

ferent philosophies of mind. In the final section I provide criticisms of Freud's later and favored position on sex differences.

II. THREE MODELS OF THE MIND

There are still, among Freud scholars, three candidates for Freud's favored mental model, for his preferred philosophy of mind. The three models are called "mechanism," "evolutionism," and "mentalism." Each model places different emphases on nature and nurture, on heredity and social forces, and thus the different models, to a certain extent, explain sex differences in incompatible ways. My own interpretation is that Freud was a philosophical "mechanist" when he wrote "Three Essays on Sexuality" in 1905 but that he had fully converted to an idiosyncratic "evolutionistic-mentalism" by the time he wrote "Some Psychological Consequences of the Anatomical Distinction Between the Sexes" in 1925.

a. Mechanism.

The mechanistic model of the mind was the favored model during the last quarter of the nineteenth century when Freud received his training as a neurologist.² Proponents of "mechanism," inspired by a belief in strict causal determinism and the model of reflexes, sought to explain behavior in terms of "reflex arcs." Environmental events caused sensory stimulation of the organism which caused physiochemical changes in the organism's nervous system resulting eventually in overt action.

The model was thought to be adequate both for reflexes (for example, shining light is an environmental event which stimulates the eye, which in turn undergoes physiochemical changes ultimately resulting in pupil contraction) and for complex human action (for example, early childhood punishment of masturbation is encoded in the brain as a traumatic memory resulting in [physiochemical] guilt feelings and odd sexual behavior in adulthood).

Since Freud was trained as a neurologist, his primary focus, to the extent that he espoused this model, was on the middle portions of the arcs, on the portions where the physiochemically-encoded psychic changes take place. Nevertheless, the model itself commits a theoretician who embraces the model to the

Owen J. Flanagan Jr.

Freud: Masculinity, Femininity, and the Philosophy of Mind

If you reject this idea as fantastic and regard my belief in the influence of lack of a penis on the configuration of femininity as an *idée fixe*, I am of course defenceless.¹

I. INTRODUCTION

My purpose in this essay is to discuss critically Sigmund Freud's (1856-1939) views on the nature and causes of "masculine" and "feminine" personality and behavioral traits. The essay is divided into three sections. In the first section I describe three different models of the mind which Freud deployed, at different times, in analyzing human personality. The proper interpretation of Freud's position on masculinity and femininity rests to a large extent on the answer to the question of which philosophy of mind, or which mixture of philosophies of mind, he embraced when writing on sex differences. In the second section I isolate two distinct Freudian positions on the nature and causes of masculine and feminine personality traits, the first from 1905, the second from 1925. These two positions are based on dif-

¹My thanks go to the National Endowment for the Humanities for a generous grant which supported this research and to Joyce Knowlton Walworth for her valuable criticisms.

belief that the *ultimate causes* of psychic changes, the true initiators of the arcs, lie in the *environment*. Therefore to the extent that Freud was a mechanist, he can be read as viewing male-female differences as primarily caused by relations within the family, by socialization, and by acculturation. His early (i.e., 1905) view on sex differences is, in my interpretation, mechanistically inspired.

b. Evolutionism

The inspiration for "evolutionism" was evolutionary theory.³ This explanatory model assumed, in accordance with Darwin, that most morphological traits (e.g., size and eye color) and many behavioral traits (e.g., mating "strategies") had evolved because they had contributed to the survival, and therefore to the reproductive success, of ancestral members of the species. Because these ancestors had survived, traits which they possessed were passed on and found with higher frequency in their descendents than the traits of less successful or unsuccessful members of the species.

Some scientists, apparently including Freud, appended to their Darwinism a tenet of Lamarck's older theory of evolution which allowed for a very rapid acquisition of traits. They believed in the hereditary acquisition of learned traits.⁴ If an organism's ancestors learned a skill or developed a behavioral trait, this skill or trait would be biologically encoded and could be passed on to descendents within a generation. This premise therefore allowed for the biological inheritance of cultural habits, of social skills, and even of historical memories.⁵ To the extent that Freud espoused "evolutionism," he favored explaining male-female differences in terms of biology, heredity, and anatomical destiny.⁶

c. Mentalism

This philosophy of mind is less a model than a style of explanation.⁷ A "mentalist" analyzes mental events in causal chains with other mental events and sets aside, without denying, the mechanistic claim that mental events are actually neural events kicked off by the environment, or the biologicistic claim that mental traits are caused by heredity.

By the end of World War I Freud was dissatisfied with

"mechanism." He said of the search for biological correlates of neurotic thoughts that "there are either *no* observable changes in the anatomical organ of the mind to correspond to them, or there are changes which throw no light upon them."⁸ Because of this Freud resolved in 1917 that

psychoanalysis must keep itself free from any hypothesis that is alien to it, whether of an anatomical, chemical, or physiological kind, and must operate with purely psychological auxiliary ideas.⁹

In actuality "mentalism" is compatible with both the environmentalism of "mechanism" and the nativism of "evolutionism," since Freud did not deny that there might be either (or both) environmental or biological catalysts for the chains of mental events. This is why I refer to it as a style, rather than as a model, of explanation. Nonetheless, the style involves focusing on the causal relations between purely mental phenomena like "feelings," "beliefs," "unconscious and conscious wishes," "repressed memories," "anxieties," "complexes" and the like and on examining the relations between these phenomena as if they constituted a closed, self-contained system.

This focus makes it difficult to tell whether or not Freud saw nature or nurture, or both, as the ultimate cause of masculine and feminine personality traits since he is, when he employs this style of explanation, primarily concerned with the machinations of the "black box," the human mind, and somewhat unconcerned with what initiates these machinations or with their outcomes.¹⁰ Nevertheless, on my reading, Freud typically supported his favored, i.e., post-1925, analyses of sex differences by allying "mentalism" and "evolutionism."

III. FREUD'S VIEWS ON MASCULINE AND FEMININE TRAITS

Freud's position on masculine and feminine traits developed in two stages. His early position was more mechanistic and environmentalistic than his "mature" view which combined features of evolutionism and mentalism.

a. The Early View: The Symmetry Thesis

In both stages of Freud's thinking about masculinity and femininity there are two important variables to keep in mind. These are:

- (i) The child's sense of its own body.
- (ii) The child's relationship with its parents.

If we organize our analysis around these two variables, we can describe Freud's early view on masculinity and femininity in the following way: Boys and girls naturally explore their own bodies. Freud described the sexuality of children as "polymorphously perverse." In approximately the fourth year, the many-sidedness of the child's explorations begins to diminish and the child focuses play on the genitals; the child begins to masturbate. Freud thought that the masturbation of boys and girls was strictly analogous; boys play with their penises; girls with their clitorises. He says, "the auto-erotic activity of the erotogenic zones is, however, the same in both sexes, and owing to this uniformity there is no possibility of a distinction between the two sexes such as arises after puberty."¹¹

Freud described the sexuality of female children as "of a wholly masculine character."¹² But he insisted in a footnote—which was added ten years after this passage—that he meant "masculine" neither in a "biological," i.e., anatomical, sense nor in a "sociological," i.e., social role, sense but in the sense which "is the essential one and the most serviceable in psychoanalysis," namely, "'masculine' and 'feminine' . . . in the sense of activity and passivity."¹³ Freud pointed out that actual men and women show a combination of "masculine" and "feminine" traits in this unusual psychoanalytic sense of the terms.

So given that boys and girls both are sexually very active, engage in virtually identical sex play and thus have very similar body sense, how do sex differences develop? Relations with the parents, the second variable, are decisive in Freud's early view. Freud believed that boys and girls develop a strong attraction to their opposite sex parent and a powerful jealousy toward their same sex parent at about the time they begin to masturbate. He referred to this attraction-jealousy constellation as the Oedipus Complex. Freud believed that the development and characteristics of the Oedipus Complex were perfectly symmetrical in boys and girls, so that the girl was attracted to the father, the boy to the mother.

The male and female child, in seeking the affection of their opposite sex parent, begin to take on the characteristics of the same sex parent of whom they are jealous. This happens because the child actually wants to be like the same sex parent; it is

precisely (for all the child knows) by being like the same sex parent that the child can win the affection of the opposite sex parent.¹⁴

The important thing to notice is that the latter analysis is perfectly compatible with "mechanism," with an environmental account of sex differences. Biology is necessary to set the sexual attraction to the opposite sex parent into play, but after that the child *learns* how to be a "man" or a "woman" through modeling, identification with, and observation of, his or her same sex parent. But the child, on this account, is not learning how to be *the* prototypical male or female; nor is the child just "becoming" *the* prototypical male or female thanks to some blueprint contained in the biological wiring; he or she is actively learning to be like his or her *particular* mother or father. Given the vast range of individual differences in parents, the child could be learning any of a large number of different personality traits. One could assume, however, that there would be some traits which a given culture would assign more frequently to men than to women and vice versa and that, therefore, boys and girls would, on the average, be socialized in the ways the particular culture characteristically makes available to members of their sex. Nevertheless, assuming that Freud is correct in his belief that the Oedipus Complex is the crucial episode in the development of sex differences, in his early account he provides no reason for thinking that the actual traits a child develops on the way to becoming a "man" or a "woman" are anything other than *learned* once the child's biological sex sets the attraction to the opposite sex parent into motion.

b. The Later View: Penis Envy and the Assymetry Thesis

In 1925 Freud attempted to solve two theoretical problems facing his 1905 symmetry thesis. First, the mother is the original love object for the child of both sexes. This means that the female child has to shift her initial affiliation away from her mother in order to enter the Oedipal phase in a way the male child does not. Second, the female child has to discover her vagina (which during the genital masturbation stage "is still undiscovered").¹⁵ Freud claimed to bring "forward nothing but observed facts" in pointing out that adult female sexuality is largely vaginal. Since the masturbation of the female child is exclusively clitoral, this means that in "the change to femininity the

clitoris should wholly or in part hand over its sensitivity, and at the same time its importance, to the vagina."¹⁶

If Freud was right, the female child has to change both her body sense *and* her relationship with her parents in a way the male child does not. Freud tried to solve the riddle of how this happens, i.e., how it is that a girl passes "from her mother to an attachment to her father," or how she passes from "her masculine phase to the feminine one to which she is biologically destined" by the "penis envy" hypothesis."¹⁷

Freud claimed that girls were bound to make a "momentous discovery":

They notice the penis of a brother or playmate, strikingly visible and of large proportions, at once recognize it as the superior counterpart to their own small and inconspicuous organ, and from that time forward fall a victim to envy for the penis.¹⁸

The "penis envy" hypothesis solved both the problem of the shift from clitoral to vaginal primacy and the problem of the shift from the primacy of mother love to father love. The little girl, according to Freud, discovers "that she is castrated."¹⁹ This is a "wound to her narcissism." This injury to the girl's ego causes her to express disappointment and dissatisfaction with "her inferior clitoris" by abandoning her efforts to gain "satisfaction from it."²⁰ The shift of the female child's "love" from the mother to the father is then explained by the fact that "girls hold their mother responsible for their lack of a penis and do not forgive her for being thus put at a disadvantage."²¹ The father takes the mother's place in the girl's eyes because the father has precisely what the girl wants, precisely what she needs to assuage her ego: a penis.

Meanwhile the male child, according to Freud, has also noticed the differences in male and female genitalia. But what the girl experiences as envy, the boy experiences as fear. The male child realizes that he could be castrated, that his more powerful father, who is his rival for his mother's affections, could cut off his penis. The shock of this discovery delivers the boy from the Oedipus Complex. He gives up the hope that he will win his mother from his father and replaces his mother with more appropriate love objects. Freud says that "in boys . . . the complex is not simply repressed, it is simply smashed to pieces by the shock of threatened castration."²²

Unlike Freud's 1905 position, the latter view combines evolutionism with mentalism. The early view explained male and

female differences in terms of the child's identification with its same sex parent, from whom the child learned the traits which that particular parent possessed. The post-1925 view is evolutionistic because it sees "nature" as the central causal force. It is the child's inevitable observation of the biologically-determined genitals (not the attraction to his or her particular and unique opposite sex parent) which is *the* decisive factor in all subsequent psychosexual development.

The later view is mentalistic as well as evolutionistic because the primary focus of the analysis, once the biological catalyst sets off the process, is on the inner dynamic of mental processes like "fear," "envy," "love," "hate," and "feelings of wounded narcissism." Freud gives little attention to "nurture," and makes virtually no mention of any unique environmental *input* that might occur in any particular child's life, e.g., the child might lack a same or opposite sex parent or might never see the genitalia of the opposite sex. Nor is there mention of idiosyncratic behavioral *outputs* or atypical personality configurations, e.g., female children who remain obviously attached to their mother, or boys who display envy toward girls. Freud theorizes as if the Oedipal drama operates in a closed system, and in an inevitable and universally repetitive fashion, immune from outside influences once put in motion by the child's biological sex. All boys fear, all girls envy; all boys love their mother, all girls love their father; all girls feel wounded, all boys feel superior.

Freud obviously believed in individual differences caused by environmental (and perhaps constitutional) factors; otherwise he would have been unable to offer explanations for individual pathology. Nevertheless his discussions of sex differences show virtually no sensitivity to individual differences and contain hardly a mention of what factors in the family or in a culture might lead to such differences. This unfortunately is the toll of the philosophical alliance of "evolutionism" and "mentalism."

In any case Freud believed that his post-1925 view on child development could account for a wide array of masculine and feminine traits commonly found in adults. I describe five of these in the following paragraphs. It should be noted at the start that Freud, probably to his detriment, made no distinction between behavioral and personality traits, not that it is an easy distinction to draw. In the examples, I have tried to make it clear whether the trait in question is best construed as a behavioral or personality trait.

a. Activity-passivity

Although Freud thought that boys and girls were about equally active pre-Oedipally, he thought that because girls give up active masturbation in a way that boys do not, females become more passive in terms of overt behavior than males. "Along with the abandonment of clitoral masturbation a certain amount of activity is renounced. Passivity now has the upper hand. . . ." ²³

b. Degree of Narcissism

Freud believed that the wound to the female's ego from the discovery that she does not have a penis results in a greater amount of narcissism and a greater amount of self-centeredness (both behaviorally and psychologically) in females than in males. "Her self love is mortified by the comparison with the boy's far superior equipment."²⁴ This psychic injury leads to self-doubt in females "so that to be loved is a stronger need for them than to love."²⁵ It also results in greater vanity in females than in males as a "compensation for their original sexual inferiority."²⁶

c. Degree of Jealousy

Freud believed that the envy females feel—and males do not—upon discovering the differences in their genitals, accounted in part for the fact that females behaved in adulthood, on the average, more enviously than males. He says "envy and jealousy play an even greater part in the mental life of women than of men. It is not that I think these characteristics are absent in men or that I think they have no other roots in women than envy for the penis; but I am inclined to attribute their greater amount in women to this latter influence."²⁷

d. Moral Sense

The superego, an individual's moral and social sense, is rooted in fear. For this reason males develop a more powerful superego than females. Freud states that the fear of losing the penis destroys the Oedipus Complex for the boy and "a severe superego is set up as its heir."²⁸ The overwhelming castration fear the male child experiences makes it impossible for him to forget

(at least unconsciously) the possible horrendous implications of not obeying moral and social law, of not relinquishing his incestuous desires. The male personality, but not necessarily male behavior, is therefore more likely to be rule-governed and guilty than the female personality.

The male's moral development is also aided by the fact that once the Oedipus Complex is "smashed to pieces," the boy looks less toward his family, less to his mother and father as love object and role model, respectively, and more to people outside the family. This prepares the way for the male child to find role models in his peer group, in the school and in the culture at large. Freud thought that a mature, "impersonal," moral sense required precisely such a widening of perspective beyond the narrow boundaries of one's own family.²⁹

Freud argued, however, that because females do not fear castration they do not have the same motivation as boys to give up their Oedipus Complex, develop a strong superego, and find "interests" and "models" outside the family. Furthermore, he believed that the greater "enviousness" of females militated against their developing a strong "sense of justice."³⁰

e. Cultural Achievement

Great artistic and scientific achievements do not come naturally to humans. They require work, and humans would rather play, especially sexually, than work. Artistic and scientific achievements are possible when sexual impulses are rechannelled (sublimated) from impossible objects and fantasies to appropriate objects (e.g., from parent to intellectual endeavors) in compliance with the demands of the "Reality Principle." For the same reasons that males have stronger superegos than females, they are led to sublimation earlier and more easily than females. When the Oedipus Complex is "smashed to pieces" the male child is forced to look away from his mother as a source of pleasure and to things and people outside the family. But since girls do not fear castration, and thus lack the main motive for overcoming the Oedipus Complex, their chance of developing skills based on sublimation suffers:

Girls remain in it (the Oedipus Complex) for an indeterminate length of time; they demolish it and, even so, incompletely. In these circumstances the formation of the superego must suffer; it cannot attain the strength and independence which gives it its cultural significance. . . .³¹

IV. A CRITIQUE OF FREUD'S VIEWS ON MASCULINE AND FEMININE TRAITS

My critical comments are devoted primarily to Freud's post-1925 view first, because this is the view he himself ultimately settled on and second, because the earlier view, thanks to the mechanistic philosophy which supports it, can be interpreted as a fairly traditional socialization model in which the parents, especially the same sex parents, serve as the primary role models (thanks to their own parents and, therefore, thanks ultimately to the culture) for masculine and feminine behavior.

There is one common philosophical objection which might be thought to undermine the entire Freudian enterprise and, therefore, to defeat his views on sex differences by implication. The objection is that the theory postulates unobservable entities, e.g., "unconscious wishes," "superego" and the like, and that this is objectionable.

It is impossible to see how the claim that Freud's theory postulates unobservables, which is correct, is a criticism, however, since every mature scientific theory engages in postulation of unobservables. Electromagnetic fields and energy quanta are just as unobservable as unconscious wishes. It may be that Freud introduces unobservables without sufficient care, but that is a different question which can only be discussed by analyzing each unobservable in turn. The following three criticisms, however, weigh more heavily and specifically against Freud's views on sex differences.

a. Unfalsifiability

This is the claim that given the way Freudian theory is formulated there are no empirical results which could possibly count against it.³² A theory is logically unfalsifiable if it allows every logically possible outcome, and therefore automatically counts everything that happens as a verification.

There is reason to think that some portions of Freudian theory are constructed in this way. An example would be the portion having to do with the sexual content of dreams; here Freud lists virtually every possible everyday symbol as a sexual one and he therefore makes it close to logically impossible to have a nonsexual dream.³³ Freud's dream theory precludes the possibility of nonsexual dreams because he defines the vocabulary of dreams as exclusively sexual from the start.

With respect to the question of the falsifiability of Freud's views on sex differences, however, one must say in fairness to Freud that the theory is *logically* falsifiable. For example, the theory does imply that females, at least on the average, can not turn out to have stronger superegos than males; and that females must not (at least initially) find penises laughable and not worth having; and that males must not find their fathers unthreatening.

Nevertheless, although the theory is not logically unfalsifiable, it may be unfalsifiable in practice, in the sense that Freud, or your average Freudian, would not give it up under any circumstances. For example, suppose I say that I have always found my father threatening. This would count, if you are a Freudian, as verification of my castration fear. Suppose instead I say that I have always found my father completely unthreatening. You might, if you are a Freudian, claim that I am resisting admitting the unconscious terror I have of my father, in which case you have taken my denial of threatening feelings as verification of my castration fear. But given that I only have two logically possible responses at my disposal and given that you are counting either my admission of fear or my denial of fear as proof of my castration anxiety, you are, in effect, precluding the falsification of the theory.

Since the Oedipal episode is the central factor in subsequent psychosexual development according to Freud, and since it involves the most upsetting of memories, psychoanalytic theory would predict that most people either would not remember or they would deny their memories of the episode. Since the entire episode is carried out intra-psychically with virtually no behavioral manifestations in the first place (e.g., children don't actually have sex with their parents, they just "fantasize" about it) and since most everyone will deny the episode, a Freudian can in practice preclude any possible falsification by counting all the "remembered" Oedipal events and all the denied ("forgotten" in the theory's terms) Oedipal events as verifications of the theory. But in lieu of overt behavioral evidence of the complex in the first place, these affirmations and denials are all the evidence there is for the Oedipus Complex!

b. The Evidence for the Oedipus Complex

Freud claimed to have discovered the Oedipus Complex, not in observation of children, but during his own self-analysis. He writes in a letter to Fleiss,

. . . libido towards *matram* was aroused; the occasion must have been the journey with her from Leipzig to Vienna, during which we spent a night together and I must have had the opportunity of seeing her *nudam*. . . .³⁴

The means by which a hypothesis is generated has no bearing on the strength of that hypothesis; the hypothesis is as strong as the subsequent tests show it to be. Freud claimed to have tested his theory in clinical settings with his patients and to have found that his patients had memories (the symbolic significance of which they either admitted *or* denied) similar to his own. Freud's "evolutionism" then led him to postulate a universal Oedipus Complex which affects *all* members of the species regardless of the cultural or individual peculiarities of their family structure.

But according to Erich Fromm, himself an analyst,³⁵ anthropological evidence shows that something like an Oedipus Complex *in boys* is found to a degree which is directly proportional to the degree to which a particular family is patriarchal (in which childrearing is the mother's task, breadwinning is the father's task, and especially in societies in which there is labor competition among males). In such families, which are more common in some cultures than in others, males tend to be greatly attached to their mothers and in competition with their fathers. This, of course, could easily be explained without evolutionistic assumptions. To the extent that the mother is the primary person with whom the male child has a relationship, he will naturally be attached to her; to the extent that the society functions on competition between males, father and son will have mixed feelings toward each other. But since there is nothing necessary about the patriarchal family, there is nothing necessary about the Oedipus Complex. Furthermore, according to Fromm, evidence for Oedipal Complexes in females, even in patriarchal cultures, is insubstantial.³⁶

c. The Evidence for Penis Envy

The penis envy hypothesis is where Freud's "evolutionism" really gets in the way. Notice that in order for this envy to get under way, Freudian theory requires (1) that the female child actually observes the genitals of a male and (2) that a penis is the sort of thing which a little girl is "wired" to be envious of. Given, however, that there must be some, if not many, children who lack siblings or playmates of the opposite sex, or who live in

cultures where nudity is inappropriate and thus where there are few chances to see the genitals of the opposite sex, there must be some children who never make the actual observation required to set-off the envy. Secondly, one has to wonder why a penis would necessarily be the sort of thing which automatically makes a female child envious. After all, female children must have encounters with all sorts of things shaped like penises without experiencing envy.

Freud anticipated both these objections and tried to protect his theory by deploying the Lamarckian portion of his "evolutionism." Freud thought that if any female failed to actually observe male genitals, she would "remember," thanks to her inherited species memory, what male genitals were like. Then she would feel envious because she would also "remember," thanks to the same species memory, just how important and valuable a penis is. Freud says that

. . . the penis (to follow Ferenczi [1925]) owes its extraordinary high narcissistic cathezes to its organic significance for the propagation of the species. . . .³⁷

Of course, the idea that there is such a species memory and that it attaches such importance to the penis is evolutionistic nonsense. In fact when one thinks about it, *if* "organic significance for the propagation of the species" is a reason for envy, then one would predict, given the actual observations that most children make, that children of both sexes would feel "womb envy."³⁸ Babies obviously come from mothers; the causal role of the father, and especially the causal role of the father's penis, is, I assume, a very late discovery in the average child's life.

V. CONCLUSION

Juliet Mitchell, a British feminist, has defended Freud on the grounds that he provided an analysis of patriarchal society.³⁹ Although this may be true, it is true by accident. Freud certainly did not see his theory that way. "Evolutionism" led Freud to analyze characteristic sex differences as if they were largely uninfluenced by familial, social, and cultural factors. Species membership and inherited sex are the crucial variables in Freud's post-1925 account. The developmental drama of male and female children is universal *and* sex specific.

If, however, we free Freudian theory from the weight of his

"evolutionism" and therefore eliminate the tenuous suite of claims of Oedipal universality, penis envy and castration fear, there is much to be said for what remains. Children do develop powerful affection toward, and identification with, their parents. A child's sense of its biological sex and a sense that its sex is not shared by half the species affects the child's choice of role models. To the extent that the chosen role models have traits which the culture assigns to members of the child's sex, personality differences between men and women, for better or for worse, will be perpetuated. The theory so framed is compatible with classical social learning models, and brings the discussion back to square one, i.e., to the question of whether any of the traits we teach, or let the children of either sex learn, are worth having in the first place.

NOTES

1. Sigmund Freud, Lecture XXXIII, "Femininity," *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1933), p. 117. This lecture, Freud insists, is mainly a rewrite of his 1925 work "Some Psychological Consequences of the Anatomical Distinction Between the Sexes." I employ it throughout as such.
2. Erich Fromm, *Greatness and Limitations of Freud's Thought* (New York: Harper and Row, 1980) considers this model, sometimes called the Helmholtz model, to be Freud's main and most important mental model.
3. Frank Sulloway in *Freud: Biologist of the Mind* (New York: Basic Books, 1979) argues that Darwinism plus a good amount of Lamarckianism was Freud's favored model, especially after 1905, when Sulloway thinks Freud abandoned "mechanism" for "evolutionism." Sulloway says that around this time Freud moved from "proximate-causal theory to ultimate-causal theory" (p. 365). This is important for our purposes since all Freud's important work on masculinity and femininity is post-1905.
4. This hypothesis was fostered, it seems, by "mechanism" and its tenet that learning was actually encoded in the physiology of the organism.
5. C.G. Jung, Freud's renegade student, took this Lamarckian tenet so seriously that he made his own theory turn on the thesis that all humans share, from the start, certain species memories, which he referred to as the "collective unconscious."
6. "Evolutionism," however, does not necessarily lead to hereditary determinism; it only usually does. One can, for example, use the

tactic some modern "sociobiologists" have and claim that humans have evolved to possess the trait of being "plastic," of being terrific learners.

7. Ernest Jones in his famous biography, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud* (New York: Basic Books, 1961) reads Freud as espousing this model.
8. Sigmund Freud, Lecture I, "Introduction," *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1917), pp. 20-21.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 21.
10. See B.F. Skinner, "A Critique of Psychoanalytic Concepts and Theories," in *Cumulative Record*, ed. B.F. Skinner, 3d ed. (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1973) where he criticizes Freud's "mentalism" for "stealing the show" from both environmental causes and the behavioral outcomes.
11. Sigmund Freud, "Three Essays on Sexuality," 1905, vol. VII, *The Complete Psychological Works*, ed. J. Strachey (London: Hogarth, 1953), p. 219.
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Ibid.*
14. Oedipus ended up marrying his mother precisely because he was so successful at being just like his father, so successful that he dethroned his father, the King.
15. Freud, Lecture XXXIII, "Femininity," *op. cit.*, p. 104.
16. *Ibid.*
17. *Ibid.*, p. 105; Freud in both his 1905 view and his post-1925 view claims that there are small but noticeable differences in male and female children and that these differences are instinctual. He says, "A little girl is as a rule less aggressive, defiant and self sufficient; she seems to have a greater need for being shown affection and on that account to be more dependent and pliant." *Ibid.*, p. 103.
18. Freud, "Some Psychological Consequences of the Anatomical Distinction Between the Sexes," 1925, vol. XIX, *The Complete Psychological Works*, *op. cit.*, p. 252.
19. Freud, Lecture XXXIII, "Femininity," *op. cit.*, p. 111.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 113.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 110.
22. Freud, "Some Psychological Consequences of the Anatomical Distinction Between the Sexes," *op. cit.*, p. 257.
23. Freud, Lecture XXXIII, "Femininity," *op. cit.*, p. 113.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 112.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 117.
26. *Ibid.*
27. *Ibid.*, p. 111.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 114.
29. Freud, Lecture XXXI, "Dissection of the Psychological Personality," in *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

30. Freud, Lecture XXXIII, "Femininity," op. cit., p. 119.
31. Ibid., p. 114.
32. Karl R. Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge* (New York: Harper, 1963) makes this charge against Freud and Marx.
33. Freud, Lecture X, "Symbolism in Dreams," in *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, op. cit., pp. 149-69.
34. Freud, *The Origins of Psychoanalysis* (New York: Basic Books, 1954), Letter of 3.10.97.
35. Fromm, *Greatness and Limitations of Freud's Thought*, op. cit., pp. 30-34.
36. Ibid., p. 27.
37. Freud, "Some Psychological Consequences of the Anatomical Distinction Between the Sexes," op. cit., p. 257.
38. See Karen Horney, *Feminine Psychology* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1967) for a critique of Freud's views on sex differences by a great woman psychoanalyst. It was Horney who developed the notion of "womb envy."
39. Juliet Mitchell, *Psychoanalysis and Feminism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1974), p. xi.