurdy published an account of the lessons learned from his tour of the British hospitals and centres for the treatment of shell-shock in the

25. I would like to thank John Burnham and Vivian Gufarotti, Librarian at Mount Pleasantville Library, NY, for supplying this information.

26. MacCurdy to Jones, 2.11.13: 'We have formed a regular Verein at the Island to meet twice a month, Pres. – Hoch, Sec – MacC. Hoch has written Jung for letters patent' (BPsaS CMB/F03/02). This letter indicates that the proposed Ward Island Society was indeed a psychoanalytic society designed to affiliate to the IPA, not, as indicated in the editorial note in EJ/SF 11.11.13, p. 237 n. 1, a psychiatric society.

Bulletin of New York State Hospitals in July 1917; it was republished by Cambridge University Press as *War Neuroses*, with a lengthy and laudatory Preface by W.H.R. Rivers, in the summer of 1918. Together with Elliot Smith and Pear's 1917 polemic, *Shell Shock and Its Lessons*, to which Rivers thought MacCurdy's book was a natural sequel, of all the books on shell-shock it makes the strongest and clearest case for complex psychological causation and treatment. As Rivers put it in his Preface, the book brings out 'the essentially psychological character of the war neuroses' and shows 'to how great an extent the symptoms of neurosis are determined by mental factors, even when the main agent in the production of the neurosis is concussion or fatigue' (MacCurdy 1918, p. vi). As one might expect, given MacCurdy's pre-war enthusiastic Freudianism, there is a psychoanalytic framework; but, taking to heart the warning given in Elliot Smith and Pear's book that 'few terms in medicine have aroused so much misunderstanding, so much criticism, well-informed and ill-informed, and so much enmity as this word "psychoanalysis"' (Elliot Smith & Pear 1917, p. 73), MacCurdy avoided the words 'Freud' and 'psychoanalysis'. Nonetheless, in his Preface, Rivers highlighted the shibboleth that preoccupied him and many others, the theme of sexuality. Noting how sexuality was less prominent in war neuroses than psychoanalytic theory would lead one to expect, Rivers did seem to accept that there was a legitimate contrast to be drawn between war neuroses, stemming from disturbances of the 'relatively simple instinct of self-preservation', and the neuroses of civil life, which 'largely hinge upon factors connected with the far more complicated set of instincts associated with sex... [MacCurdy] believes that those who have shown a lack of adaptability to the stresses dependent on sex are also liable to fail in their adaptability to the stresses of warfare' (MacCurdy 1918, p. vii). It was not, however, the flexibility in relation to the sexual aetiology of the neuroses that was distinctively Freudian in MacCurdy's approach; rather, it was his emphasis on the 'wish'. MacCurdy advanced the view that there were two principal wishes involved in the war neuroses: the wish for death and the wish for a wound. Rivers formulated the thesis as follows:

Those who suffer from anxiety states have wished for death during the period of strain and fatigue preceding the final collapse, while sufferers from conversion hysteria have entertained the desire for disablement, for a 'Blighty' wound, or for some disabling illness. It is a striking fact that officers are especially prone to the occurrence of anxiety states, while privates are the chief victims of hysterical manifestations. Dr MacCurdy explains this fact by differences of education and responsibility which produce a different mental outlook towards the two chief means of escape from the rigours and horrors of warfare. (MacCurdy 1918, pp. vi-vii)

MacCurdy structured his book around the distinction between the officer and the private, building his account around two exemplary cases, one of

each class. This thesis concerning the differential incidence and aetiology of the neuroses of officers and men was to be repeated by Rivers in a paper on 'military training' published in October 1918 in a new though short-lived journal, *Mental Hygiene*, which was clearly a forum for the progressive psychiatrists mobilized by the War (Rivers 1918). These texts are the principal, perhaps the sole, sources published during the War to advance this 'class' thesis concerning shell-shock, which was then taken up after the war, with the principal source probably being Rivers's much-read book of 1920, *Instinct and the Unconscious*, which reprinted his 'military training' paper as Appendix IV. So it appears that MacCurdy is probably the source for this clinical insight, which, given the instability of diagnostic categories – MacCurdy did not employ the term 'neurasthenia', but concentrated on anxiety states and conversion hysteria – may well have been a clinical canard.²⁷

MacCurdy's emphasis on the classic Freudian wish, rather than an instinct for self-preservation, is buttressed by classic Freudian psychic mechanisms: 'Any man is often most fearful of that which he unconsciously most desires (MacCurdy 1918, p. 125), he declared. Like others influenced by Freud during the War, he highlighted nightmares and dreams both as presenting symptoms and as indices of the progress of treatment, since they provide the best window on to the shifting economy of the soldier's wishes and fears. While acknowledging the importance of physical factors, which play a larger factor in war neuroses than in those of peacetime, he insisted in his final sentence that 'It is only the physician who constantly maintains the psychological standpoint, however, who will be consistently successful in treating the war neuroses' (MacCurdy 1918, p. 128).

Back in the USA after the War, MacCurdy re-established himself in New York, living on 55th St. in Manhattan and in a fine country house some 30 miles north of the city, where in the spring of 1920 Siegfried Sassoon, on a celebrity lecture tour as poet, ex-neurotic, war hero and pacifist, was put in touch with MacCurdy by Rivers and spent some happy days losing at golf to his generous host (Sassoon 1973, p. 211). Despite MacCurdy's distress over Jones's private life, Jones still regarded MacCurdy as one of the very few psychoanalytic stalwarts in America. Following the founding of the British Psychoanalytical Society in February 1919, Jones wished to found an English-language journal under his control. In early 1916, MacCurdy had written to Freud to enquire about the fate of the German-language psychoanalytic journal, which he was clearly not receiving; Freud had reassured him:

27. For classic discussions, see Stone 1985 and Showalter 1985, pp. 174 ff.; for detailed discussion of this issue, which, on the basis of a comprehensive survey of all published writings on shell-shock during the War, questions whether doctors other than MacCurdy and Rivers perceived such a distinction, see Loughran 2006 esp. Ch. 2.

I do not know whether the organization of the Inter $\Psi\alpha$ A. will survive this crisis, but I hope that Ψ A itself will continue, and in this I count not to the least on the interest generated in America, which does not directly suffer from a war which it could shorten. My best thanks for your personal offer. You can do a lot for me, by taking the detour into our science. I hope you are doing this already, and do not feel obliged just to please me.²⁸

MacCurdy had already taken the 'detour' via psychoanalysis: when in 1923 he wrote his overview of psychoanalysis, for and against, he declared in the Preface that 'for eight years [i.e. since 1915] I have been treating [the psychoneuroses] in private practice, largely by psychoanalytic procedures' (MacCurdy 1923, p. x). So, by 1919, MacCurdy was, with Brill, the only 'American' Jones actively wished to include on the Editorial Board, alongside himself and another Englishman (Flügel) (EJ/SF 2.5.19, p. 344). In the event, Jones followed Brill's advice and did without an Editorial Board, so MacCurdy was not called on to be Jones's editorial assistant.

When Ferenczi in war-, revolution- and inflation-racked Budapest considered emigrating in early 1920, he asked Freud to write to Brill and MacCurdy to secure him passage to New York.²⁹ Freud replied that things were not so straightforward: 'about MacCurdy we know only that he has left the American group' (Freud 1920, p. 12). Although not quite true – he had not paid his dues as of July 1920, as Brill informed Jones – this was prophetic. With MacCurdy as Secretary following Jones's departure in 1913, the American Psychoanalytic Association had lapsed into inactivity.³⁰ In March 1920, Jones told Rank that MacCurdy was very lukewarm about the new journal and would not serve as assistant editor in charge of psychiatry, nor would he promise a paper for it.³¹ Brill warned Jones in June 1920 that MacCurdy 'never wished to be absolutely identified with' psychoanalysis.³² At its meeting in 1920, its President Brill confessed he had had difficulty convening a meeting through lack of interest.

Some of the members thought it advisable to discontinue the Society in that it had outlived its usefulness... the reason given for the discontinuing of the

28. Sigmund Freud to John T. MacCurdy, 24 January 1916. Unpublished letter in MacCurdy Collection, Archives of Dept of Experimental Psychology, University of Cambridge. Letter transcribed and translated Martin Eimo, 24.7.98.

29. Ferenczi, S.(1920) Letter from Sándor Ferenczi to Sigmund Freud, 20 March 1920. *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi, Vol. 3, 1920–1933*, pp. 9–12.

30. MacCurdy to Jones, 2.11.13, in response to Jones's suggestion to put forward MacCurdy's name as Secretary of the APA, MacCurdy wrote: 'As to the proposal... Really, Dr. Jones, it is a matter of indifference to me... However, if the others agree that I am best qualified to attend to the necessary work, I am only too willing to accept the responsibility' (BPsaS CMB/F03/02).

31. Jones to Rank, 3.3.20 (BPsaS CRA/FO6/10).

32. Brill to Jones, 17.6.20 (BPsaS CBD/FO2/08).

organization was that since psychoanalysis had made such strides in this country, the so-called propaganda function, originally perhaps a very important function of the American Psychoanalytical Society, was now unnecessary. (Anon. 1920c, pp. 211–12)³³

MacCurdy and others ‘wanted it to “die a natural death”; he saw no need for it’.³⁴ However, the attending members voted to continue the Society and then turned to scientific matters, hearing a thoroughly orthodox paper by MacCurdy concerning a woman patient with a hysteric or mild psychotic depression, where the chief interest lay in the problem of resolving the strongly erotic transference, which had developed into delusional states. In May 1920, then, it is clear that MacCurdy still remained a psychoanalytic stalwart in theoretical orientation even if he was in the process of distancing himself from psychoanalytic organizations.

The institutional crisis in America of the early 1920s did highlight a problem with the dissemination of Freudian ideas: the more popular and more familiar they became, the fewer professionals were enthusiastic enough to commit themselves to a Society devoted to their discussion (Hale 1995, pp. 13–24). What need was there for a separate Society when Freudian ideas had become so well established? The idea of disbanding did not go away: at the annual meeting in 1921 the Association again considered dissolution by merging with the American Psychopathological Association, of which MacCurdy became President in 1922 (Banister & Zangwill 1949, p. 1). In the end, the Association again re-affirmed the ‘definite need of a national psychoanalytical organization, as a recognized body, to give psychoanalysis the scientific standing it deserves’ (Stern 1921, p. 251). At some point in these years, MacCurdy began to feel otherwise. While working on Hoch’s manuscript on benign stupors in 1920, which would also develop into his own major study published in 1925, *The Psychology of Emotion, Morbid and Normal*, he corresponded with Morton Prince, the grand old man of American psychopathology, who had become unremittingly hostile to psychoanalysis. Although MacCurdy made clear to Prince why he continued to adhere to basic psychoanalytic axioms – ‘the motives for all our activity are irrational from a coldly scientific standpoint’ – he also confessed the reasons why he was now abandoning his former psychoanalytic friends:

I turn to you, rather than to any psychoanalytic friend, for the simple reason that most of them are, like J[ones], incapable of distinguishing between fact and interpretation. If I asked them for facts, I know full well that I would be given not original observations but a reference to the Koran or some mixture of fact

33. The fact that they had forgotten that the original name of the organization was ‘Association’, not ‘Society’, is surely symptomatic.

34. Brill to Jones, 17.6.20 (BPsaS CBD/FO2/08).

and interpretation. All methods lead to results, some rather directly, and others only if followed with equal industry and imagination. I think that psychoanalysis is as near to being a royal road to truth as any method we have in psychopathology. But a fool who cannot distinguish between the road and its terminus is not a useful guide even though he be on the right road. To put it strongly, I would rather listen to a voice like yours crying in the wilderness than to the shouts of those hawking their wares along the highroad. (MacCurdy 1920, p. 7)

Given such a position, MacCurdy may have unconsciously been looking for his place in the wilderness.³⁵ Events now conspired to offer him the ideal location.

In Cambridge, there was an urgent need for someone to fill the gaping hole left by the departure of Myers and the death of Rivers, to fill the new Psychopathology Lectureship expressly designed to re-orient psychology and make up for the failure of the Addenbrooke's Clinic project and Prideaux's departure to a permanent position at the Ministry of Pensions.³⁶ MacCurdy was suddenly available. Sometime around 1922, Winifred MacCurdy met in Santa Barbara a New York stockbroker, Harold Sterling Gladwin (1883–1983), who had just sold his seat on the New York Stock Exchange and was now pursuing full-time his enthusiasm for archaeology. They became inseparable, eventually marrying in 1933, and devoted themselves to Gila Pueblo Archaeological Foundation in Globe, Arizona, founded by Gladwin with Winifred's help in 1928. MacCurdy's children changed their names to Gladwin.³⁷ With the failure of his marriage, MacCurdy wished to change his life.³⁸ Immediately following Rivers's

35. Once installed in Cambridge, MacCurdy invited Prince, evidently in England for the International Psychological Congress held at Oxford at the end of July, to give a series of lectures on 'Hypnosis as a method of psychological investigation' on 23-25.7.23 (see *CUR*, 1922-23).

36. Prideaux left in September 1921, after two years in the position. His replacement for some months was Dr J.P. Lowson, who after the War, had been appointed Demonstrator in Experimental Psychology in the Laboratory; he contributed a classically orthodox account of Freud's method of interpreting dreams to *Psyche* in 1921-22. Lowson left for Australia in 1922 to become Research Professor of Medical Psychology at University of Queensland in Brisbane, publishing papers in the same spirit of eclectic support for psychoanalysis (Lowson 1924, 1926; and Damousi 2005, pp. 39, 40, 44-6). Following Rivers's death, Lowson also wrote a comparison of his dream theory and Freud's, much to Freud's benefit; he claimed that Rivers, had he lived, would have revised his theories to recognize the comprehensiveness of Freud's theories (Lowson 1923, p. 111). His successor at Addenbrooke's for some months in 1922 was Dr Archdale, Superintendent at Fulbourn, who himself left in November 1922 and was followed by Dr P.C. Cloake, who held the position for a year and also lectured on 'Social and Abnormal Psychology' in the University Laboratory (see Rook, Carlton & Cannon 1991, pp. 313, 315, 320-1).

37. http://treefic.com/treefic/billjones?a=tree_page&format=rawhtml&root_id=153&ancg=1&descg=1&zoom=1, accessed 19 September 2007.

38. Bury 1952, pp. 260-2: 'He had married in 1914 and had one son and one daughter, but to his great and lasting sorrow there was a separation in 1922, and this was the immediate

death in June, MacCurdy was invited to give lectures in Cambridge in Michaelmas Term 1922; the course he offered was on 'Dreams and the Unconscious', a ghostly reminder of the spirit of Rivers. On 22 January 1923, a notice advertising the Lectureship in Psychopathology was printed in the *University Reporter*. The proposed salary was the agreed £175, a rather paltry sum, 'together with such further payment as may be made by the Medical Grant Committee from the funds at their disposal' (*CUR* 23.1.23, p. 580); one can compare this with Myers's original proposal in February 1919 for the Director of the Addenbrooke's Psychological Clinic, planned to be R.G. Rows, for which the 1922 proposal of a University Lectureship in Psychopathology was a clever, very Myers-like substitute:

His income should be £1000 a year. It would be impossible to secure the services of an able and properly trained physician for less. Each patient generally needs an hour's interview and treatment at the outset. The work is consequently exacting and private practice should, if possible, be forbidden. At the present moment, legislation is wanting which would permit of payment by Local Authorities. But the Medical Research Committee is empowered to make grants for medical research, and University Authorities may give an annual stipend for teaching in connection with such work.³⁹

The independently wealthy MacCurdy was appointed to the position on 26 March.⁴⁰ He gained a Fellowship at Corpus Christi College, whose Master, E.C. Pearce, then Vice-Chancellor and Chair of the Appointments Committee that appointed him, was also President of the Cambridgeshire Voluntary Association for Mental Welfare and had been party, as a member from its inception of the Mental Hygiene Committee, to all of Myers's attempts to set up the Psychological Clinic. If Cambridge could not have Rows, if Cambridge had lost Myers and Rivers, it had gained Ernest Jones's psychoanalytic protégé, former Secretary of the American Psychoanalytic Association, John T. MacCurdy.

John T. MacCurdy moved into rooms in Old Court in Corpus Christi College and remained a resident Fellow until his death in 1947. The most telling fact about MacCurdy's long tenure of his post was that he never bothered to acquire the English medical qualifications that even he, a graduate of one of the most prestigious medical schools in the world,

reason for his coming to England.' This was written in 1952 by Patrick Bury, Fellow and Librarian, who must have known MacCurdy quite well. The fact of MacCurdy's marriage and the existence of his two children is corroborated by references in a letter he wrote to Ernest Jones (BPsaS 11.2.20 CMB/FO3/04). I would like to thank Robin Myers, Corpus Christi College, and Jacqueline Cox, University Archives, Cambridge, for supplying material relating to MacCurdy.

39. [Charles S. Myers], 'Scheme for the treatment of early mental disorder', p. 3.

40. From the Minutes of the Faculty Board of Biology 'B' for the period 1926–39, one can ascertain that MacCurdy's salary at appointment was £300; in 1927 he was successful in requesting a supplement of £50 p.a. His salary remained at this level well into the 1930s.

Johns Hopkins, required to practise and see patients.⁴¹ As Zangwill, who was a student of MacCurdy's and knew him well, noted, he 'never took any interest in the Department of Medicine', even though his formal duties were originally attached to that Department. In 1924–5, teaching for the Diploma was undertaken not by MacCurdy but by Emanuel Miller, one of a number of Cambridge-trained doctors, which included John Rickman and J.R. Rees (both King's College) just pre-war who would have a great influence on the development of psychoanalysis in Britain.⁴² MacCurdy's decision to 'retreat' to Cambridge was in effect also a withdrawal from involvement with the clinical field to which he had been appointed. As a flicker of recognition of the field which was his former enthusiasm, MacCurdy did offer six lectures in the Easter Term of 1927 on 'Theory and Practice of Psycho-Analysis'; but these were never repeated.

MacCurdy's appointment at Cambridge coincided with the publication of his critical appraisal of psychoanalysis, *Problems in Dynamic Psychology*. Within a few days of publication, this stock-taking of his years as a solid supporter of psychoanalysis elicited from Freud the comment that 'he is as impudent in his praise as in his criticism of my work and person. Lack of manners is a common character of these Americans' (SF/EJ 27.3.23, p. 517). MacCurdy's book was a substantial piece of work, drawing on his experience as a psychiatrist and on his eight years of private psychoanalytical practice in New York, seeking to find internal consistency in the confusion of concepts and hypotheses in the field of psychoanalysis, due in part to the scattered nature of Freud's writings, in part to the diverse and partial ways in which his work had been taken up by others, in part to the strong weight of subjective factors inherent in the very nature of psychoanalytic interpretation and in part due to the selective availability of material from patients, who leave analysis as soon as they are relieved of most of their symptoms (MacCurdy 1923, pp. 4–5). Taking account of the publication in 1920 of two important works, the translation of Freud's *Introductory Lectures* and Rivers's *Instinct and the Unconscious*, MacCurdy thought the time was ripe to attempt a critical and systematic exposition of the foundational concepts and findings of Freud's science of the unconscious. In the interests of that science, he would make it a no

41. Letter from Prof. Oliver Zangwill to Dr Colin Crampton, 13 February 1979, interleaved in copy of Crampton's dissertation held by Dept of Experimental Psychology, Cambridge.

42. Miller had come up to St. John's College in 1911 and had read first natural and then moral sciences (Thom 2004). Taking his medical qualifications at the London Hospital during the War, Miller had returned to Cambridge and taken the DPM in 1921. Myers offered him a post in Cambridge (G. 1970) – perhaps the Lectureship in Psychopathology which MacCurdy took, perhaps the Demonstratorship that Lawson had occupied for some years – but Miller decided to make his base in London, becoming a freelance Freudian and founder of the first child guidance clinic in Britain, but never submitting to the orthodoxy required of a member of the British Psychoanalytical Society.

holds barred account – which he certainly did. His criticisms were sharp, but were matched by his extravagant praise – and this applied as much, indeed more, to Rivers's theories, which he judged 'such a mixture of error and inspiration' (MacCurdy 1923, p. 251). The book is a well-informed piece of admirably sustained ambivalence, taking with one hand and then, in a remote part of the book, giving back with the other. Freud's concepts are demolished in the 100-page first of the four parts and then resurface, without being attributed to Freud, as the basic elements of MacCurdy's own account of the instinctual basis of psychopathology. As James Glover observed, reviewing on behalf of the faithful Freudians, MacCurdy displays a 'curious conjunction of perfectly sincere acknowledgement of the importance and value of Freud's contributions to the "Problems of Dynamic Psychology" with a sustained and skilful attempt to show that it is, beyond a few general ideas, of very little real value after all' (Glover 1924, p. 384). This is accurate. MacCurdy's logical scalpel at work on Freud's concepts wreaks havoc. And then, repeatedly, in a passage close by, he attributes virtually the whole of the modern science of psychology to Freud's epochal work. For instance:

For close on to a decade I have been dissatisfied with the exclusive importance placed by Freud on the sexual as an explanation of practically all psychopathological phenomena. (MacCurdy 1923, p. 254)

This makes MacCurdy sound like one of those who from the start regretted Freud's general emphasis on sexuality. But the very next sentence reads:

This dissatisfaction was not a matter of incredulity as to alleged findings but with the interpretation of the data. In studying the trend of false ideas in the constitutional psychoses I found it almost exclusively sexual in type and yet I found evidence of another factor combining with the sexual, namely egoism.

From 1914 on, MacCurdy claims, he asserted the importance of the ego instincts and the social instincts. Now, with Rivers's emphasis on the self-preservative instincts in the war neuroses and Trotter's work on the herd instincts, MacCurdy is vindicated. Elaborating his own theories of the interplay between sex, ego and herd instincts, he gives a new framework and can thus write, without a qualm, that a lapse into a morbid psychological condition may arise from external frustration, so that:

the process of regression leads to an attempt at unconscious satisfaction. Since the unconscious is constituted largely of egoistic sex cravings the immediate determinants of the ensuing symptoms may be sexual, without the general cause of the disease having much to do with sex. (MacCurdy 1923, p. 364)

It is a curious performance, the mauling of Freud alternating with his parroting – made even more curious because in a dense 40-page chapter, he performs the same surgical dissection and magical resurrection on Rivers's body of work.

MacCurdy would continue to enact his respectful indebtedness to the psychoanalysts combined with his orotund criticisms in a series of later books, the most substantial of which was *Common Principles in Psychology and Physiology* (1928), an attempt to root psychology in biology and physiology on the basis of his reading of Sherrington's work on the integrative action of the nervous system, Koehler's studies of the mentality of apes and Child's studies of the physiology of the nervous system. Yet it became increasingly clear that MacCurdy had cut himself loose from empirical work of any kind and was becoming an astute commentator on other people's scientific findings and theories. His major contribution, he thought, was his 'pattern theory', in which he attempted to capture the 'immaterial agency specific to psychology', those 'unconscious and instinctive agencies underlying our conscious mental life' (MacCurdy 1928, p. 31). This emphasis on 'patterns' might be viewed as foreshadowing later developments in psychology: akin to Bartlett's influential 'schemas' published in final form in *Remembering* (1932), a precursor of 'systems theory', a proto-structuralism, even cousin to the influential 'patterns' found in American cultural anthropology. But it was not a developed theory, nor was it influential. And this book, like his others, is littered with asides re-assessing psychoanalysis, re-interpreting its data, endorsing it from his newly clarified theoretical position – for instance: 'Freud and his followers have attempted to compose [the unconscious] out of elements used by introspective psychology, and have fabricated a system of wishes and fantasies which cannot satisfy a rigorous critic. Prejudiced opponents can demolish the system and then comfortably neglect the evidence' (MacCurdy 1928, p. 258).

MacCurdy the rigorous critic wrote three more slim books. *Mind and Money: A Psychologist Looks at the Crisis* (1932) and *Germany, Russia and the Future: A Psychological Essay* (1944) were social commentaries from a psychological perspective. *The Structure of Morale* was prepared in 1942 from 'lectures for students coming to Cambridge wanting to receive instruction on methods of selection and training of personnel' – it was a part of MacCurdy's war-work, which included working in a special 'Black propaganda' unit of the Foreign Office where he wrote pamphlets encouraging German soldiers to feign illness or induce a non-fatal illness which would save their lives – induction of violent diarrhoea was a MacCurdy strategy (Richards (2002)).⁴³ The Preface to the book thanked 'Mr Herbert Jones for his tireless skill in the dull task of editing and correcting the typescript for publication'. Herbert Jones – divorced from

43. Lee Richards (2002) 'Black' Propaganda: British Subversive Psychological Warfare During World War II <http://www.psywar.org/malingering.php> [accessed 21.9.07]; thanks to Ben Shephard for this reference.

Loe Kann in 1938⁴⁴, and remarried (to Olwen, née Jones), who bore him a son, Herbert, in 1940 – was still a close friend of MacCurdy's. Perhaps the figure of Ernest Jones was determining for both their lives in ways we can no longer perceive.

There are other mysteries surrounding MacCurdy's life. 'Perhaps at his best when the port was circulating after dinner round the table in the Common Room at Corpus, the College which became his home in England' (Banister & Zangwill 1949, p. 4), his life was apparently divided into two halves, a youthful career in North America as a pioneer psychoanalytic psychiatrist and a career almost in retirement as a Cambridge don in psychology who eschewed both experimental and clinical work. The clean rupture in his life may have been caused by the break-up of his marriage, but that clean rupture also coincided with his declaration of independence from Freud, Jones and all the other psychoanalysts. In this respect he was a cultural weather-vane: the tide of general, frenzied and chaotic enthusiasm mixed with panic surrounding psychoanalysis in Britain began to turn in 1923. Even his retreat into the quiet courts of Corpus Christi College was in time with the temper of the University, as the new Statutes and administrative structures imposed solid order and inherent conservatism on the shaping of disciplines and research initiatives. In another respect, MacCurdy became the quintessential Cambridge don, in his love of and adeptness at dialectical and inquisitorial discussion, in which he who plays the part of the devil's advocate wins most plaudits. 'Few of his students agreed with him – for long at least', his obituarist-colleagues concluded, quite aware of the ironies of this observation.

Yet he had at least two influential students whose interests flowed at times in the direction of psychoanalysis: Gregory Bateson and Ralph Pickford, both of whom he thanked in *Common Principles*, above all the latter. Bateson's concept of schismogenesis, first set out in his enigmatic classic anthropological monograph *Naven* (1936), owed much to MacCurdy's interrogation and informed comments from the angle of psychopathology.⁴⁵ Pickford 1940 (1903–1986)⁴⁶ read Part I Natural Sciences, but then switched

44. <http://www.talachddu.demon.co.uk/genealogy/ppl/a/8/a84e9c3575c36e5aa0d.html>, accessed 22 September 2006.

45. Bateson ([1936] 1958) pp. 180, 182, 185, n. 1; see Wardle 1999.

46. Pickford came from a family who had strong links with Cambridge: his uncle, Rev. J. Cyril Flower, an Anglican priest was a research student in Cambridge, had become a member of the Medical Section of the BPS in the early 1920s and wrote *An Approach to the Psychology of Religion* (1927), an important study based on his work with Rivers on the religion of the Winnebago Indians, the Winnebago Peyote Cult and the religious experiences of George Fox, founder of Quakerism (Richards 2000, pp. 65–6). Pickford's older sister Grace (1902–1986) (Slack 2003) read natural sciences at Cambridge in 1921–25, then undertook research in South Africa as a Newnham Exhibitioner, where she married fellow Cambridge student G. Evelyn Hutchinson and moved with him to

to Psychology in the Moral Sciences Tripos, gaining a First in 1927 and then a Cambridge doctorate in psychology in 1932. He became one of the most wide-ranging of mid-century British psychologists, with interests extending from aesthetics, in particular, music, painting and the psychology of art, via hypnotism to colour vision (including the design of an anomaloscope), becoming the first President of the Experimental Psychology group founded (as if to restart British psychology in an anti-Myersian mode, as a predominantly university-based, indeed Oxbridge-based, experimental project) in 1946.⁴⁷ From 1930 on, he worked at Glasgow University, increasingly drawn to psychoanalysis and psychotherapy alongside his interests in colour vision and defects, undergoing analysis and practising regularly as a therapist at the Davidson Clinic. In 1954 he published a book-length single case-study, *Analysis of an Obsessional*, recounting a treatment employing his loosely Freudian technique. Pickford respectfully cited MacCurdy's work in a series of papers in the 1940s on *déjà vu*, which, predictably enough, were criticized by psychoanalytic writers for citing MacCurdy where he should have cited Freud (Pickford 1940, 1942; Eisler 1942; Fenichel 1947). However, in an interview conducted in 1973, Pickford, adopting a trenchantly critical tone, singled out psychoanalysis as the one area of psychology where Bartlett's and MacCurdy's blind spots were visible and positively detrimental:

At Cambridge [in the late 20s], psychoanalysis was very much under a cloud. MacCurdy spoke about it but always in a critical way, and Bartlett (and other people) in his discussions used to spend a lot of time raising objections to Freudian psychology. In fact I suppose in a sense it was the only real gap in Bartlett's understanding of psychology, from my point of view at present, that he had no use for psychoanalysis and no insight whatever into its importance...later on I gradually came to realize its importance, although it was a long process, at first involving the gradual breakdown of the many rationalized objections to psychoanalysis which I had learned to admire at Cambridge and then the gradual application of psychoanalytic insights to everyday phenomena and people's problems – not only other people's but my own – and discovering the importance of it as an illuminating branch of study. (Pickford 1973)

Recounting his slow and steady immersion in psychoanalysis, through working with patients at the Western Infirmary, part of the Glasgow Royal Mental Hospital, he remembered how 'one or two special patients I had gave me extraordinary insight into psychoanalysis, and I realized that

Yale in 1928. She remained at Yale for the rest of her career, developing an international reputation for her expertise on the octopus group and becoming in 1969 the first woman biologist to be appointed full Professor.

47. The group was soon renamed Experimental Psychology Society and ever since has been known as the EPS; see John Mollon, 'History of the EPS' <http://www.eps.ac.uk/society/meetings.html>

everything that Freud had said was true, even if one did not believe in the basic materialistic and deterministic doctrines of Freudian psychology'. For Pickford, in a sense the whole of Cambridge-style psychology was structured around the exclusion of psychoanalysis:

Those people who attack psychoanalysis on the grounds of scientific inadequacy and various logical objections do not understand in the least its importance in relation to real human problems. In fact, in the course of pursuing the more respectable forms of scientific psychology, you do not even meet these problems and are more or less defended against ever seeing them. One has to pass through a kind of change of outlook in order to realize what is not being seen in what is called conscious or standard experimental scientific psychology.⁴⁸

Another younger man indebted to MacCurdy's presence in Cambridge was R.D. Gillespie, in 1927 the first holder of the Darwin-Pinsent Studentship established by the Darwin and Pinsent families in memory of their War dead (including David Pinsent, Wittgenstein's lover); Gillespie advanced his influential concept of 'reactive depression' under the influence of MacCurdy and Hoch's work on melancholia (Gillespie 1929) at the same time as he was completing, with the senior author David Henderson (himself an old colleague of MacCurdy's from the vigorous days at Ward's Island, New York before the War, when Hoch and MacCurdy founded the Ward's Island Psychoanalytic Society (Oberndorf 1949, p. 157), the first British textbook of psychiatry, always known as 'Henderson and Gillespie'.⁴⁹

In addition to stimulating gifted students, MacCurdy is reputed to have been 'largely responsible for the policy adopted by the University concerning nervous breakdowns before examinations. While he freely gave advice, in general he refused to undertake treatment' (Bury 1952, p. 261). However, there is a hint in James Strachey's correspondence with Alix that in his first years in Cambridge MacCurdy was psychoanalysing patients.⁵⁰

MacCurdy's love for and gratitude towards Cambridge and his College is expressed in his Will,⁵¹ in which he left the content of his University superannuation policies taken out in 1924 and 1927 to the University 'for the provision and maintenance of a collection of psychopathological works in some library' in the University, the core of which was his own library of works in psychology, psychopathology and medicine. The balance of his estate was left to his friend Will Spens, Master of Corpus Christi College as a

48. Interview with Ralph Pickford, 4.6.73, Manchester, conducted by Mr Kana, BPS.

49. The second holder of the Darwin-Pinsent Studentship was Lionel Penrose (see Cameron & Forrester 2000, p. 208).

50. James to Alix Strachey, 1.12.24, BL Strachey Papers Add. 60714 Vol. LX: 'The last time I saw him (Mr. C.) he said he'd been analysed by MacCurdy [*sic*], which would about correspond.'

51. Drawn up 26 Nov 1937; John Thompson MacCurdy, died 1.7.47, Principal Probate Registry, 16.10.47, note as to residence 18.2.48. See also *CUR* 11.11.47.

Life Tenancy, reverting to the College on his death; MacCurdy's estate now, entirely aptly, funds the Annual Feast for members of the College. There is no mention of any relatives at all in MacCurdy's will and no mention of any American estate. It as if, after 1923, he only had an existence in Cambridge.

But it appears he had another life. He remained listed as a member of the American Psychiatric Association until the 1940s⁵²; he was a Consultant Psychiatrist and Physician to the Northern Westchester Hospital, 30 miles or so north of New York City, from 1919 to 1943⁵³ and was registered as having two practices, one in Pleasantville, New York (adjacent to Northern Westchester Hospital) and one on Park Avenue in New York City.⁵⁴ Did MacCurdy live a double life, both Cambridge don and New York psychiatrist, for 20 years? Or did he just leave behind in New York City and Pleasantville traces of a former life – psychiatric practices, ex-wife and children – from which the walls of his Cambridge College separated him definitively for good? It certainly appears that the psychoanalytic persona of MacCurdy went the way of his wife, children and any clinical practice tied to his published work. The permanent trace in Cambridge of that persona is the MacCurdy Psychopathological Library in the Department of Experimental Psychology, a specialist collection unusually well stocked with the principal psychoanalytical and psychopathological books and journals, in German and English, of the early twentieth century. Virtually nobody in that building knows why a Department mythically dedicated from its inception to experimental psychology should possess a library of psychoanalytic works going back to its very beginnings. The enigmatic life of John T. MacCurdy – and the psychoanalytic ferment of 1919 – provides a partial, yet tantalizing, answer.

Concluding Remarks

In 1919 the founders of experimental psychology pronounced the verdict that it was a failed research programme and simultaneously caught the wave of post-war psychoanalytic enthusiasm. The initial foundation of the BPsaS bears the marks of this ephemeral historical moment: the timing of its foundation and its constitution (the class of 'Associate Members') reveal that Ernest Jones was caught between the organizational imperatives emanating from Vienna and those emanating from Cambridge, as

52. Email from Diane Richardson, Special Collections Librarian, Oskar Diethelm Library, Institute for the History of Psychiatry, 15 Aug. 2006.

53. See *Medical Directory of New York, 1935–1936*, New York: The Medical Society of the State of New York, Hospitals of New York State, Vol. XXXVII, pp. 529–78.

54. Joanna Faraday, M.L.S., AHIP, Hal Federman, M.D. Health Sciences Library, Northern Westchester Hospital, 400 East Main Street, Mount Kisco, NY 10549, Email: jfaraday@nwhc.net, Email dated: 11 Aug. 2006.

psychology was reconfigured for the inter-war period. The opening up of Cambridge psychology to psychoanalysis was not to last; but neither was the openness of the fledgling British Psychoanalytical Society to endure. With the introduction in 1925 of the IPA's Eitingon Committee proposals regarding training, the new Institute of Psycho-Analysis became the centre of gravity of Jones's British psychoanalytic institutions: attention was focused on professional training rather than scientific inquiry, the flow of new members ceased and a period of relative stagnancy, at least in terms of numbers and communications with other comparable bodies, was the result. The institutions of Cambridge closed up for entirely different reasons, stemming from its new Statutes and from the new financial regime – the era in science of government and foundation funding, a regime from which psychoanalysis was excluded – or excluded itself. But for a brief period of fluidity after the Great War, not only was there a psychoanalytic network based in Cambridge (Cameron & Forrester 2000), linking to Vienna directly (the Stracheys, Rickman, Tansley, Ramsey and others), but the institutional innovations of psychology and psychoanalysis were bound up together as Jones and Myers vied in their institutional empire-building. What if Rivers had lived? – the question that haunted British psychology and anthropology in the 1920s – and what if he had given up his Cambridge post not for Melanesia but, like Tansley, for analysis in Vienna with Freud? The salutary answer to such historical what-ifs is the story of J.T. MacCurdy, Jones's psychoanalytic student, who turned away from psychoanalysis to embrace the quiet, cloistered life of the Cambridge don, wedded to claret and critical wit.

Abbreviations

- BMS - Board of Moral Science, Minutes, Cambridge University, Cambridge University Archives
- BPsaS - Archives of the British Psychoanalytical Society
- BPS - Archives of the British Psychological Society
- CUA - Cambridge University Archives
- CUR* - *Cambridge University Reporter*
- EJ/SF or SF/EJ - Letter from Ernest Jones to Sigmund Freud, or from Sigmund Freud to Ernest Jones, followed by date and page number in: *The Complete Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Ernest Jones, 1908–1939*, ed. R. Andrew Paskauskas, introduction by Riccardo Steiner, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993
- CRO - Speeches at Special Meeting (SM), Conference held at County Hall, Cambridge, convened by the Cambridgeshire Voluntary Association for the Mentally Defective, 13 January 1919, together with other papers, Cambridgeshire Record Offices, Ref. R84/23

References

- Allbutt, C. (1910) Neurasthenia. In C. Allbutt and H. Rolleston (eds), *System of Medicine, second edn (1905–1911)*, vol. 8. London: Macmillan
- Allcock, J.A.M. (1920) A presidential view. *The New Age* 27, No. 22, 30 Sept: 317.
- Allderidge, P. (1991) The foundation of the Maudsley Hospital. In G.E. Berrios and H. Freeman, *150 Years of British Psychiatry, 1841–1991*. London: Gaskell, pp. 79–88.
- Anon. (1919) *New Cambridge*, 4 Dec. 1919.
- Anon. (1920a) Discussion of a Report. *Cambridge University Reporter*, 10 December.
- Anon. (1920b) Reports of the International Psycho-Analytical Association. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 1: 114–24.
- Anon. (1920c) Reports of the International Psycho-Analytical Association—Sixth Congress of the International Psycho-Analytical Association. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 1: 208–21.
- Anon. (1921) Annual Meeting, Royal Medico-Psychological Association, 13 July 1921, Discussion. *Journal of Mental Science* 67, Oct: 525–32.
- Anon. (1922) *The Times*, 3 Oct, p. 7.
- Anon. (1923) *Cambridge University Reporter*, 23 Jan, p. 580.
- Anon. (1926) List of Members of the International Psycho-Analytical Association. *Bulletin of the International Psychoanalytic Association* 7: 144–53.
- Anon. (1938) History of the American Psychoanalytic Association: Charter Members Former Officers, and Previous Meetings. *Bulletin of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 1: 12–17.
- Appignanesi, L. & Forrester, J. (2005) *Freud's Women*. London: Orion.
- Armstrong-Jones, R. (1916) Functional nervous disease. *The Lancet*, 22 Jan.
- Banister, H. & Zangwill, O.L. (1949) John Thomson MacCurdy, 1886–1947. *British Journal of Psychology (General Section)* 40: 1–4.
- Bartlett, F.C. (1932) *Remembering: A Study in Experimental and Social Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bartlett, F.C. (1937) Cambridge, England, 1887–1937. *American Journal of Psychology* 50: 97–110.
- Bartlett, F.C. (1968) W.H.R. Rivers. *The Eagle* 62: 156–60. Cambridge: St John's College.
- Bateson, G. (1936) *Naven: A Survey of the Problems Suggested by a Composite Picture of a New Guinea Tribe Drawn from Three Points of View*. California: Stanford University Press, 1958.
- Brooke, C.N.L. (1993) *A History of the University of Cambridge, 1870–1990*, vol. 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Brown, W. (1916) Functional nervous disease. *The Lancet*, 29 Jan.
- Bury, P. (1952) *The College of Corpus Christi and the Blessed Virgin Mary: A History from 1822 to 1952*. Cambridge: Printed for the College.
- Cameron, L. & Forrester, J. (2000) Tansley's psychoanalytic network: an episode out of the early history of psychoanalysis in England. *Psychoanalysis and History* 2(2): 189–256.
- Cerullo, J.J. (1982) *The Secularization of the Soul: Psychical Research in Modern Britain*. Philadelphia, PA: Institute for the Study of Human Issues.
- Clark, D.H. (1987) The Story of a Mental Hospital: Fulbourn, 1858–1987. http://www.psychanalysis-and-therapy.com/human_nature/clark/chap2.html, accessed 20.9.07
- Crampton, C. (1978) *The Cambridge School: The Life, Work and Influence of James Ward, W.H.R. Rivers, C.S. Myers and Sir Frederic Bartlett*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Edinburgh.
- Culpin, M. (1949) An autobiography. *Occupational Psychology* 23: 139–52.

- Damousi, J. (2005) *Freud in the Antipodes: A Cultural History of Psychoanalysis in Australia*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.
- Edgell, B. (1947) The British Psychological Society. *British Journal of Psychology* 37: 113–32.
- Eisler, E.R. (1942) Abstract and comment. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 11: 280.
- Elliot Smith, G. & Pear, T.H. (1917) *Shell Shock and Its Lessons*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Fauvel, A. (2006) Les mots des sciences de l'homme: psychiatrie. *Pour l'Histoire des Sciences de l'Homme. Bulletin de la SFHSH*, printemps-été 2006: 43–51.
- Fenichel, O. (1947) Abstract and commentary. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 16: 125.
- Forrester, J. (2006) Remembering and forgetting Freud in early twentieth-century dreams. *Science in Context* 19(1): 65–85.
- Freud, S. (1920) Letter from Sigmund Freud to Sándor Ferenczi, March 15, 1920. *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi, Vol. 3, 1920–1933*, eds P. Giampieri-Deutsch and A. Haynal. Trans. I. Meyer-Palmedo and P.T. Hoffer and Intro. J. Dupont. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- G.H. (1970) Dr Emanuel Miller. *The Lancet*, 15 Aug: 375.
- Gauld, A. (1992) *A History of Hypnotism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gillespie, R.D. (1929) The clinical differentiation of types of depression. *Guy's Hospital Reports*, July: 306–44.
- Glover, J. (1924) Problems in dynamic psychology. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 5: 379–85.
- Good, T. S. (1922) The Oxford Clinic. *Journal of Mental Science* 68, Jan: 17–23.
- Good, T.S. (1930) Presidential address: the history and progress of Littlemore Hospital. *Journal of Mental Science* 76, Oct: 602–21.
- Grinker, R.R., Sr. (1995) The history of psychoanalysis in Chicago, 1911–1975. *Annual Psychoanal.* 23: 155–95.
- Hale, N.G. (1995) *The Rise and Crisis of Psychoanalysis in the United States. Freud and the Americans, 1917–1985*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hall, L. (1995) 'Disinterested enthusiasm for sexual misconduct': The British Society for the Study of Sex Psychology, 1913–47. *Journal of Contemporary History* 30(4): 665–86.
- Herle, A. & Rouse, S. (1998) *Cambridge and the Torres Strait. Centenary Essays on the 1898 Anthropological Expedition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, N. (2001) *1918–1919 Influenza Pandemic Mortality in England and Wales*. Colchester, Essex: AHDS History.
- Jones, E. & Wessely, S. (2005) *Shell Shock to PTSD. Military Psychiatry from 1900 to the Gulf War*. Hove: Psychology Press.
- Jones, E. (1916) Functional nervous disease. *The Lancet*, 11 March.
- Jones, E. (1956) J.C. Flugel [Obituary Notice]. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 37: 193–7.
- Jones, E. (1957) *Sigmund Freud: Life and Work, vol. III*. London: Hogarth Press.
- Jones, E. (1959) *Free Associations: Memories of a Psycho-Analyst*. London: Hogarth Press
- Jung, C.G. (1907) Letter from C.G. Jung to Sigmund Freud, November 30, 1907. *The Freud/Jung Letters*, ed. William McGuire, trans. R. Manheim and R.F.C. Hull. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1974.
- King, P. (ed.) (2003) *No Ordinary Psychoanalyst: The Exceptional Contributions of John Rickman*. London: Karnac.
- Kuhn, P. (2002) 'Romancing with a wealth of detail' or narratives of Dr Ernest Jones's 1906 trial for indecent assault. *Studies in Gender and Sexuality* 3/4: 344–78.
- Loughran, T.L. (2006) *Shell-Shock in First World War Britain: An Intellectual and Medical History, c.1860–c.1920*. Ph.D. dissertation, Queen Mary London.

- Lovie, S. (2001) Three steps to heaven: how the British Psychological Society attained its place in the sun. In Bunn, Lovie and Richards (eds), *Psychology in Britain: Historical Essays and Personal Reflections*. Leicester: BPS Books, pp. 95–114.
- Lowson, J.P. (1923) Freud or Rivers. *Australasian Journal of Psychology and Philosophy* 1: 111.
- Lowson, J.P. (1924) Some points in the psychology of nervous breakdown. *Australasian Journal of Psychology and Philosophy* 2(2), June: 113–28.
- Lowson, J.P. (1926) The treatment of war neuroses by abreaction of war shock. *Medical Journal of Australia* 6 Nov: 621–5.
- MacCurdy, J.T. (1918) *War Neuroses*, with a Preface by W.H.R. Rivers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacCurdy, J.T. (1920) Letter from MacCurdy to Morton Prince, 7 September 1920. In O.L. Zangwill, The theory of emotion: a correspondence between J.T. MacCurdy and Morton Prince. *British Journal of Psychology (General Section)* 39, Sept 1948: 1–11.
- MacCurdy, J.T. (1923) *Problems in Dynamic Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacCurdy, J.T. (1928) *Common Principles in Psychology and Physiology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maddox, B. (2006) *Freud's Wizard: The Enigma of Ernest Jones*. London: John Murray.
- Martin, K. (1966) *Father Figures: A First Volume of Autobiography, 1897–1931*. London: Hutchinson.
- Mercier, C. (1916) Functional nervous disease. *The Lancet*, 15 Jan.
- Mitchell, T.W. (1912) A study in hysteria and multiple personality, with report of a case. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychological Research XXVI, Part LXVI*, Nov, pp. 286–311.
- Myers, C.S. (1918) *Present-Day Applications of Psychology, with special reference to Industry, Education and Nervous Breakdown*. London: Methuen.
- Myers, C.S. (1940) *Shell Shock in France 1914–18. Based on a War Diary kept by...* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunberg, H. & Federn, E. (1975) *Minutes of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, vol. 4*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Oberndorf, C.P. (1949) Forty years of psycho-analytic psychiatry. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 30: 153–61.
- Olby, R. (1991) Social imperialism and state support for agricultural research in Edwardian Britain. *Annals of Science* 48: 509–26.
- Oppenheim, J. (1991) *'Shattered Nerves': Doctors, Patients, and Depression in Victorian England*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pear, T.H. (1960) Some early relations between English ethnologists and psychologists. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 90: 227–37.
- Pickford, R.W. (1940) Three related experiences of *déjà vu*. *Character and Personality* 9: 152–9.
- Pickford, R.W. (1944) *Déjà vu* in Proust and Tolstoy. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 25: 155–65.
- Pickford, R.W. (1973) 'Interview for BPS Archives conducted 4.6.73'. Tape transferred to CD. Archives of British Psychological Society (transcribed by JF).
- Ramsey, F. (1920). *Diary*. (Jan 1920). King's College Cambridge Modern Archive, Ramsey Papers.
- Richards, G. (2000) Psychology and the churches in Britain 1919–39: symptoms of conversion. *History of the Human Sciences* 13: 57–84.
- Richards, L. (2002) 'Black' Propaganda: British Subversive Psychological Warfare During World War II. <http://www.psywar.org/malingering.php>

- Rickman, J. (1951) Reflections on the function and organization of a psycho-analytical society. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 32: 218–37.
- Rivers, W.H.R. (1918) War-neurosis and military training. *Mental Hygiene* 2(4) Oct: 513–33.
- Rivers, W.H.R. (1919) Psychology and medicine. *The Lancet*, 24 May: 889–92.
- Rivers, W.H.R. (1920) *Instinct and the Unconscious*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rivers, W.H.R. (1923) *Conflict and Dream*, with a Preface by G. Elliot Smith. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner.
- Rook, A., Carlton, M. & Graham Cannon, W. (1991) *The History of Addenbrooke's Hospital, Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sassoon, S. (1945) *Siegfried's Journey, 1916–1920*. London: White Lion, 1973.
- Shepherd, B. (1996) 'The early treatment of mental disorders': R.G. Rows and Maghull 1914–1918. In H. Freeman and G. Berrios (eds), *150 Years of British Psychiatry, vol. 2*. London: Athlone, pp. 434–64.
- Shepherd, B. (2002) *A War of Nerves: Soldiers and Psychiatrists 1914–1994*. London: Pimlico.
- Shorter, E. (1997) *A History of Psychiatry: From the Era of the Asylum to the Age of Prozac*. New York: Wiley.
- Showalter, E. (1985) *The Female Malady: Women, Madness and English Culture, 1830–1980*. New York: Pantheon.
- Slack, N.G. (2003) Are research schools necessary? Contrasting models of twentieth-century research at Yale led by Ross Granville Harrison, Grace E. Pickford and G. Evelyn Hutchinson. *Journal of the History of Biology* 36: 501–29.
- Slobodin, R. (1978) *W.H.R. Rivers*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Stansfield, F.R. (2005) The growth years of the National Institute of Industrial Psychology, 1921–1930. Unpublished paper presented at The British Psychological Society History of Psychology Centre, London, 2 March.
- Steiner, R. (1991) To explain our point of view to English readers in English words. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 18: 351–92.
- Stern, A. (1921) The American Psychoanalytical Association. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 2: 251–3.
- Stone, M. (1985) Shell shock and the psychologists. In W.F. Bynum, R. Porter and M. Shepherd (eds), *The Anatomy of Madness: Essays in the History of Psychiatry, vol. 1: People and Ideas*. London and New York: Tavistock, pp. 242–71.
- Thom, D. (2004) Miller, Emanuel (1892–1970). *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/61403>, accessed 17 Feb 2005]
- Trist, E. (1993) Guilty of enthusiasm. In A.G. Bedeian (ed.), *Management Laureates*, vol. 3. Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Wardle, H. (1999) Gregory Bateson's lost world: the anthropology of Haddon and Rivers continued and deflected. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 35: 379–89.
- Weatherall, M. (2000) *Gentlemen, Scientists and Doctors: Medicine at Cambridge 1800–1940*. Woodbridge: Boydell.
- Werskey, G. (1978) *The Visible College: A Collective Biography of British Scientists and Socialists of the 1930s*. Harmondsworth: Allen Lane.
- Westwood, L. (1999) Avoiding the Asylum: Pioneering Work in Mental Health Care, 1890–1939. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Sussex.
- Wooldrige, A. (1994) *Measuring the Mind: Education and Psychology in England c.1860 – c.1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Young, A. (1995) *The Harmony of Illusion: Inventing Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Young, A. (1999) W.H.R. Rivers and the war neuroses. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 35(4): 359–78.

ABSTRACT

Viewing the reception of psychoanalysis in Britain from Cambridge, the paper examines the intertwining histories of the post-War British Psychological Society and the founding of the British Psycho-Analytical Society, following the initiatives of the two principal psychological entrepreneurs of the era, Charles Myers and Ernest Jones. Reforms in Cambridge in which psychoanalysis played a significant part are analysed, including the foundation of a Clinic for Nervous Diseases and the establishment of a separate Department of Experimental Psychology. The career of J.T. MacCurdy, Jones's student and Lecturer in Psychopathology is discussed.