

Feature Article: JAF006

CIVILIZATION AND ITS "MALCONTENT": SIGMUND FREUD AND THE PROBLEM OF GUILT

The Second in an Occasional Series on the West's Most Influential Thinkers

by C. Wayne Mayhall

This article first appeared in the *Christian Research Journal*, volume 31, number 1 (2008). For further information or to subscribe to the *Christian Research Journal* go to: <http://www.equip.org>

SYNOPSIS

Sigmund Freud despised religion, theism, and the Bible, and, although his goal was to eradicate the problem of guilt, he is ultimately responsible for confusing it. His primary motivation for psychoanalysis was to transform guilt into neurosis and sin into sickness. Freud believed that guilt must be eliminated through self-analysis and that our struggle to transcend the stifling codes of culture is inescapable unless we are willing to break out of our moral prison. Freud viewed himself as a destroyer of conventions whose purpose was to dissociate guilt from sin, making it a problem for science rather than faith.

A careful study of Freudian thought reminds us that as long as people continue to believe in a view that relegates the problem of guilt to biological determinism and ignores individual responsibility, Freud is with us. Secular thinkers, for better or worse, consider him an architect of the modern mind, whereas Christian critics name him an unholy builder of said modern mind, in the line of Marx and Darwin.

FREUDIAN GUILT: from either a dread of an external authority or dread of the demands and punishments of the superego, an internalized authority. It is through drive-repressing guilt and the resulting sublimations that civilization arose. Guilt also has a primeval source: the murder of the primal father.¹

Sigmund Freud wrote *Civilization and Its Discontents* in 1929 and it was first published under the German title of *Das Unbehagen in der Kultur* ("The Uneasiness in Culture") in 1930. In the book, one of his most important and widely read, Freud espouses his view of the nature of the individual and the individual's place in civilization.

Freud believed that as individuals we find ourselves struggling between a quest for freedom and culture's attempts to have us conform. The urge to conform can inhibit our instinctual drives and leave us with a nagging sense of false guilt, an "uneasiness" of conscience.

A MESS OF POTTAGE

In the early 1960s, psychologist and one-time president of the American Psychological Association, O. Hobart Mowrer, confronted clients with the controversial idea that people who were labeled neurotic could be helped by confessing and taking responsibility for their deviant behavior. A non-Christian, Mowrer "challenged the entire field of psychiatry, declaring it a failure, and sought to refute its fundamental Freudian presuppositions. Boldly he threw down the gauntlet to conservative Christians as well. He asked: 'Has Evangelical religion sold its birthright for a mess of psychological pottage?'"²

In his book *The Crisis in Psychiatry and Religion*,³ Mowrer rejected the Medical Model of psychiatry (the patient as mentally ill or as victim suffering from poor mental health) and put forth a Moral Model (the patient as suffering from real guilt, not guilt feelings [false guilt]). He writes: "The basic irregularity is not emotional, but behavioral. [The patient] is not a victim of his conscience, but a violator of it. He must stop blaming others and accept responsibility for his own poor behavior. Problems may be solved, not by ventilation of feelings, but rather by confession of sin."⁴

From his position of prominence within the Ivory Tower of the psychoanalytic culture, Mowrer realized that Freudian psychoanalysis turns out to be "an archeological expedition back into the past in which a search is made for others on whom to pin the blame for the patient's behavior."⁵

THE RISE OF "OPRAHFICATION"

There's a popular neologism ("new word") for the demise of the biblical approach to the problem of guilt and the exaltation of the morally neutral ventilator—the phenomenon of "Oprahfication."⁶ Following an episode of *Oprah* in 2004, social critic Philip Terzian wrote:

You read a lot about the Oprahfication of American culture—the exaltation of victimhood, the no-fault moral universe, the abuse of public discourse for private therapy—and it pays to witness the phenomenon at Ground Zero. No one in American political life has claimed that mantle of victimhood, or reaped the benefits of fake sincerity, with as much success as Bill Clinton, and Oprah Winfrey is the national laureate of pop therapy. Sitting before a rapt audience of thirty-somethings, the former president recounted the childhood horrors of a negative body image and a drunken stepfather and the grown-up challenges of brutal Republicans and journalists who live to hurt politicians' feelings. Oprah was, at all times, duly sympathetic and handled the subject of adultery with considerable skill: Scolding her guest with affectionate concern, she drew from her audience laughter and applause simultaneously. This enabled Mr. Clinton to smile in his trademark boyish fashion and pledge that marathon counseling had made him a better man, better husband, better father, better president and better guest on 'The Oprah Winfrey Show.'⁷

How has our culture come to this place theologian David F. Wells labels "the bonfire of the self,"⁸ where people "have lost their capacity to think of themselves as moral beings,"⁹ where they make no room for a reality that transcends their experience and self-understanding? Of the paradox, Wells writes, "First, we now have no transcendent reference point outside of ourselves. Second, sin has become a conceptual impossibility. However, since we continue to sin, much of our life has become inexplicable to us. These losses in understanding are lethal to our discovery of who we are as human beings and so to our identity."¹⁰

GUILT AS MAN'S BASIC PROBLEM

In the summer of 1997, exactly one-hundred years beyond Freud's first intense interaction with religious phenomena and the beginning of his own self-analysis in 1897, after two weeks visiting Nazi Labor and death camps in Germany and Poland, I came by Eurail to the foot of the Heumoz mountains in the Swiss Alps. There I boarded an incline for a ride up into the heart of Christian apologist Francis Schaeffer's L'Abri Fellowship¹¹ for a time of intense study and the opportunity, I hoped, to get my mind off the absurdity of Hitler's "final solution."

I arrived at the cozy retreat to discover it was between student summer sessions and virtually abandoned. Alone in the Fellowship library, surrounded by hundreds of volumes of the thoughts of great thinkers, I came across a seventy-six-page book humbly titled *Freud*,¹² written by theologian Rousas J. Rushdoony.¹³ For the next few days, beginning very early in the morning and lasting long into the night, I explored his thesis that the central problem Freud confronted was the nature and character of guilt and the development of a method for its eradication.

As I write this article, a decade after that experience, I realize why I was so consumed by Rushdoony's perspective. Five years prior to that trip to L'Abri, in 1992, I was an upstart professional freelance writer

plying my trade for national magazines when I was commissioned by *Harper's* magazine to do research on white supremacist groups in America. As I combed through stacks of their propaganda riddled with the rhetoric of hate and destruction, I was shocked when I came across a pamphlet blatantly denying that mass extermination of Jewish people had even occurred. I pledged right there and then to visit the sites of concentration camps myself one day, so that I could see it for myself.

At L'Abri, after fulfilling my pledge to wade through historical remnants of Nazi sewers of depravity, alone in that quiet place, my thoughts and experiences coalesced. I realized clearly the guilt of the white racist and the German fascist were cut from the same cloth, one denying the other fabricating a death machine responsible for the slaughter of millions of innocent men, women, boys, and girls. I saw in Rushdoony's reasoning, how Freud's desire to eradicate religion under the banner of illusion and eliminate guilt through the language of biological determinism let them both off the hook, with neither God to judge nor conscience to condemn them.

The Move from Sin to Dissociated Guilt

Freud's theories, Rushdoony observed, were developed in self-analysis and in tandem with his fascination and exploration of religion and neurosis and confirmed in the psychoanalysis of others. "In himself Freud had discovered the dreams and desires for incest, parricide, and every other facet of his theory, and these discoveries were confirmed in his unconscious feelings with respect to his father, mother, and daughters,"¹⁴ writes Freudian scholar Ernest Jones. "This self-analysis continued, so that in 1910 he could write... 'A part of homosexual cathexis [i.e., a concentration of psychological energy focused on homosexuality] has been withdrawn and made use of to enlarge my own ego.'"¹⁵

Why would Freud choose to explore such worlds? It was not the 'unconscious,' for the doctrine of the unconscious was an old one when Freud was born. Neither was it 'sex,' for in Freud's day,¹⁶ many scholars studied sex.¹⁷ Rushdoony adds that although sex was important to Freud's theory, to make it central is to misunderstand the theory. He concludes, "What then was Freud's central concern and the key to his theory? It was his concern with the feeling of *guilt*."¹⁸

Freud's close friend Ernest Jones recognized the essential nature of this concern in Freud's study *Civilization and its Discontents*.¹⁹ In his biography of Freud, Jones writes, of Freud's "intention to represent the sense of guilt as the most important problem in the evolution of culture, and to convey that the price of progress in civilization is paid by forfeiting happiness through the heightening of the sense of guilt."²⁰ Freud's move from sin to dissociated guilt was his attempt to reckon with the idea of Christian guilt. As he saw it, regardless of advances in culture, a person struggling with guilt was rendered helpless. Freudian scholar, Egon Friedell, believes Freud alienated himself from other materialists by introducing "a religious premise into a godless world...an unheard of starting point for a man of science [but one that others saw] as the rebirth of the soul in Western culture."²¹

Freud was a scientist not a theologian, more concerned with the psychology of religion than the nature of faith. "There was no reason why Freud should have been so engaged by the problem of religion—at least no obvious, psychoanalyzable reason. He had never gone through a phase of faith; no family pieties had stifled him so that he had to speak out," writes Freudian scholar Philip Reiff. "His free-thinking father...raised his children in a secular atmosphere. After a childhood devoid of religious impulse and schooling, Freud was easily converted to the Darwinian gospel..."²² It was only natural, for Freud to address religious belief through anthropology, "instead of dealing with guilt in terms of God, creation, and man's fall."²³

A PRIMER ON FREUD'S PSYCHOLOGY

For Freud, naturalistic anthropology²⁴ had to be the basis for a proper psychology, such that he could say, "in the psychical field the biological factor is really the rock-bottom."²⁵ By "biological factor", he meant the evolutionary biology of the day. Let us examine briefly Freud's concept of psychology in the context of his anthropology.

Id, Ego, and Superego

There are three major aspects of the human personality, according to Freud—the *id*, the *ego*, and the *superego*. An attempt to translate these terms into clear language will be helpful here.

Latin for “it,” the *id* is the psychological makeup of a person at birth, including instincts. Within the unconscious processes of the *id* resides a vast reservoir of psychological energy.

The *pleasure principle* governs the operations of the *id*, working to reduce any uncomfortable level of tension that might accumulate in the unconscious mind. Take for example a hungry person who has a mental picture of a cheeseburger in a dream. Freud says that this can’t really reduce the tension of being hungry because it is not possible to eat the “dream burger.” As this is the case, the *id* is going to require a new structure to help it bring unfulfilled desires to fruition. This is the *ego*.

The *ego* mediates for us between the *id* and the world outside. It can help the dreamer, for example, search out, discover, and take possession of the cheeseburger so that it can eradicate the tension from being hungry. “The *ego* is the executive of the personality, because it controls the gateways to action, selects the features of the environment to which it will respond, and decides which needs will be satisfied and in what order,” writes Freudian scholar, Vernon J. Nordby; “It has to try to integrate the conflicting demands of the *id*, the *superego*, and the external world.”²⁶

The *reality principle* governs the *ego*, and attempts to prevent the discharge of tension until it can be satisfied by its desired object—until, to stay with our example, the cheeseburger actually can be obtained and eaten, thus eliminating the hunger. The *reality principle*’s process works to eliminate any fantasy or hallucination put forth by the *pleasure principle* that might prove harmful to our psyches and to keep our attention focused on objects in reality that are actual and not potential; to effect reason and rationality over idealism and vain speculation. Freud called the process by which the *reality principle* compares fantasy with reality in order to determine which actually comes to pass *reality testing*.

The *superego* contains “the traditional values, ideals, and moral standards of society as interpreted to the child by his parents, and enforced by means of a system of rewards and punishments imposed upon the child.”²⁷ The *superego* pushes the child toward perfection and forces the child to treat any guilt he or she struggles with due to moral norms, in Freudian terms, as simply misplaced psychical energy or, in other words, unnecessary and unwarranted thoughts or feelings. One substructure of the *superego* generates in us a sense of guilt when we violate moral norms, and the other generates in us a sense of pride when we behave properly.

Will, Mind, and Conscience

These three systems that Freud says comprise the psyche and form the personality are familiar categories to the Western mind. Rushdoony, as has been typical among Christian scholars who explore Freudian theory, compared the *id* to the fallen will of humanity that we inherited from Adam, the *ego* to the human mind and its thought processes, and the *superego* to the active conscience.

Christian scholars have recognized that no other modern thinker, apart from the obvious historical Christian tradition, has explored the guilt question as openly and passionately as did Freud: “Thus he faced the religious issue of guilt with a messianic faith in science’s ability, if not to dissolve guilt, at least to reduce it to biology and then to answer it with scientific understanding. Other psychologists have sought to ignore the religious implications of man’s personality. Freud recognized them and sought to dissolve and destroy them.”²⁸

The Instinct to Eradicate Guilt

There are two classes of instincts (or inborn psychological wishes to satisfy bodily needs)²⁹ for Freud. Life instincts such as hunger, thirst, and sex, promote survival and propagation. Death instincts promote the desire, which Freud saw as universal, to eradicate psychological struggle, such as guilt, through death or destruction. The *ego*’s life instinct of *libido*, or “the dynamic manifestation of sexuality,”³⁰ is responsible for fostering neuroses. As Nordby explains:

For Freud, “the forces of the neuroses originate in the sexual life.” And sexual life is burdened by guilt, coming in part from the Super-ego and the early, repressive training of the child, and from the id, where ancient taboos are equally strong impulses as are biological energies. As a result, man is torn between a desire to violate the taboo and a desire to obey the taboo, the result being a continual ambivalence, a “wish and counter-wish.”³¹

This conflict leads to the repression of the libido; this repression, in turn, produces anxiety. Freud’s concepts of neuroses and anxiety clearly result from his biological interpretation of guilt.

A MOST DANGEROUS ENEMY OF RELIGION

From the balcony of his biological worldview Freud boldly proclaimed to the progenitors of religion below, “I regard myself as one of the most dangerous enemies of religion,”³² and of God, he declared, “I stand in no awe whatever of the Almighty. If we were ever to meet I should have more reproaches to make to Him than He could make to me. I would ask Him why He hadn’t endowed me with better intellectual equipment, and He couldn’t complain that I have failed to make the best use of my so-called freedom.”³³

Christianity was merely a “myth” that Freud explained away with his anthropology. As a Jew, Freud was more in rebellion against Moses than against Jesus Christ. He saw himself as a guide to a new promised land and as a giver of a new law who “must be destructive of Moses.”³⁴ In his later work *Moses and Monotheism*, Freud set out to refashion Moses and to depose his Law and the guilt of breaking that Law. According to Freudian scholar David Bakan, Freud performed the “Messianic function of relieving guilt, the very same function he ascribes to Jesus.”³⁵ He continues, “The Devil in Jewish legend tempted Jews to apostasy, in a sense to the golden calf. Freud saw himself as Satan in this sense, as a deliverer, and remarked, ‘Do you know that I am the Devil? All my life I have had to play the Devil, in order that others would be able to build the most beautiful cathedral with the materials that I produced.’”³⁶

Freud’s premise in *Moses and Monotheism* is that Moses was an Egyptian Gentile. He seeks (1) to usurp Moses’ claim as deliverer of the elect, (2) to expose Moses’ law as bondage and Moses as a false deliverer, and (3) to rewrite history in terms of his theory of the primal horde.³⁷ In this manner, Freud could maintain that, through their id and superego and on behalf of the people he represented Moses, as a father, gained his vengeance on the primal law of the Father God and, in turn, on “the archetype of God, the primeval Father, and his reincarnations.”³⁸

Freud believed that his conclusions freed humanity and reduced religion to a neurotic state of mind; in doing so, those conclusions demanded the abolition of religion, but, ironically, offered no answers to the problem of guilt itself.

Freud writes that “if guilt were the product of the Super-ego alone, then the free-thinking education of the child would remove guilt and repression. But the id itself is a will to death as well as a will to pleasure, so that the id carries not only guilt within its being, but a sentence of death on that guilt.”³⁹

There is an unresolved conflict in each of us that neither asceticism (in the denial of self) nor libertarianism (in the indulgence of self) can eliminate. As Freud states, “One side in either event will remain unsatisfied,” because we are “a walking law or Torah of ancient taboos which govern [us] infallibly.”⁴⁰ In the end, Freud did not set out to be a reformer but an observer of culture, and in doing so, he condemned conventional morality: “what the world calls its code of morals demands more sacrifices than it is worth.”⁴¹ For Freud the “therapeutic effect of psycho-analysis” could only hope for the “substitution of something conscious for something unconscious.”⁴²

“GUTSY GUILT”

The closest he ever came to being fired from his position as preaching pastor of twenty-six years at Bethlehem Baptist Church in Minneapolis, Minnesota, John Piper recalls, occurred in the mid-1980s, when he penned an article for the church newsletter titled “Missions and Masturbation.” He wrote the article after returning from a missions conference in Washington, D.C., where he had listened to speaker George Verwer, the head of Operation Mobilization.⁴³

Verwer spoke about his burden for the many young people who had gone from a period of radical obedience to the call of Christ to living a life of status quo, marked by a “gnawing sense of guilt and unworthiness” over their sexual failure, which “gradually gave way to spiritual powerlessness.”⁴⁴

This alarmed Piper, however, because in his estimation, no sexual failure, whether masturbation, pornography, or fornication, is in and of itself the great tragedy. The ability of failures such as these to strip followers of Christ of their radical obedience to His call upon their lives, and Satan’s efforts to capitalize on their guilt experience, was the greatest of tragedies. Piper writes: “I want to take out of the Devil’s hands the weapon that exploits our sin and makes your life a wasted, worldly success. Sooner or later, whether it’s that sin or another, you are going to fall. I want to help you deal with the guilt of failure so that Satan does not use it to produce another wasted life.”⁴⁵

Here, where Piper explores what a person who is struggling with guilt might encounter in an enemy that desires to destroy him or her, is also where the biological determinism of Freud—seeking to eradicate the Christian concept of guilt and redefine it as misplaced psychosexual energy—turns back on itself. For Freud, human nature is not only burdened with a sense of guilt (with no meaning or responsibility behind it), but it is also doomed to seek the eradication of that guilt, through masochism or self-inflicted punishment as a way of atonement, or through sadism as a way to lay the guilt on someone else, a reminiscence of the victim mentality mentioned earlier.

For Piper, guilt consists of either genuine or false guilt feelings, the former an established attitude consistent with God’s attitude and the latter an established attitude not consistent with God’s attitude. Genuine guilt feelings, Piper notes, are not “an end of themselves but rather a vehicle to drive us to see the prevailing beauty and efficacy of the righteousness of the Lamb who was slain.”⁴⁶

It is important to note the distinction between subjective feelings of guilt and the objective fact of guilt before God. Biblically, guilt is an objective reality that needs resolution on a level that transcends human feelings, and yet because of the effect of Freudian psychology on secular culture, and secular culture’s effect on the church, Christians often think unbiblically about guilt. Our real concern is objective guilt before God, not guilt feelings. When the believer truly understands the propitiation (satisfaction of divine wrath toward our sin) that God provided through Christ, he is able to understand “how much more...the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish to God, purif[ies] our conscience from dead works to serve the living God” (Heb. 9:14 ESV). In such a promise, we find the only lasting solution to feelings of guilt, unworthiness, and condemnation.

Piper calls it “gutsy guilt” when a “believer admits that he has done wrong” but does “not surrender his hold on the truth that God is on his side,” even though God is placing him “in a condition of darkness and discipline.”⁴⁷ Piper anchors the believer’s proper confidence in this truth in Micah 7:8-9:

Rejoice not over me, O my enemy;
when I fall, I shall rise;
when I sit in darkness,
the Lord will be a light to me.

I will bear the indignation of the Lord
because I have sinned against him,
until he pleads my cause
and executes judgment for me.
He will bring me out to the light;
I shall look upon his vindication. (ESV)

“Yes, I am sitting in darkness,” Piper writes. “I feel miserable. I feel guilty. I am guilty. But that is not all that is true about me and my God. The same God who makes my darkness is a sustaining light to me in this very darkness. He will not forsake me.”⁴⁸

On the Edge of the Abyss

Freud fought hard to eliminate guilt by scientific inquiry, but can it be that in the end he only serves to highlight its existence all the more? As Rushdoony remarks, “Having denied sin, he had also denied

salvation, for, in reducing guilt to biology, he had no way of enabling man to transcend his biology and hence transcend or escape his biological sense of guilt. His biological myth and anthropological myth had become the new dimensions of man's hell."⁴⁹

Freud places us at the edge of the chasm of the narcissistic self, unable to span the distance between who we are and what we've done, teetering on the edge of self-abasement and self-adulation, caught up in the throes of a perpetual "blame game." Yet, being armed with biblical knowledge of God, Christ, and the Cross, we can decipher the cacophony of sounds we encounter there; between the rush of the chasm wind moaning a message of neuroses unresolved and the deafening roar of the rapids below, where the deadly rocks of real guilt from real sin are eternally surrendering themselves to the powerful flowing water of God's amazing grace.

How sweet the sound!

NOTES

1. Visit "Psychoanalysis, Their Weird Theories: A Glossary of Freudian Terms," at <http://skeptically.org/minther/id6.html> for a definitive glossary of Freudian terms.
2. Jay E. Adams, *Competent to Counsel: Introduction to Nouthetic Counseling* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970), xvi.
3. O. Hobart Mowrer, *The Crisis in Psychiatry and Religion* (Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand Company, 1961), 60.
4. *Ibid.*
5. Adams, xvii.
6. For an excellent critique of Winfrey's spiritual path away from the "narrow way" of her grandmother's biblical Christianity to the "broad way" of the New Age, see Kate Maver, "Oprah Winfrey and Her Self-Help Saviors: Making the New Age Normal," *Christian Research Journal* 23, 4 (2001): 12 (<http://www.equip.org/DN403>), and, in the From the Editor column of that issue, Elliot Miller, "Oprah Spirituality," *Christian Research Journal* 23, 4 (2001): 2.
7. Philip Terzian, "The Love Tour: When You Hear Bill Clinton Tell It, You Almost Want To Weep over His Story," *The Opinion Journal, Wall Street Journal Editorial Page*, Friday, June 25, 2004, <http://www.opinionjournal.com/taste/?id=110005268>.
8. David F. Wells, *Losing Our Virtue: Why the Church Must Recover Its Moral Vision* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 117.
9. *Ibid.*, 119.
10. *Ibid.*, 123.
11. L'Abri is a French word that means "shelter." The first L'Abri community was founded in Switzerland in 1955 by Francis Schaeffer and his wife, Edith. Schaeffer was a Christian theologian and philosopher who also authored a number of books on theology, philosophy, general culture, and the arts. Visit the L'Abri Web Site at <http://www.labri.org/>.
12. Rousas J. Rushdoony, *Freud*, from the series *An International Library of Philosophy and Theology, Modern Thinkers Series* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, 1977).
13. Rousas John Rushdoony (1916–2001) was a Calvinist philosopher, historian, and theologian widely credited as the father of Christian Reconstructionism. My reference throughout this article to his masterfully written essay on Freud is not, however, an endorsement of Christian Reconstructionism.
14. Ernest Jones, *The Life and Works of Sigmund Freud* (New York: Basic Books); vol. 1, 1953: *The Formative Years and the Great Discoveries, 1856–1953*; vol. 2, 1955: *Years of Maturity, 1901–1919*; vol. 3, 1957: *The Last Phase, 1919–1939*.
15. Jones, vol. 2, 83.
16. Rushdoony, 19–20.
17. These included Sir Richard Francis Burton (1821–1890), Henry Havelock Ellis 1859–1939), Lewis Henry Morgan (1818–1881), and Paolo Mantegazza (1831–1910).
18. Rushdoony, 19–20.
19. Sigmund Freud, *Civilization and Its Discontents* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1961).
20. Jones, *The Last Phase*, 342.
21. Egon Friedell, *A Cultural History of the Modern Age*, vol. 3, trans. Charles Francis Atkinson (New York: Knopf, 1933), 483.
22. Philip Reiff, *Freud: The Mind of the Moralizer* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1973), 57–58.
23. Rushdoony, 20.
24. Freud's anthropology, while exploring religious themes, was actually naturalistic. He was a disciple of William Robertson Smith (1846–1894), whose book *The Religion of the Semites*, Freud wholeheartedly endorsed. Every culture, Freud believed, gives the holy or taboo a double meaning—it is both sacred, or consecrated, and forbidden and unclean. This dual meaning results in an ambivalence of emotions and a crisis of conscience.
25. Sigmund Freud, "Analysis Terminable and Interminable" (1937), in *Collected Papers*, vol. 5, 357.
26. Vernon J. Nordby, *A Guide to Psychologists and Their Concepts* (New York: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1974), 46.
27. *Ibid.*, 46.
28. Rushdoony, 31.
29. Nordby, 47.
30. Sigmund Freud, "The Libido Theory" (1922), *Collected Papers*, vol. 5, 131. In five volumes, *Collected Papers*, authorized translation under the supervision of Joan Riviere (New York: Basic Books, 1959). These papers, because they deal with specific and limited subjects, often are the best indices to Freud's thought.

31. Sigmund Freud, "Totem and Taboo," in *Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud*, trans. and ed. with an introduction by A. A. Brill (New York: Modern Library, 1938), 835.
32. Jones, vol. 3; cf. 192.
33. *Letters of Sigmund Freud*, selected and edited by Ernst L. Freud, trans. Tania and James Stern (New York: Basic Books, 1960), 307.
34. Jones, vol. 2, 19.
35. David Bakan, "Moses in the Thought of Freud, an Ambivalent Interpretation," in *Commentary*, 26, 4 (October 1958): 331.
36. David Bakan, *Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition* (Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand, 1958), 181.
37. The primal horde is the "original primitive grouping of humanity headed by a father-authority who forbade incestuous acting-out among younger men, who, to gain their sexual freedom, eventually overpowered and cannibalized him and thereby discovered the powers and benefits of community." Definition provided by "Psychoanalysis, Their Weird Theories: A Glossary of Freudian Terms."
38. Sigmund Freud, *Moses and Monotheism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1939), 16.
39. Sigmund Freud, *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis*, trans. Joan Riviere (New York: Garden City Publishing Company, 1938), 375–77.
40. Ibid.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid.
43. John Piper, "Gutsy Guilt: Don't Let Shame over Sexual Sin Destroy You," *Christianity Today*, October 2007, 73–76.
44. Ibid., 73.
45. Ibid., 74.
46. Noted in Erik Raymond, "Dealing with Guilt," blog entry, October 6, 2007, Irish Calvinist, <http://www.irishcalvinist.com/?p=995>.
47. Piper, "Gutsy Guilt," 75.
48. Ibid.
49. Rushdoony, 50.