



“Pair of Disembodied Eyes Askew  
Against an Existential Landscape”

by Louis N. Sandowsky

# Existential Psychoanalysis and Freudian Psychoanalysis

Louis N. Sandowsky  
Haifa University

*This essay examines the similarities and dissimilarities between Freudian psychoanalysis and the form of analysis outlined by Sartre in *Being and Nothingness* in relation to the theory of intentionality developed by Brentano and Husserl. The principal aim of the paper is to establish a suitable starting point for a dialogue between these two forms of analysis, whose respective terminologies with respect to consciousness and the unconscious appear to cancel one another out.*

“I did that,” says my memory. “I could not have done that,” says my pride, and remains inexorable. Eventually—the memory yields.  
—Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil*. Ch. IV (68)

## *Essence and Existence as Contrasting Temporal Orientations*

On the one hand, the existentialists maintain that existence precedes essence. There is no inner person within the person that ultimately defines who one is. The idea that there is some kind of homunculus living within us belongs to an essentialist world-view and, like a ghost in the machine, it still haunts certain contemporary forms of discourse that have not rid themselves of a residual Cartesianism.<sup>1</sup> According to the existentialist orientation, however, if one peels away the layers of oneself, all that is revealed at the core of one's being is pure nothingness. One is a pro-ject—a transitive movement in which the fulfilment of Self *as consciousness coming to itself* is always a futural affair (*possible* state of affairs).

On the other *side of the same* hand, Freudian psychoanalysis is not by any means rooted in an essentialist doctrine of the human psyche (despite the ‘populist’ images of the *id* and the *ego*), but it places particular stress on the affective nature of the past in determining the characteristic behaviour of the individual—the traces (traumatic or benign) that shape the contours of the present and influence the way in which the future unfolds. Freud demonstrated a number of ways in which the psyche appears to be fragmented within itself (indeed, his whole discourse on the psyche involved mapping out its different regions according to various different perspectives, e.g., the topographic model, the economic model, etc.), and it is in the discourse on the *id* and the *ego* that we find similar characteristics to an essentialist thesis. This is particularly apparent in the way in which psychoanalytic theory

reduces the motivation of the individual to universal structures of desire (e.g., the Oedipus Complex). In the Freudian view of the psyche, the child is the parent of the adult. However, Freud's various models of the individual psyche are dynamic and take time into account. Therefore, psychoanalytic theory is irreducible to essentialism in a pure sense. It is important to mention that the tendency toward systematization in Freudian psychoanalysis has been effected by the tradition that has grown in the wake of his writing. Freud himself was not actually an 'Orthodox Freudian.' He constantly reminds the reader of the merely 'provisional' nature of his insights in his own writing. Freud was a conscientious researcher with a natural gift for phenomenological observation and critique.

For both Freud and Sartre, the individual enters the world *tabula rasa*.<sup>2</sup> The difference between existential psychoanalysis and that of the Freudian kind is not a straightforward disjunction. Their contrariness does not inhere in a comfortable diametrical opposition between existence and essence, but in the alternative emphasis placed on the affective aspects of two different horizons of temporality: the past and the future. It is this tension between the existentialist's focus on the future and the Freudian fascination with the past that requires analysis in any attempt to address their moments of coincidence and the differences that divide them.

Sartre's *Being and Nothingness* establishes the horizon of existential psychotherapy in terms of what it is not. He writes that "...the empirical scientist, while defining man by his desires, remains the victim of the illusion of substance" (p. 712). Despite Sartre's respect for Descartes' philosophy, he resolutely rejects the idea of consciousness as *res cogitans*—where it is defined as mental *substance*. In phenomenological mode, he continues by warning us against the box or container-view of consciousness. The phenomenological concept of intentionality, whereby consciousness is always understood as *consciousness of* something, is the primary basis of Sartre's discourse on the psyche.<sup>3</sup> For example, desire originally transcends itself toward possible fulfillment. It is self-transcending in principle.

Let us beware then of considering these desires as little psychic entities dwelling in consciousness; they are consciousness itself in its original projective, transcendent structure, for consciousness is on principle consciousness *of* something. (pp.712-13)

Sartre speaks out against empirical psychopathologization. It general-

izes the subject into an objective collection of interconnected states. Like Kierkegaard before him, Sartre is concerned to bring out the importance of an individual in terms of its own 'particularity' as distinct from the 'general states' by which it is often reduced to a pathological 'type' when he writes....

...we will realize the link between chastity and mysticism, between fainting and hypocrisy. But we are ignorant always of the concrete relation between *this* chastity (this abstinence in relation to a particular woman, *this* struggle against a definite temptation) and the individual content of the mysticism; in the same way psychiatry is too quickly satisfied when it throws light on the general structures of delusions and does not seek to comprehend the individual, concrete content of the psychoses (why this man believes himself to be that particular historical personality rather than some other; why his compensatory delusion is satisfied with specifically these ideas of grandeur instead of others, *etc.*). But most important of all, these "psychological" explanations refer us ultimately to inexplicable original givens. p. 715.

Furthermore, each individual is a whole and cannot be broken down into constitutive parts. The whole is both greater and less than the sum of its parts, since it remains, for existential reasons, unrealized. Sartre continues by saying that,

The problem poses itself in approximately these terms: If we admit that the person is a totality, we can not hope to reconstruct him by an addition or by an organization of the diverse tendencies which we have empirically discovered in him. On the contrary, in each inclination, in each tendency the person expresses himself completely, although from a different angle, a little as Spinoza's substance expresses itself completely in each of its attributes. But if this is so, we should discover in each tendency, in each attitude of the subject, a meaning which transcends it. (p. 720)

In *The Transcendence of the Ego* and *Being and Nothingness*, Sartre likens the transcendence of the totality of the *individual* to the way in which an object does not wholly give itself to consciousness. Each object is *given as a totality*, despite the fact that most of it is actually unseen at any given

moment. That is, the object only exhibits itself according to particular perspectives.<sup>4</sup>

Likewise, there is a tendency in each act toward a meaning that transcends it. Choice is not an act that is made and then filed as a retained decision, which rests in the past. It is to some extent, contemporaneous with the present *and* the future because it is a *call to future fulfilment*. One *lives* in the choice. One is not so much propelled by the past as sucked toward the future—although this should not be confused with a teleological form of reverse causation, since this would be to fall back into the trap of essentialism. Choice is an intentional relation and not principally one of cause and effect (forwards or backwards). In other words, the stimulus is futural rather than lying in the past precisely because consciousness is an *ekstatic* movement: it is outside itself beyond stasis. One lives in the *extended* act or ‘way of being-towards’ futural fulfilment. It is to fill the emptiness of that which is not-yet with the fullness of the desired that the living present projects into it. Decision/choice is to embrace one’s existence as a constitutive movement in the face of the nothing. It is the future as uncertainty/ambiguity—as the nothing—that the for-itself seeks to transmogrify into some Thing. It is the very absence of meaning and certainty in the future that produces anxiety, and it is this primary ontological phenomenon of disclosure that produces the motivation for action.

Anxiety is not identical to fear. Fear has an object, whereas anxiety is precisely the reaction to the absence of an object.

Anxiety is the index to our freedom/possibility/lack.

For Sartre, it is not the unconscious past that drives one forward. It is the unrealized future. This unrealized future is one’s unrealized Self. Choice is not simply a moment of decision that can be isolated at one point. It is rather an extension, an extending of a project—which is precisely consciousness itself.

Sartre writes,

If the empirical attitude signifies the choice of the intelligible character, it is because it is itself this choice. Indeed the distinguishing characteristic of the intelligible choice... is that it can exist only as the transcendent meaning of each concrete, empirical choice. It is by no means first effected in some unconscious... (p.720)

In these terms, the concept of an unconscious is an unnecessary sub-

stitute for the absence/non-presence of a primordial core of meaning. It is the difference between the transcendental and the transcendent. Every consciousness is consciousness *of* something—and, as such, it transcends itself. It is only through such transcendence that consciousness is able to recuperate itself. The very structurality of consciousness involves a relation between consciousness and itself—through that which it is not—but this is not a consciousness of what is traditionally referred to as the Self. This is not to say that the mind as a whole is fragmented within itself because each consciousness is actually discrete/atomic. Every consciousness is always already an extending of a pro-ject—which is most appropriately expressed by the term ‘streams of consciousness’ (as coined by William James and adopted by Edmund Husserl). Each consciousness is rather a moment of a transcendent whole (which must not be confused with completeness). Sartre maintains that the whole is coincidental with each aspect, but that it is only *given according to that aspect*. Like broken shards of a hologram, each aspect contains the original object as a whole, but according to that aspect’s own lines of angularity. Sartre likens this to Husserl’s discourse on the *Abshattungen* (perspective variations) of experience where an object of experience is present as a whole without being wholly given. Consciousness *as a whole* is similarly transcendent.

Sartre’s definition of consciousness as *Être pour soi* is analogous to Heidegger’s definition of *Dasein* as that being which asks the question of the meaning of Being. Likewise, the for-itself is that being whose Being is in question. This absence of foundation or concreteness is the basis of its motivation.

In the Freudian scenario, motivation lies in a sense that is concealed in the past, whereas in Sartre’s horizon, motivation comes from transcendence and an endlessly open future of possibilities. In these terms, it is because the existence of Being-for-itself precedes its essence that neurosis is less a product of the past that enfolds it in the congealed guise of necessity than a certain kind of anticipatory unfolding of the future in the face of its absolute contingency.

When Sartre raises the issue of a special method of psychoanalysis in *Being and Nothingness*, he emphasizes that such existential therapy will be ‘different’ in each ‘particular’ case. But he also says that such existential therapy will be ‘different’ in each particular case. There is a sharp contrast here between method and system. Sartre is focused on bringing out the particularity of each individual story, which he contrasts with the Freudian

approach and its tendency to universalize. It is somewhat like the tension between Kierkegaard and Hegel. Sartre means to avoid the disappearance of the individual, which is the danger in any project of universal pathologization (systematization)

The theme of the 'story' is crucial to both Freud and Sartre.<sup>5</sup> In simple terms, for Freud, the story that one writes about the future is determined in the past as played out in the present, whereas for Sartre, the story that one writes about the past is written in a projected future as it unfolds in the transcendence of the present toward it (the present or Living Present/*lebendige Gegenwart*, has the intentional sense of 'waiting-towards something'). The past is not written in stone since life itself is constantly re-writing it.

*Bad Faith vs. Repression: the problem of the unconscious*

Freud did not write extensively on consciousness.<sup>6</sup> He was not always consistent on what constituted the conscious dimension of the psyche either. It appears that he treats these terms—consciousness and conscious—synonymously. His writings are principally concerned with the ways in which the *unconscious* realm of the mind announces itself through slips of the tongue, bungled actions (parapraxes), symbolic association, dreamscapes, etc. and the ways in which the psyche is fragmented—made up of dimensional differences within itself.<sup>7</sup> It is extremely difficult to graft the language of phenomenology onto Freudian metapsychological theory.

In phenomenology, consciousness is always consciousness *of* something, therefore it would seem that the concept of an unconscious is paradoxical. But is unconsciousness what Freud means when he speaks of the unconscious? Quite clearly, the phenomenological understanding of the meaning of consciousness is not equivalent to his notion of the conscious. The conscious component of consciousness, in phenomenological terms, would be its higher reflexive function. Consciousness, in its most fundamental form, is pre-reflexive or non-positional in relation to itself. In this sense, it may be unconscious with respect to its own motivational drives, but it is not unconsciousness. Principally, consciousness is positionally related to things while being non-positionally related to itself. In other words, we do not take our mode of consciousness as an object as if we *lived reflectively* from moment to moment, e.g., the mode of consciousness that we call desire is '*lived-through*' as a certain kind of being-towards that which is desired.

We are not positionally related to the desire for we *exist as this desire* in its positional relatedness towards that which would fulfill it.

It is according to this line of reasoning that Sartre substitutes the expression Bad Faith (*mauvais foi*) for the kinds of phenomena that Freud associates with the unconscious. However, Bad Faith cannot account for the degree of occultation about which Freud is concerned.<sup>8</sup>

Both Freudian Psychoanalysis and that of the Sartrean kind speak of the necessity of not just a certain kind of forgetting, but a forgetting of the forgetting. The reason for this is because the forgetting of something means that some faculty (a kind of censor) must be aware of that which requires suppression. However, if such a faculty is aware, then this undermines the forgetting. Freud resolved this problem by introducing a second censor. The first censor is located at the interface between the conscious and the pre-conscious, and the second censor is situated between the pre-conscious and the unconscious (note that this topographical model is not to be taken in a literal sense). The point is that the psyche as-a-whole is not wholly transparent to itself.

Sartre's concept of Bad Faith does not really go any deeper than what we usually call rationalization. In the essay "Some Elementary Lessons in Psychoanalysis" (1938), Freud anticipates Sartre's objection and demonstrates that there is a much deeper dimension to psychic functions in a story about a patient under the influence of a post-hypnotic suggestion.

Freud writes,

...it is possible in the case of persons in a state of hypnosis to prove experimentally that there are such things as unconscious psychological acts and that consciousness is not an indispensable condition of activity. Anyone who has witnessed such an experiment will receive an unforgettable impression and a conviction that can never be shaken. Here is more or less what happens. The doctor enters the hospital ward, puts his umbrella in the corner, hypnotizes one of the patients and says to him: 'I'm going out now. When I come in again, you will come to meet me with my umbrella open and hold it over my head.' The doctor and his assistants then leave the ward. As soon as they come back, the patient, who is no longer under hypnosis, carries out exactly the instructions that were given him while he was hypnotized. The doctor questions him: 'What's this you're doing? What's the meaning of all this?' The patient is clearly embarrassed. He makes some lame remark such as 'I

only thought, doctor, as it's raining outside you'd open your umbrella in the room before you went out.' The explanation is obviously quite inadequate and made up on the spur of the moment to offer some sort of motive for his senseless behaviour. It is clear to us spectators that he is in ignorance of his real motive. We, however, know what it is, for we were present when the suggestion was made to him which he is now carrying out, while he himself knows nothing of the fact that it is at work in him (*Freud - Complete Works*, p.5070).<sup>9</sup>

Clearly, Bad Faith cannot account for the kind of phenomenon that Freud describes above. The subject, after having been told to open his umbrella at a certain signal, does so on cue, but he remembers nothing of the hypnotic command itself. When asked why he performed this action, he quickly responds by expressing a reason in an attempt to mask his embarrassment. However, this is not the real reason. It is certainly a reasonable reply, but it is false. The point is that if the patient were to actually convince himself of the truth of the stated reason, then this would correspond with Sartre's notion of Bad Faith. However, as far as the real reason is concerned it remains unknown regardless of what the patient actually believes. It is in this sense that Freud's discourse engages with a deeper order phenomenon than that of Sartre.<sup>10</sup>

The question still remains whether phenomenology can penetrate such a deep dimension. In many ways, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Paul Ricoeur, Rudolf Bernet, and Jacques Derrida have addressed this question and provided a few clues as to how the conundrum may be unraveled.<sup>11</sup> But perhaps the most important cutting-edge therapeutic text that addresses the issue of how well-equipped phenomenology is to deal with the question of the unconscious is R.D Laing's *The Divided Self*.

### *The Invisible—Intentionality and the Question of the Unconscious*

Liminal (Latin: *limen* = threshold) relating to the point (or threshold) beyond which a sensation becomes too faint to be experienced. Subliminal (Latin: *sub* [under] and *limen* [threshold]). This expression is often treated as being synonymous with *subnoetic* and *anoetic*. Residing below the threshold of consciousness; beneath recognition by consciousness<sup>12</sup>

In Husserl's phenomenology (whose notion of intentionality provides the theoretical basis of Sartre's phenomenological ontology), the subliminal is not equivalent to the anoetic. The noeses bear this horizon within themselves. One must not confuse that which does not appear before consciousness as an object of recognition with that which is not of consciousness and which may well be capable of being made present as a theme for consciousness. Without this, Freud's clinical 'principle of principles' would lack force—i.e., 'where id was, ego shall be.' Freud first came to the notion of the unconscious through the observation of neurotic symptoms/phenomena—which he took as visible traces/signs of a 'repressive activity' that consigned certain ideas to a region of comparative invisibility. It is a question of only 'comparative' invisibility, since the repressed material was 'indicated' by many forms of neurotic behaviour, dreams, and slips of the tongue (parapraxes), which provided a starting-point from which to begin to uncover it—to illuminate its significance.

Freud's discourse on the unconscious became more sophisticated and elaborate in the later part of his career and extended into diverse aspects of this deep-level psychology.<sup>13</sup> His economic or dynamic model, in particular—which focused on an unconscious play of forces—extended into a more primordial field of energy than the form of unconscious that is originally produced through higher level acts of repression (which required a different set of distinctions).

All that is repressed is indeed unconscious, but not all that is unconscious, according to Freud, has been repressed<sup>14</sup>—which is why the pre-conscious is continuous with, although non-identical to the unconscious. Part of the ego itself is and has always been unconscious. But the profoundest element in Freud's discourse has to do with the observation that there are invisible elements of the psyche that have never actually been present—unconscious *mental functioning*—like an organ of vision that sees everything but itself.

Put simply, there are two subliminal dimensions that Freud takes into account, whereas for Sartre there is only one (which corresponds with the *pre-conscious*). The *pre-conscious* dimension of virtual information is available for reiteration (because it has not been repressed), but it would over-saturate the mind if it were present all at once. Imagine what it would be like if the entire history of one's knowledge and experience presented itself contemporaneously. Rather than 'pushing away,' it is more a case of letting go. This dimension involves a form of forgetting, while Freud's no-

tion of the *un*-conscious involves a *forgetting of* the forgetting. The expression *un*-conscious points to a field that is profoundly deeper. Nevertheless, despite Freud's more mature views, which culminated in his discourse on the unconscious *as id* (*es* / *it*)—which focused not so much on repressed 'ideas' as on primordial and unconscious 'drives' (*Triebe*, which are not to be confused with instincts, as in the standard translations<sup>15</sup>)—the gateway to the unconscious is still illuminated by signs (chains of symbolic associations), indicating that that which was unconscious was not wholly invisible. It leaves *traces* of itself.

The Freudian disjunctions between the conscious, pre-conscious, and unconscious are not at work in phenomenology precisely because its discourse on consciousness is by no means equivalent to Freud's conception of the 'conscious.' To reiterate, Freud's writing on consciousness is rather sparse, since his inquiries were always beguiled by the question of the 'unconscious' (ranging from that which had been repressed to that which had never actually been present).<sup>16</sup> This also resulted in a rather sketchy model of the conscious field of mental life.

Sartre's discourse on consciousness is animated by the Husserlian principle of intentionality—the transcendence of consciousness in relation to itself as it encounters the world: its transitivity. For Husserl, the theme of intentional analysis coincided with the meaning of phenomenology as a whole. The breadth of his conception of intentional consciousness stands in better comparison to Freud's notion of the 'psyche,' which embodies the conscious/pre-conscious/unconscious disjunctions within itself. But here, all similarity ends—or can only be maintained rather tenuously through a distortion of their texts.<sup>17</sup>

However, there remains a significant intersection between them at a most fundamental level, which has to do with the fact that both thinkers attended lectures by Franz Brentano, whose philosophy first introduced (or re-introduced) the modern concept of intentionality.<sup>18</sup>

In Eugen Fink's "Appendix on the Problem of the Unconscious"—in Husserl's final and un-finished manuscript, *The Crisis of the European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*, it is stressed that:

Only *after* an *explicit* analysis of consciousness can the problem of the unconscious be posed at all. But only in the working mastery of this problem will it be revealed whether or not the 'unconscious' can be treated according to the method of intentional analysis. (*The Crisis of*

*European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology [Crisis]. p.387)*

Despite the slippage that occurs whenever an attempt is made to graft the phenomenological map onto Freudian metapsychology, or vice versa, it is vital that we take the issue of intentionality into account as the most fundamental point of convergence. In a sense, the id is wholly intentional. The drives are always directed toward fulfilment (where fulfilment equals the cessation of the impulse—the *petit mort*). They do not exist for themselves. The *Triebe* are transitive in principle.

Therefore, it is the phenomenological concept of intentionality in its purest sense that marks the appropriate starting-point for a dialogue between Freud and Sartre. And, it is the question of *lived-time* in all its pluri-dimensionality that should establish the proper context of such a discourse.

*References*

- Bernet, R. (2002). Unconscious consciousness in Husserl and Freud. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 1, 327-351.
- Bettelheim, B. (1982). Freud and man's soul. Pelican.
- Blanco, I.-M. (1975). The unconscious as infinite sets—an essay in bi-logic. Duckworth.
- Brentano, F. (1988). *Philosophical investigations on space, time and the continuum*. (B. Smith, Trans.). London: Croom Helm.
- Brentano, F. (1995). *Psychology from an empirical standpoint* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Caws, P. (1979). *Sartre*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Derrida, J. (1982). *Margins of philosophy*. (A. Bass, Trans.). London: The Harvester Press.
- Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and difference*. (A. Bass, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dostoevsky, F. (1961). *Notes from the underground*. New York: New American Library.
- Freud, S. (1984). *On metapsychology: The theory of psychoanalysis*. Harmondsworth: Pelican.
- Freud, S. (1955). *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud*. (J. Strachey, Trans.). New York: Norton.
- Freud, S. (1964). *Moses and monotheism, an outline of psychoanalysis and other works*. London: The Hogarth Press.
- Husserl, E. (1963). *Cartesian meditations*. (D. Cairns, Trans.). The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Husserl, E. (1962). *The crisis of the European sciences and transcendental phenomenology*. (D. Carr, Trans.). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Husserl, E. (1950). *The idea of phenomenology*. (W.P. Alston & G. Nakhnikian, Trans.). The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Husserl, E. (1981). *Husserl: Shorter works*. (P. McCormick & F. Elliston, Ed.). London:

Harvester Press.

Husserl, E. (1964). *The phenomenology of internal time consciousness*. (M. Heidegger, Ed.; J.S. Churchill, Trans.). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Kraus, O. (1976). *The philosophy of Brentano*. (L.L. McAlister, Ed.). London: Duckworth.

Laing, R.D. (1959). *The divided self: An existential study of sanity and madness*. New York: Pelican.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *Phenomenology of perception*. (C. Smith, Trans.). London: Routledge.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1964). *The primacy of perception*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1968). *The visible and the invisible*. (A. Lingis, Trans.; C. Lefort, Ed.). Evanston, IUL: Northwestern University Press.

Nietzsche, F. (1966). *Beyond good and evil*. (W. Kaufmann, Trans.). New York: Vintage.

Nietzsche, F. (1967-68). *Twilight of the idols*. (R.J. Hollingdale, Trans.). New York: Penguin.

Ricoeur, P. (1970). *Freud and philosophy: An essay on interpretation*. (D. Savage, Trans.). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Sartre, J.-P. (1958). *Being and nothingness*. (H.E. Barnes, Trans.). London: Methuen.

Sartre, J.-P. (1985). *The Freud Scenario*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sartre, J.-P. (1966). *Nausea*. New York: Penguin.

Sartre, J.-P. (1962). *Sketch for a theory of the emotions*. (P. Mairet, Trans.). London: Methuen.

Sartre, J.-P. (1972). *The transcendence of the ego*. (F. Williams & R. Kirkpatrick, Trans.). New York: Octagon.

Thomas, D.M. (1981). *The white hotel*. New York: Viking Press.

Yalom, I.D. (1992). *When Nietzsche wept*. New York: HarperPerennial.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> I allude to Gilbert Ryle's text, *The Concept of Mind* (1949), in which he coined the famous phrase "the ghost in the machine."

<sup>2</sup> Tabula rasa (blank tablet) – as in the sense of a clean page for life itself to write upon.

<sup>3</sup> Sartre is influenced by discourse on intentionality in the phenomenology of Edmund Husserl, although his orientation (as a kind of material ontologist) actually comes closer to that of Franz Brentano – who re-introduced the scholastic notion of intentionality to contemporary philosophy. Sartre is fascinated by the ways in which The World announces itself phenomenologically, e.g., *nausea*: as the primordial disclosure of being in itself.

<sup>4</sup> Husserl's discourse on *Abschattungen* (perspective variations) and *Ablaufphänomene* (running-off-phenomena), in his analyses of the modes of givenness / profiling of objects both spatially and temporally, is fundamental to understanding the phenomenological importance of the question of perspective in relation to wholes and parts. There is always a play of immanence and transcendence, givenness and non-givenness in the appearance of anything – which means that the givenness of one's mind as a whole or any three-dimensional object

as a whole are elusive to any singular ray of attention. However, Sartre takes this analogy too far when he applies it to consciousness's relation to itself. Each consciousness is indeed non-positionally conscious of itself as a positional directedness toward something, but there are important phenomenological differences between the types of elusiveness that announce themselves with respect to the transcendence of the subject, on the one hand, and the transcendence of the object, on the other. To a considerable extent, Sartre's confusion lies in his misunderstanding of the phenomenological *epoché*.

<sup>5</sup> The centrality of this theme in Sartre's thought is particularly apparent as early as 1938 in his novel, *Nausea*. In a sense, we are all Winston Smith's (George Orwell's 1984) in relation to our past[s]. One's history is always being discreetly re-written.

<sup>6</sup> Freud often treats 'consciousness' and the 'conscious' as if their meanings were identical. See, in particular, "The Unconscious" (1915e). Freudian psychoanalysis displaces the primacy given to consciousness in philosophical thought by divorcing it from the somatic drives – thus re-situating the sense of intentionality within the sphere of physical forces (although he still considers them to be 'mental.' Therefore, intentionality is considered to be the stuff of *passion* rather than reason. Phenomenology does not set up such a disjunction. Instead, consciousness is defined by its intentionality and, as such, it becomes the stage upon which philosophy can engage with the question of *motivation*. Such motivation is another name for passion or impulse. It is the re-situation of intentionality according to different ontologies that appears to set Freudian metapsychological theory apart from that of phenomenology and phenomenological ontology (existentialism). But, actually, these different viewpoints still retain their natural ties through the concept of intentionality since, in both cases, to paraphrase Hume: reason still remains the slave to passion – regardless of whether we think in terms of a disjunction between consciousness and physical forces or dimensional differences within consciousness itself.

<sup>7</sup> These issues trace themselves out in Freud's earliest writings (e.g., *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900a), *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* (1901b), and the many case-studies) to his later and more sophisticated metapsychological papers, e.g., "The Unconscious" (1915e), "Beyond the Pleasure Principle" (1920g), "The Ego and the Id" (1923b), etc.

<sup>8</sup> See my article on Husserl and Sartre, "Recuperation in Transgression." Forthcoming.

<sup>9</sup> Freud adds the following footnote: "I am describing experiments made by Bernheim at Nancy in 1889 at which I myself assisted. In these days there is no need for me to discuss any doubts as to the genuineness of hypnotic phenomena of this kind" (*Ibid*).

All references to Freud's texts are to *Freud - Complete Works*. Ivan Smith 2000. All Rights Reserved. This is an internet version of *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* (translated under the General Editorship of James Strachey).

<sup>10</sup> It is somewhat ironic that Sartre was commissioned to write the screenplay for John Huston's film, *Freud: the Secret Passion* (1962), given that he forcefully rejected the notion of an unconscious at the time of writing *Being and Nothingness* (1943). There is a part early in the film where Sartre's attitude is put to the test and parodied by the young Freud (played by Montgomery Clift). This takes place in a hospital ward where Freud and a group of medical students stand at the bedside of a woman lying in a state of paralysis while listening to a professor claim that she does not have a neurological problem and that she is merely shamming / deluding herself / in Bad Faith. The young Freud picks up a long needle and sticks it into the patient's thigh *without any physical reaction* on her part. He then turns

to the dogmatic professor and asks how he might explain this phenomenon if the patient's paralysis was nothing more than a sham.

Sartre's screenplay was published in 1984, entitled, *Le scénario Freud*, Gallimard (translation by Quintin Hoare, published as *The Freud Scenario*, University of Chicago Press, 1985).

<sup>11</sup> See, Maurice Merleau-Ponty's *The Visible and the Invisible*, Paul Ricoeur's *Freud and Philosophy: an Essay on Interpretation*, Rudolf Bernet's article "Unconscious Consciousness in Husserl and Freud" (*Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*), and particularly Jacques Derrida's essay "Freud and the Scene of Writing" (*Writing and Difference*) in which he examines the theme of memory and trace structure by recalling Freud's essay "A Note Upon the 'Mystic Writing-Pad'" (1925).

<sup>12</sup> See Peter Angeles's *Dictionary of Philosophy*. Harper and Row, 1981.

<sup>13</sup> Freud's most important metapsychological papers have been collected together in the Pelican edition of Freud's works, entitled: *On Metapsychology: the theory of psychoanalysis*.

<sup>14</sup> Freud writes,

Everything that is repressed must remain unconscious; but let us state at the very outset that the repressed does not cover everything that is unconscious. The unconscious has the wider compass: the repressed is a part of the unconscious ("The Unconscious" p. 2991).

<sup>15</sup> See Bruno Bettelheim's excellent book *Freud and Man's Soul* (check bibliography) for a discussion on misleading translations of key terms in the Strachey edition of Freud's works.

<sup>16</sup> The German expression *Nachträglichkeit*, is of singular importance in this regard. Repression is always a reference to a kind of deferred action or a delayed presentation. This is one of the principal areas of fascination in Derrida's writing, particularly the theme of *différance* (difference and deferral).

Freud gives an account of two different types of repression in the essay of that title when he writes...

We have reason to assume that there is a primal repression, a first phase of repression, which consists in the psychical (ideational) representative of the instinct being denied entrance into the conscious. With this fixation is established; the representative in question persists unaltered from then onwards and the instinct remains attached to it. This is due to the properties of unconscious processes of which we shall speak later.

The second stage of repression, repression proper, affects mental derivatives of the repressed representative, or such trains of thought as, originating elsewhere, have come into associative connection with it. On account of this association, these ideas experience the same fate as what was primally repressed. Repression proper, therefore, is actually an after-pressure [Nachdrängen]. Moreover, it is a mistake to emphasize only the repulsion which operates from the direction of the conscious upon what is to be repressed; quite as important is the attraction exercised by what was primally repressed upon everything with which it can establish a connection. Probably the trend towards repression would fail in its purpose if these two forces did not co-operate, if there were not something previously repressed ready to receive what is repelled by the conscious ("Repression" p. 2979).

1915 was an extraordinary year with respect to Freud's development of his metapsychological theories of psychoanalysis. His prolific output included "The Drives [Triebe] and their Vicissitudes" (where Triebe is incorrectly translated in the Strachey edition as "Instincts"), "Repression," and "The Unconscious." Clearly, these three papers must be thought together.

<sup>17</sup> Arguably, the most absorbing, detailed, and entertaining writing on a possible form of dialogue between existential psychoanalysis and that of a Freudian kind is Irvin D. Yalom's fictional novel, *When Nietzsche Wept*.

<sup>18</sup> As well as attending lectures by Brentano, both Freud and Husserl were influenced by his text, *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*, 1874. (See also, Brentano, 1911: *The Classification of Mental Phenomena*).

Husserl developed a different perspective on intentionality to that of Brentano by exploring the theme without any presuppositions regarding causality—taking the 'methodological' path through transcendental idealism (thus being principally semiological in orientation)—whereas Freud was initially interested precisely in its causal and somatic sense in neurophysiological terms. However, as his investigations into the psyche deepened throughout the development of psychoanalysis as a depth psychology, Freud ultimately invested more energy traveling the semiological route.