
Psychoanalysis Arrives in America

The 1909 Psychology Conference at Clark University

Rand B. Evans *Texas A&M University*
William A. Koelsch *Clark University*

ABSTRACT: Seventy-five years ago, in 1909, G. Stanley Hall convened a celebration of the 20th anniversary of Clark University. At that conference, Sigmund Freud, Carl Jung, and others of the psychoanalytic movement were introduced to an American audience. Drawing on archival materials, we will describe the Clark conference and suggest its impact on those attending.

September 1984 marked the 75th anniversary of the Clark University Vicennial Conference on Psychology and Pedagogy. Sometimes called the "Freud" Conference, the 1909 meeting was a de facto international congress of psychology, although it was under the official auspices of no one but Clark University and its colorful psychologist president, G. Stanley Hall. It may seem somewhat peculiar that a university should have observed its 20th anniversary at all, let alone mark it with a series of international conferences. Indeed, Sigmund Freud himself placed an exclamation point after the word *twentieth* in letters to Karl Abraham and Carl Jung discussing his invitation to speak there. Yet 10 years before, in July 1899, G. Stanley Hall and his faculty had organized a week-long, similar series of public lectures and social events to mark the completion of Clark's first decade of research and advanced instruction. The Vicennial observances of 1909 were simply an enlarged version of that highly successful 10th anniversary celebration.

Psychologists know the conference on psychology and pedagogy primarily because it was there that Sigmund Freud, Carl Jung, and others of the psychoanalytic movement were introduced to an American audience. However, the psychology conference was only one of several planned for the 20th anniversary celebration, which in all occupied three weeks during the summer and early fall of 1909. Other conferences, on mathematics, physics, chemistry and biology, were staged. Conferences even larger than the one for psychology were held, including a conference on international relations that focused on China and the Far East and a national conference on child welfare (Clark University, 1909).

The conferences were originally scheduled for July, as the 10th anniversary series had been.

Hall himself took on the coordination of international invitations for the biology and psychology conferences. For the psychology conference, he had two "foreign savants" particularly in mind, Wilhelm Wundt and Sigmund Freud. Hall wrote to Wundt on December 15, 1908, inviting him to the conference, offering 3,000 marks, or \$750, and an honorary degree, but Wundt refused in a letter to Hall, dated January 5, 1909 (Hall Papers, 1844-1924). Wundt would not travel even a few miles for an official international congress and most certainly would not travel thousands of miles for a convocation; he gave his advanced age as an excuse. The close proximity of the 500th anniversary of the University of Leipzig was probably also a consideration. On the same day he wrote Wundt, Hall also wrote to Sigmund Freud. To Freud he offered 1,600 marks, or \$400. On December 29, 1908, Freud also sent his regrets, saying that his psychiatric practice went through the middle of July and that he needed rest until September (Hall Papers). On December 30, 1908, however, Freud wrote to Carl Jung that "I have declined without even consulting you or anyone else, the crucial reason being that I should have had to stop work 2 weeks sooner than usual, which would mean a loss of several thousand kronen" (McGuire, 1974, p. 192). Jung responded that Freud should try to arrange to go after the anniversary if possible. Jung grasped immediately the significance of the invitation not only for the Americans but also, as he wrote to Freud on January 7, 1909, "because of the echo it would arouse in Europe, where things are beginning to stir too." (McGuire, 1974, p. 195). On December 30, 1908, Freud had written to Jung of his genuine disappointment at not being able to accept and had recognized Clark University as a "small but serious institution" (McGuire, 1974, p. 193).

Hall's invitation was also declined by Alfred Binet, who had refused it a decade before as well. The experimental lecture slot originally designed for Wundt was offered to Hermann Ebbinghaus, then at Halle. He was scheduled to give five lectures and receive an honorary degree. Ebbinghaus accepted

the invitation but died in late February. Problems with acceptances seem to have plagued the other conferences as well. The principal problem appears to have been the date of the conference itself rather than a depreciation of Clark University. There were conflicts in the scheduling of various activities in July. The University of Leipzig was celebrating its 500th anniversary about that time and the University of Geneva its 350th. Many Americans and Europeans were going to attend those celebrations. Also, European universities typically ran their "spring" semester through July. In January 1909 it was decided to shift the date of all the conferences except the one on child welfare to September. Such being the case, the story that the psychology conference was shifted specifically to accommodate Sigmund Freud appears untrue. There was, however, a tremendous amount of shuffling of the papers in the conference to accommodate Freud, as we shall see.

With the date shifted to September, Hall invited Freud again, offering him the honorarium originally offered to Wundt. This time Freud accepted. On March 9, 1909, Freud wrote to Jung that "this has thrilled me more than anything else that has happened in the last few years" and that "I have been thinking of nothing else" (McGuire, 1974, p. 210).

Other invitations were being accepted as well. Several individuals appear to have been considered to replace Ebbinghaus. As late as April, Oswald Külpe of Würzburg was being mentioned, as was William McDougall of Oxford. However, William Stern of Breslau was the final choice.

Ernst Meumann, a student of Wundt's and a pioneer in experimental educational psychology, was also invited to participate in the pedagogy side of the conference, probably as an alternative to the declining Binet. Meumann initially accepted but later withdrew. Apparently the replacement for Meumann was Carl Jung, which is the reason Jung's honorary doctorate is listed in pedagogy rather than psychology. Jung accepted; Freud, hearing of the

invitation, wrote to Pfister on June 13, 1909, that it "changes my whole feeling about the trip and makes it important" (Meng & Freud, 1963, p. 25). Freud and Jung were not the only psychoanalysts invited. Sandor Ferenczi accompanied Freud, and Ernst Jones and A. A. Brill also attended, although, of that group, only Freud and Jung were to speak and receive honorary degrees. Leo Burgerstein of Vienna, a specialist in school hygiene, was also invited to speak, and he accepted.

On the American side, Edward Bradford Titchener of Cornell was invited to give two lectures. Titchener was probably selected because he had become a leader in experimental psychology in America. Yet, there may also have been a more telling reason for the invitation. Edmund C. Sanford was stepping up from head of the department of psychology at Clark to become president of Clark College, the undergraduate component of Clark University. Titchener was under serious consideration for Sanford's replacement as department head and his visit at the meeting was also a job interview. Hall invited other domestic "savants" as well. One was Adolf Meyer, the Swiss psychiatrist who had been associated with Clark earlier as a member of the Worcester State Hospital staff and who was about to go to Johns Hopkins University. Meyer was to give one lecture and receive an honorary degree. Others invited to give one lecture apiece and to receive honorary degrees were Franz Boas, also formerly at Clark, and H. S. Jennings of Johns Hopkins.

Although a multitude of major psychologists were invited to speak or at least to attend, it is clear that in Hall's mind the center of attention was to be Sigmund Freud of Vienna. Why was Hall interested in Freud, who was largely ignored in Europe? Hall had been long attracted to Freud's ideas. He even owned one of the 257 copies sold of Freud's book on aphasia. As early as 1901, Hall was mentioning Freud's work in his lectures at Clark (Ross, 1972, p. 382). By 1904, he was lecturing on the subject of sex to Clark students (with females excluded from such delicate discussions). The degree to which Freud directly influenced Hall's ideas is problematical, because Hall seems to have had something of a preoccupation with the subject of sex throughout his lifetime. Most certainly, however, Hall found in Freud someone with a similar emphasis on the importance of sexuality in early childhood. By 1907, Hall clearly believed that Freud's work was fundamental to psychology (Ross, 1972, p. 384). At a less lofty level, Hall's invitation to Freud demonstrated what Dorothy Ross called Hall's "familiar and formidable ambitions" and might be viewed as an attempt to steal a march on the Boston group, which had lately begun to make much of

This article is based on lectures given by the first author at the Baltimore meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, 1984, and at the Toronto meeting of the American Psychological Association, 1984; and by the second author at the Fifth Annual Paul S. Clarkson Lecture, Clark University, 1984, and at the Toronto Meeting of the American Psychological Association, 1984. The authors would like to thank Jean Perkins, Assistant to the Librarian, Clark University; Stuart Campbell, Clark University Archivist; and Dorothy Mosakowski, Special Collections Assistant, Clark University, for their gracious assistance. This research was supported in part by National Science Foundation grant SES-8319882, a College of Liberal Arts Summer Research Grant from Texas A&M University, and a Texas A&M University Minigrant to the first author.

Requests for reprints should be sent to Rand B. Evans, Department of Psychology, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843.

psychoanalytic ideas, but from whose circles Hall felt excluded (Ross, 1972, p. 387).

As we have seen previously, Jung had grasped the practical political significance for the psychoanalysts of their presence in Worcester. Freud, too, had realized the significance and usefulness of the invitation. In writing to Karl Abraham, he remarked that "perhaps it will annoy some people in Berlin as well as Vienna" (Abraham & Freud, 1965, p. 75). Clark University was well known to Europeans in those days, and Hall's *American Journal of Psychology* was widely read in Europe and had considerable status. Doubtless many Europeans, as well as Americans, first read Freud and Jung through their lectures published in the 1910 volume of the *American Journal of Psychology*.

Titchener was quite aware of his role as the primary experimentalist on the podium. On May 28, 1909, E. C. Sanford of Clark wrote to Titchener that "You are in a sense my king-pin as regards experimental psychology pure and simple. With Stern, Freud, Meyer, Boas and Jennings we shall be pretty well loaded on the side of applied psychology. (Titchener Papers, 1880-1927). In the same letter, Sanford even suggested the topic for one of Titchener's papers: "You might if you like make a sort of justification of pure psychological work as against these other [applied] tendencies which are now certainly very strong" (Titchener Papers). Titchener's talk did not let Sanford down.

The Conference on Psychology and Pedagogy began on Monday, September 6, 1909, Labor Day. The conference was officially sponsored by two departments: the Department of Experimental and Comparative Psychology and the Department of Pedagogy and School Hygiene. The conference started one day ahead of the other conferences of that week because of the large number of sessions planned. According to the advance program, Freud was scheduled for only four lectures, the first on Wednesday evening (September 8) and the other three over the ensuing three mornings. Originally, Freud's travel plans would have made him several days late for the conference. Freud later changed his plans but apparently did not notify Hall of the earlier arrival until he was in New York. Freud had sailed with Jung and Ferenczi from Bremen rather than Trieste and arrived in time to attend the full conference (Koelsch, 1970). Ironically, Jung later reported this trip as the source of the initial crack that would end in the break between himself and Freud (Jung, 1965, p. 158).

The schedule of the conference was hastily rearranged, Franz Boas generously giving up his 11:00 a.m. "prime time" slot so that Freud, who arrived in Worcester on Sunday, September 5, would be able to begin lecturing on Tuesday morning,

September 7.¹ Were this not the case, Freud's well-known book would have been titled *Four Lectures on Psychoanalysis* rather than the title we know. Freud's talks were not titled in the advance program. In fact, Freud had not prepared formal talks at all and improvised his talks during morning walks with Ferenczi. The written form that became Freud's *Five Lectures on Psychoanalysis* was prepared only after Freud returned to Vienna, although the similarity between the written and spoken forms is apparently very great (Freud, 1910).

The session opened with 175 people present in the art room of the Clark University Library, a room whose walls were covered with Jonas Clark's collection of paintings and rare books. Following words of welcome by President G. Stanley Hall, Wilhelm Stern opened the conference with the first of his series of four lectures, given in German, on the psychology of testimony and on individual psychology (Stern, 1910). On September 6, 1909, Jung reported to his wife that "Professor X (as stated in the published letter) "had first turn, with boring stuff," so much so that the psychoanalysts "decamped" from the session and took a long walk to the woods and lakes at the edge of town. (Jung, 1965, p. 365). Whether the psychoanalysts returned in time to hear H. S. Jennings talk on the "Study of Behavior in Lower Organisms" at 11:00 a.m. is not mentioned, but presumably they did not. The afternoon session was devoted to school hygiene and in particular to a talk and discussion on the "Opportunity and Need for Scientific Research in School Hygiene." The evening of the first day was devoted to a social session at Hall's home, where the speakers and guests could meet and talk. It may well have been at this social that Titchener and Freud first met. When Titchener was introduced to Freud, Freud's response was, "O, Sie sind der Gegner" [Oh, you are the opponent] (E. Jacobson, personal communication, March 6, 1972). Titchener is said to have denied that he was opposed to Freud. On September 19, 1909, Titchener reported to Meyer that

I offered to attempt a translation out of this psychology of association into modern psychological terms, and Freud laughed at me, and said that if I came to him for half a year I should see that modern psychology needed to be "revolutionised" in his way. Revolutionised, ye gods! That

¹ Extreme care should be exercised in accepting at face value published accounts of dates and times of the papers at the conference. The sudden change in Freud's arrival date caused several changes in the schedule, and even the official brochures for the conference do not reflect the actual event. Editors and historians have further confused matters. James Strachey, for instance, in his translation of Freud's *Five Lectures on Psycho-Analysis* has Freud giving his first lecture on Monday, September 6 "and the four following days" (Freud, 1910/1977, p.3).

means, set back just about two human generations. And the man wonders that we do not take his psychologising seriously. (Meyer Papers, 1885-1949)

Freud's turn came the following day, on Tuesday, September 7. Freud's talk was at 11:00 a.m., originally Franz Boas's slot and following Leo Burgerstein's talk on the subject of "Problems of Schoolroom Sanitation and School Work" and William Stern's second talk, also on the psychology of testimony. Freud's first lecture was a general outline of the history and major findings of psychoanalytical research—in German. Freud had been concerned about whether the audience would grasp his ideas if he spoke in a language foreign to them. On June 4, 1909, Jung told Freud that "your success is guaranteed in advance, for the kudos lies in the appointment itself . . . What if you do lecture in German? There's nothing they can do about it" (McGuire, 1974, p. 229). Exactly what Freud's demeanor was as he gave that first lecture, we do not know, except that Jones (1955) said it was serious in tone. This was a very significant moment for Freud. He recalled later that "as I stepped out to the platform at Worcester to deliver my Five Lectures upon Psycho-Analysis it seemed like the realization of some incredible day-dream: psychoanalysis was no longer a product of delusion, it had become a valuable part of reality" (Freud, 1925/1952, p. 99). It was in this talk that Freud told his audience about Josef Breuer's treatment of Anna O., his own application of Breuer's method, and his generalizations on hysterics as suffering from "reminiscences." This lecture and the other four still represent perhaps the most accessible and lively discourse on psychoanalysis ever written.

Boas began the Tuesday afternoon session with his deferred lecture on "Psychological Problems in Anthropology" (Boas, 1910). He was followed by a conference on "The Teaching of Psychology in Normal Schools," with Hall's former student and Titchener's colleague at Cornell, Guy Montrose Whipple, presiding. The 7:30 evening session was devoted to "School Hygiene in Courses for the Training of Teachers."

Leo Burgerstein led off the Wednesday morning session with a talk on "Co-education and Hygiene with Special Reference to European Experience and Views." This was followed by Titchener's first lecture, titled "The Past Ten Years of Experimental Psychology," at 10:00 a.m., which in turn was followed by Freud's second lecture. Adolf Meyer's talk on "The Dynamic Factors in Dementia Praecox and Allied Psychoses," originally scheduled for 11:00 a.m. was moved to 2:30 p.m. to accommodate Freud's presentation. The afternoon conference session was devoted to "The Opportunity and Need for Research in the Field of Education."

If Freud had any doubts about whether Titchener was "der Gegner," they were dispelled by Titchener's 10:00 a.m. talk. Titchener clearly had taken E. C. Sanford's suggestions to heart. In his talk, Titchener strongly warned against the unbridled application of psychology and seemed to warn against Freud's line of thought in particular. Titchener warned that "the diversion into practical channels of energy which would otherwise have been expended in the service of the laboratory must be regarded as a definite loss to pure science" (Titchener, 1910, p. 407). He added, perhaps for Freud's benefit, that "the notion of quasi-mechanical dissociation . . . or various modern forms of the doctrine of the unconscious . . . are both foreign to the spirit and inadequate to the status of experimental psychology" (p. 408).

In his second talk, Freud continued in the historical vein, discussing the development of psychoanalysis beyond Breuer. Almost as if in answer to Titchener, Freud emphasized that he "did not start out, like Janet, from laboratory experiments, but with therapeutic aims in mind" (Freud, 1910/1977, p. 22). It was also in this lecture that Freud gave his classic representation of repression, using G. Stanley Hall and the conference itself as part of his example.

It was at the Thursday morning session that Carl Jung was introduced. He lectured at 9:00 a.m. on "Studies of Association and Mental Hygiene" (Jung, 1910). Titchener came next at 10:00 with his second lecture, titled "The Experimental Psychology of the Thought Processes," followed again by Freud at 11:00. For this talk, Freud chose to talk about the psychopathology of everyday life, slips of the tongue and pen. The Thursday afternoon session dealt with "Education as a College Subject" and was attended and commented on, among others, by the anarchist Emma Goldman. At 5:00 p.m., there was a demonstration (in German) by Stern of children's drawings and the psychology of testing.

Friday morning was a repeat of the cast of the previous day. Jung led at 9:00 a.m. with his talk on the association method, Stern followed with his third lecture at 10:00 on individual psychology, and Freud with his fourth lecture, again at 11:00, this time on the topic of infantile sexuality. All three morning lectures were given in German. The afternoon conference dealt with "Elementary Psychology in the College" and was chaired by Carl E. Seashore. Participants in this conference were E. F. Buchner, who gave a talk on "The Preparation of the Student," E. B. Titchener, who spoke on "The Aim of the Course," and Joseph Jastrow and Steven Colvin, who lectured on "The Contents of the Course." William James came over from Cambridge to attend the Friday session, and he commented briefly on the

afternoon papers. That afternoon, also, the well-known group photograph of speakers and guests was taken. At 5:00 p.m., Stern continued his demonstration on children's drawings.

The formal schedule called for a "general academic session" on Friday, September 10. It was then that Clark University bestowed honorary degrees on notables from the psychology/pedagogy, biology and mathematics/physics conferences. Freud and Jung were granted degrees of Doctor of Laws. It would be Freud's only academic accolade. Newspaper accounts of the proceeding indicate that Freud was introduced as follows: "Sigmund Freud of the University of Vienna, founder of a school of pedagogy already rich in new methods and achievements, leader today among students of the psychology of sex, and of psychotherapy and analysis, doctor of laws" (Hall Papers). The phrase "the psychology of sex" was put on a line by itself and printed in bold-face type in the Worcester *Telegram* (Hall Papers).

Jung at age 34 became the youngest recipient of an honorary doctorate from Clark. In describing the affair in a letter to his wife on September 4, 1909, Jung wrote that "there was a tremendous amount of ceremony and fancy dress, with all sorts of red and black gowns and gold-tasseled square caps." It was, he said, "a grand and festive assemblage" (Jung, 1965, p. 367). Jung was introduced as follows: "Carl G. Jung of the University of Zurich, Switzerland, specialist in psychiatry, brilliant investigator by the Diagnostische Assoziation-Methode, editor and fruitful contributor to the literature of psycho-pathology, doctor of laws" (Hall Papers).

In the Saturday session, Jung spoke at 9:00 a.m. and Freud at 11:00 a.m., each giving the last of their lectures. This time Stern spoke at 10:00 a.m., giving his second lecture on individual psychology. The lecture by Jung was on the "Psychology of the Child" and is said to mark the first public use of the concept of introversion. Freud's talk dealt with transference, wish-fulfillment, and three possible outcomes in the use of psychoanalysis. Freud closed his talk with a simple statement: "I must thank you for your invitation and for the attention with which you have listened to me" (Freud, 1910/1977, p. 55). At 3:00 p.m. there was a demonstration of apparatus for the measurement of sound and a discussion of questions of laboratory equipment and management, given in the physics laboratory by Clark physicist Arthur Gordon Webster and attended by several psychologists. Simultaneously, there was a demonstration of apparatus in the Clark Psychological Laboratory conducted by E. C. Sanford and J. P. Porter of Clark. The Psychology and Pedagogy Conference officially ended with the 8:00 p.m. address by Leo Burgerstein on "The Relation of Body and Mind," which was attended by 100 persons. Jung

wrote to his wife on September 14, 1909, that Hall then held a "private conference" of his own in his home on the topic of the "psychology of sex." (Jung, 1965, p. 367).

The meeting was received well by those who attended. On October 29, 1909, Titchener wrote to Thomas Hunter that "we had a very good time; a whole week together . . . It was very delightful tho' strenuous" (Brown & Fuchs, 1969, p. 28). On September 18, 1909, Adolf Meyer wrote to Titchener that the meeting was "really delightful and extremely stimulating; I only wish these occasions would come oftener" (Titchener Papers). William James congratulated Hall on the meeting, pronouncing it "vastly better than the bigger affairs" (Hall Papers). In a letter to Hall, Edwin B. Holt of Harvard, later author of *The Freudian Wish* (1915), gushed

Will you please accept my enthusiastic thanks for one of the most delightful and profitable weeks which I have ever spent? Scientific meetings *in abstracto* I abominate, but your speakers were so well chosen, the programmes so well arranged and the whole affair conducted with such high-bred informality and hospitality that every moment was a delight. (Hall Papers, Box 19 Folder 3)

The local press also treated the meeting well in its coverage, especially the Worcester *Telegram*, the Worcester *Evening Gazette*, and the *Boston Evening Transcript*. There was also a most laudatory coverage in the national publication, *The Nation* (Cromer & Anderson, 1970). Hall seems to have been determined to get the good press coverage that had been lacking for the 10th anniversary session. A survey of the documents in the Clark University Archives makes clear that Hall himself wrote and planted the article in the *Nation*. This has been suspected for some time, particularly as Hall listed the anonymous article in his list of publications at the end of his autobiography (Hall, 1923, p. 611; Shakow & Rapaport, 1964, p. 66). Letters to Hall from Clark mathematics professor, Henry Taber, a principal conference planner, and from Paul Elmer More, editor of the *Nation*, together with drafts found in the Hall conference file of the general article and specific sections on Freud, clearly demonstrate the process by which that particular appraisal of Freud appeared (Hall Papers).

Fabian Franklin, formerly professor of mathematics at Johns Hopkins and a former colleague of both Hall and Taber, was then associate editor of the *Nation*. Franklin arranged a meeting between Taber and More at which More, in effect, commissioned an article from Hall and defined an acceptable format. Hall talked with Taber the next day, and within 24 hours he and others had drafted and sent off the article. More cut down its length somewhat, in the process eliminating much of Hall's boilerplate

on the achievements of Clark University, and ran it in the September 23 issue (Hall, 1909). More wrote Hall, apologizing for having to cut down his article.

There does not appear to have been any attempt on Hall's part to hide the fact of his authorship, although the piece was unsigned. It is interesting, however, that when E. C. Sanford and W. H. Burnham of Clark described the conference for the *Journal of Educational Psychology*, they identified the author of the *Nation* article as "the correspondent of the *New York Nation*" (Sanford & Burnham, 1910, pp. 35-36). It is possible, although most unlikely, that they did not know better. Because Hall had established a press committee for the conference, headed by Clark librarian Louis N. Wilson, it must be surmised that most of the newspaper coverage was "managed" to some degree. The editorial appearing in the *Springfield Republican* (quoted in Koelsch, 1970, p. 127) for instance, appears in manuscript form in G. Stanley Hall's papers and was obviously typed on the same typewriter as the manuscript of Hall's opening address for the psychology conference (Hall Papers).

The psychology conference appears the most likely candidate for press management because so many of the talks were in German. It is highly unlikely that the reporters from the Worcester and Springfield newspapers would have been able to produce the news items and summaries of lectures in that language without assistance. A printed English abstract of Stern's lectures survives, and the content of the newspaper articles strongly suggests that other addresses given in German were summarized in English for the local reporters. An exception might be the Boston *Transcript's* reporter Adelbert Albrecht, who was apparently well read in Freud's work and was quite likely a native speaker of German (Albrecht, 1909; Clark, 1980, p. 272). The facts that the *Transcript* sent this particular reporter and that part of his series was a special interview with Freud at Hall's house suggests, however, that there was some prior arrangement assuring favorable coverage. All this means that great caution should be exercised in taking the newspaper accounts of Freud's Clark visit as an indicator of public interest or opinion.

The opinions expressed of Freud and Jung by those at the conference were mixed. Titchener was not impressed by Freud's views. On September 19, 1909, he wrote to Adolf Meyer,

Then as to Freud. His psychology is, basally, the psychology of associationism. The fundamental fallacy of that psychology is that it looks upon "ideas" not psychologically, as very fluid existences, but logically, as hard static meanings. The idea of the associationists is always a meaning, a symbol, even when it is not termed by them a "symbolic" idea. The result of this confusion is manifold. (Meyer Papers)

Personally, however, Titchener appears to have developed a certain respect for Freud, calling him a "very great man" in the same letter to Meyer (Meyer Papers). Perhaps Titchener identified with Freud to some degree. Freud, like Titchener, was fighting against the current of popular psychological opinion. On May 20, 1918, Titchener wrote to Meyer that he respected Freud "immensely, though I think his psychology is antediluvian and his constructions largely precarious; but he is a man who has worked and thought and suffered; and I have no stomach for controversy with him" (Meyer Papers).

Titchener thought well of Jung; in a letter to Meyer on September 19, 1909, he wrote that "Jung has oftentimes shown the effects of his psychological training, and has instinctively avoided his master's dogmatic fallacies" (Meyer Papers). As with Freud's ideas, however, Jung's psychological thinking did not meet Titchener's criterion for being called psychological.

William James seems to have responded positively to Freud's ideas but somewhat negatively to Freud himself. Ernest Jones reported that James put his arm around Freud and said, "The future of psychology belongs to your work" (Jones, 1955, p. 57). To Theodore Flournoy, James wrote, "I hope that Freud and his pupils will push their ideas to their utmost limits, so that we may learn what they are. They can't fail to throw light on human nature" (James, 1920, pp. 327-328). On the specifics of Freud's theory, however, James said that "I can make nothing in my own case with his dream theories, and obviously 'symbolism' is a most dangerous method" (James, 1920, p. 328). James commented on Freud that "I confess that he made on me personally the impression of a man obsessed with fixed ideas" (James, 1920, p. 328). On September 19, 1909, James wrote to Mary Calkins, that "I strongly suspect Freud, with his dream theory, of being a regular *halluciné*" (Perry, 1935, Vol. 2, p. 123). Jung seems to have made a better personal impression on James than did Freud.

Freud and Jung went from the conference for a bit of sightseeing and then to the wilds of the Adirondacks with James J. Putnam, professor of neuropathology at Harvard, before leaving again for Europe. Freud recalled a few years later that for him the most important personal relationship that arose from the conference was with Putnam (Freud, 1914). Titchener went back to Cornell and, although offered the headship of psychology at Clark, was unable to accept because Cornell would not let him out of his contract. James went back to Harvard, but he died the following year.

The seed of Freudian psychoanalysis, if it had not already been sown in America, was certainly sown now and nurtured through this meeting.

American psychology would not be quite the same again.

REFERENCES

- Abraham, H. C., & Freud, E. L. (Eds.). (1965). *A psycho-analytic dialogue: The letters of Sigmund Freud and Karl Abraham, 1907-1926*. (B. Marsh & H. C. Abraham, Trans.). London: Hogarth.
- Albrecht, A. (1909, September 11). Prof Sigmund Freud, *Boston Evening Transcript*.
- Boas, F. (1910). Psychological problems in anthropology. *American Journal of Psychology*, 21, 371-384.
- Brown, L. B., & Fuchs, A. H. (1969). *The letters between Sir Thomas Hunter and E. B. Titchener* (No. 23). Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University of Wellington Publications in Psychology.
- Clark, R. W. (1980). *Freud: The man and the cause*. New York: Random House.
- Clark University. (1909). *Twentieth anniversary*. Worcester, MA: Clark University.
- Cromer, W., & Anderson, P. (1970). Freud's visit to America: Newspaper coverage. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 6, 349-353.
- Freud, S. (1910). "The origin and development of psychoanalysis." *American Journal of Psychology*, 21, 181-218.
- Freud, S. (1914). "On the history of the psycho-analytic movement." In J. Riviere (Ed.), *Sigmund Freud: Collected papers* (Vol. 1). New York: Basic Books.
- Freud, S. (1977). *Five lectures on psycho-analysis* (James Strachey, Ed. & Trans.). New York: W. W. Norton. (Original work published 1910)
- Freud, S. (1952). *An autobiographical study*. In J. Strachey (Ed.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 20). London: Hogarth. (Original work published 1925)
- Hall Papers. (1844-1924). (Available at Clark University Archives, Clark University, 950 Main St., Worcester, MA 01610)
- Hall, G. S. (1909). Twentieth anniversary of Clark University. *Nation*, 4, 284-285.
- Hall, G. S. (1923). *Life and confessions of a psychologist*. New York: Appleton.
- Holt, E. B. (1915). *The Freudian wish and its place in ethics*. New York: Holt.
- James, H. (1920). *The letters of William James* (Vol. 2). Boston: Atlantic Monthly Press.
- Jones, E. (1955). *The life and work of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 2). New York: Basic Books.
- Jung, C. G. (1910). The association method. *American Journal of Psychology*, 21, 219-269.
- Jung, C. G. (1965). *Memories, dreams, reflections* (rev. ed., A. Jaffé, Ed.; R. Winston & C. Winston, Trans.). New York: Vantage Books.
- Koelsch, W. (1970). Freud discovers America. *Virginia Quarterly Review*, 46, 115-132.
- McGuire, W. (Ed.) (1974). *The Freud/Jung letters*. (R. Manheim & R. F. C. Hull, Trans.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Meng, H., & Freud, E. L. (Eds.). (1963). *Psycho-analysis and faith: The letters of Sigmund Freud and Oskar Pfister*. (E. Mosbacher, Trans.). London: Hogarth & the Institute of Psycho-Analysis.
- Meyer Papers. (1885-1949). (Available at Welch Medical Library, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21218)
- Perry, R. B. (1935). *The thought and character of William James* (2 vols). Boston: Little, Brown.
- Ross, D. (1972). *G. Stanley Hall: The psychologist as prophet*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sanford, E. C., & Burnham, W. H. (1910). Twentieth anniversary of Clark University. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1, 35-36.
- Shakow, D., & Rapaport, D. (1964). The influence of Freud on American psychology. *Psychological Issues*, 4, 66.
- Stern, W. (1910). Abstracts of lectures on the psychology of testimony and on the study of individuality. *American Journal of Psychology*, 21, 270-282.
- Titchener Papers. (1880-1927). (Available at Cornell University Archives, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14850)
- Titchener, E. B. (1910). The past decade in experimental psychology. *American Journal of Psychology*, 21, 404-410.