THE Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry

Edited by HELEN SWICK PERRY and MARY LADD GAWEL
With an Introduction by MABEL BLAKE COHEN, M.D.

1953

W.W. NORTON & COMPANY, INC., New York
CHAPTER

16

Preadolescence

Need for Interpersonal Intimacy

Just as the juvenile era was marked by a significant change—the development of the need for companions, for playmates rather like oneself—the beginning of preadolescence is equally spectacularly marked, in my scheme of development, by the appearance of a new type of interest in another person. These changes are the result of maturation and development, or experience. This new interest in the preadolescent era is not as general as the use of language toward others was in childhood, or the need of similar people as playmates was in the juvenile era. Instead, it is a specific new type of interest in a particular member of the same sex who becomes a chum or a close friend. This change represents the beginning of something very like full-blown, psychiatrically defined love. In other words, the other fellow takes on a perfectly novel relationship with the person concerned: he becomes of practically equal importance in all fields of value. Nothing remotely like that has ever appeared before. All of you who have children are sure that your children love you; when you say that, you are expressing a pleasant illusion. But if you will look very closely at one of your children when he finally finds a chum—somewhere between eight-and-a-half and ten—you will discover something very different in the relationship—namely, that your child begins to develop a real sensitivity to what matters to another person. And this is not in the sense of “what should I do to get what I want,” but instead “what should I do to contribute to the happiness or to support the prestige and feeling of worthwhileness of my chum.” So far as I have ever been able to discover, nothing remotely like this appears be-
before the age of, say, eight-and-a-half, and sometimes it appears decidedly later.

Thus the developmental epoch of preadolescence is marked by the coming of the integrating tendencies which, when they are completely developed, we call love, or, to say it another way, by the manifestation of the need for interpersonal intimacy. Now even at this late stage in my formulation of these ideas, I still find that some people imagine that intimacy is only a matter of approximating genitals one to another. And so I trust that you will finally and forever grasp that interpersonal intimacy can really consist of a great many things without genital contact; that intimacy in this sense means, just as it always has meant, closeness, without specifying that which is close other than the persons. Intimacy is that type of situation involving two people which permits validation of all components of personal worth. Validation of personal worth requires a type of relationship which I call collaboration, by which I mean clearly formulated adjustments of one’s behavior to the expressed needs of the other person in the pursuit of increasingly identical—that is, more and more nearly mutual—satisfactions, and in the maintenance of increasingly similar security operations. Now this preadolescent collaboration is distinctly different from the acquisition, in the juvenile era, of habits of competition, cooperation, and compromise. In preadolescence not only do people occupy themselves in moving toward a common, more or less impersonal objective, such as the success of “our team,” or the discomfort of “our teacher,” as they might have done in the juvenile era, but they also, specifically and increasingly, move toward supplying each other with satisfactions and taking on each other’s successes in the maintenance of prestige, status, and all the things which represent freedom from anxiety, or the diminution of anxiety.

*Editors’ note: Sullivan’s use of the terms “collaboration” and “cooperation” should be kept in mind throughout this section. By cooperation, he means the usual give-and-take of the juvenile era; by collaboration, he means the feeling of sensitivity to another person which appears in preadolescence. “Collaboration...is a great step forward from cooperation—I play according to the rules of the game, to preserve my prestige and feeling of superiority and merit. When we collaborate, it is a matter of we.” (Conceptions of Modern Psychiatry, p. 55.)

*Editors’ note: Up to this point, this chapter is taken from 1944-1945 lectures, rather than from the series on which this book is primarily based, since this portion is missing in the latter series because of failures of recording equipment. The material corresponds, however, to the outline in Sullivan’s Notebook.)

Preadolescent Possibilities in Preadolescence

Because of the rapidly developing capacity to revise one’s personifications of another person on the basis of great interest in observation and analysis of one’s experience with him, it comes about that the preadolescent phase of personality development can have and often does have very great inherent psychotherapeutic possibilities. I believe I have said earlier that it is at the developmental thresholds that the chance for notable favorable change tends to segregate itself. Although the structure of the self-system is such that its development in general is rather powerfully directed along the lines it has already taken, it is much more subject to influence through new experience, either fortunate or unfortunate, at each of the developmental thresholds. The fact that the self-system can undergo distinct change early in each of the developmental stages is of very real significance. For it is the self-system—the vast organization of experience which is concerned with protecting our self-esteem—which is involved in all inadequate and inappropriate living and is quite central to the whole problem of personality disorder and its remedy. And it is this capacity for distinct change in the self-system which begins to be almost fantastically important in preadolescence.

During the juvenile era a number of influences of vicious family life may be attenuated or corrected. But in the Western world a great deal of the activity of juveniles is along the lines of our ideals of intensely competitive, invidious society; only recently—and, I fear, still quite insularly—has there been any marked social pressure toward developing the other aspects of the same thing, the capacity to compromise and cooperate. Because of the competitive element, and also because of the juvenile’s relative insensitivity to the importance of other people, it is possible that one can maintain throughout the juvenile era remarkably, fantastic ideas about oneself, that one can have a very significantly distorted personification of the self, and keep it under cover. To have a very
fantastic personification of oneself is, actually, to be very definitely handicapped. In other words, it is a misfortune in development.

Because one draws so close to another, because one is newly capable of seeing oneself through the other's eyes, the preadolescent phase of personality development is especially significant in correcting autistic, fantastic ideas about oneself or others. I would like to stress—at the risk of using superlatives which sometimes get very tedious—that development of this phase of personality is of incredible importance in saving a good many rather seriously handicapped people from otherwise inevitable serious mental disorder.

I may perhaps digress to the extent of saying that for some years I have had no negative instance to the following generalization: As a psychiatrist and a supervising psychiatrist, I have had occasion to hear about many male patients who find all relationships with other men occasions for considerable tension in and vigilance, and who are uncomfortable in all their business, social, or other dealings with other men; of this group, I have found without exception that each one has lacked anything like good opportunities for preadolescent socialization. (I am confining my remarks to male patients here because the female picture is more complicated and I have less material on it.) These male patients may have what they call very close friends of the same, sex, may even be overt and promiscuous homosexuals; but they are not at ease with strange men, they have much more trouble doing business with other men than seems to be justified by the factual aspects of the difficulty, and they are particularly uncertain as to what members of their own sex think of them. In other words, I am practically convinced that capacity for ease, for maximum profit from experience, in carrying on the conventional businesses of life with members of one's own sex requires that one should have been fortunate in entering into and profiting from relations with a chum in the preadolescent phase of personality development.

It is self-evident, I suppose, that I am conspicuously taking exception to the all-too-prevalent idea that things are pretty well fixed in the Jesuitical first seven years. This idea has constituted one of the greatest problems for some anthropologists who have tried to translate psychiatric thought into anthropologically use-

ful ideas. The anthropologists have noted at them from all sides the enormous importance of infantile experience—meaning experience certainly under the age of eight. Yet one of the most conspicuous observations of an anthropologist working anywhere is that children of the privileged, who are raised by servants, do not grow up to be like the servants. That is a little bit difficult for an anthropologist to reconcile with the tremendous emphasis on very early experience. My work has shown me very clearly that, while early experience does a great many things—as I have been trying to suggest thus far—the development of capacity for interpersonal relations is by no means a matter which is completed at some point, say, in the juvenile era. Very far from it. And even preadolescence, which is a very, very important phase of personality development, is not the last phase.

**Preadolescent Society**

Except in certain rural communities, there occurs in preadolescence the development of at least an approach to what has long been called by sociologists “the gang.” I am again speaking rather exclusively of male preadolescents, because by this time the deviations prescribed by the culture make it pretty hard to make a long series of statements which are equally obviously valid for the two sexes. The preadolescent interpersonal relation is primarily, and vastly importantly, a two-group; but these two-groups tend to interlock. In other words, let us say that persons A and B are chums. Person A also finds much that is admirable about person C, and person B finds much that is admirable about person D. And persons C and D each has his chum, so that there is a certain linkage of interest among all of these two-groups. Quite often there will be one particular preadolescent who is, thanks to his having been fortunate in earlier phases, the sort of person that many of these preadolescent people find useful as a model; and he will be the third member, you might say, of many three-groups, composed of any one of a number of two-groups and himself. At the same time, he may have a particular chum just as everybody in this society may have. Thus these close two-groups, which are extremely useful in correcting earlier deviations, tend at the same time to interlock through one person or a few people who are,
in a very significant sense, leaders. And incidentally, let me say that many of us are apt to think of leadership in political terms, in terms of "influence" and the "influential." We overlook the fact that influence is exerted by the influential in certain conspicuous areas other than that of getting people to do what the leader wants done. The fact is that a very important field of leadership phenomena—and one that begins to be outstandingly important in preadolescence—is opinion leadership, and understanding this and developing techniques for integrating it might be one of the few great hopes for the future.

Thus some few people tend to come out in leadership positions in preadolescent society. Some of them are the people who can get the others to collaborate, to work with understanding and appreciation of one another toward common objectives or aims, which sometimes may be crimes, or what not. And others are the leaders whose views gradually come to be the views of a large number in the group, which is opinion leadership. This kind of leadership has certain fairly measurable and perhaps some imponderable aspects. One of its reasonably measurable aspects is that people whose development, combined with their intellectual abilities, has given them the ability to separate facts and opinions, tend to be considered by the others as well informed, right in their thinking about things of interest at that particular stage, and thus tend to do the thinking for a good many of the others because of the latter's unfortunate personality warp. And the time when these leaders in opinion do the thinking almost exclusively is when there are serious problems confronting the members of the group. The level of general insecurity about the human future is high at this stage of development, and in any case probably increases when serious problems arise, whether they occur in the preadolescent gang or in society as a whole. It is at those times that perhaps far more than half of the statistical population—handicapped by lack of information, by lack of training, and by various difficulties in personal life which call out a good deal of anxiety, which in turn interferes with practically everything useful—that is the time to opinion leadership for anything like reassuring views or capable foresight. Thus an important part of the preadolescent phase of personality development is the developing pattern of leadership-led relationships, which are so vital in any social organization and which are, theoretically at least, of very great importance in relatively democratic organizations of society.

I have suggested that an important aspect of the preadolescent phase is that, practically for the first time, there is consensual validation of personal worth. Now it is true that some children are fortunate, indeed, through the influences to which they have been subjected in the home and school, they are about as sure as they can be that they are worth while in certain respects. But very many people arrive in preadolescence in the sad state which an adult would describe as "getting away with murder." In other words, they have had to develop such remarkable capacities for deceiving and misleading others that they never had a chance to discover what they were really good for. But in this intimate interchange in preadolescence—some preadolescents even have mutual daydreams, spend hours and hours carrying on a sort of spontaneous mythology in which both participate—in this new necessity for thinking of the other fellow as right and for being thought of as right by the other fellow, much of this uncertainty as to the real worth of the personality, and many self-deceptive skills at deceiving others which exist in the juvenile era, may be rectified by the improving communication of the chums and, to a much lesser extent but nonetheless valuably, by confirmatory relations in the collaboration developed in the gang.

**Types of Warp and Their Remedy**

We might next look at a few of the warped juveniles who can receive very marked beneficial effect from the maturation of this need for intimacy and, from preadolescent socialization, who can at this stage literally be put on the right road to a fairly adequate personality development. For example, there are egocentric people, who go from childhood through the juvenile era and still retain literally unlimited expectations of attention and services to themselves. Some of these people you know as those who sulk when something doesn't suit them; some of them are people who have tantrums under certain circumstances. If the families of these juveniles are so influential that the more adult members of the
school community hesitate to "break" the juveniles of these undesirable "habits;" then about the last chance they have of favorable change is based on their need for getting along with a chum in preadolescence. As juveniles, they have been classified quite uniformly by other juveniles as thoroughly bad sports; there is a distinct tendency for other juveniles to avoid them, to ostracize them, in spite of some necessity for accommodating to them which is imposed by the influence of the family. It is quite possible that in preadolescence such a person will establish his chumship with some other ex-juvenile who is more or less on the fringe of ostracism, and who had been in the out-group of the juvenile society. That looks as if it wouldn't be too good; and in some instances it is not so good, as I will note later. But it is very much better than what was going on before. Not infrequently people of this kind go through the comparatively brief period of preadolescence and come out very much less inclined to expect unlimited services from others, very much nearer the ideal of a good sport who can "take it," and who doesn't require very special treatment. In other words, two unfortunate juveniles thrown together by their unfortunate social status as juveniles may, under the influence of this growing need for intimacy, actually do each other a great deal of good. And as they show some improvement they will become less objectionable to the prevailing preadolescent society and may actually get to be quite well esteemed in the gang. But the risk is that these bad sports, these self-centered or egocentric juveniles, now formed into two-groups, may carry their resentment and misery from the ostracism they have suffered to the length of seeking out and identifying themselves with the most antisocial leadership which can be found.

However, the notion that preadolescence readily consolidates a criminal, antisocial career is the most shocking kind of nonsense, which overlooks almost all instances which happen to be negative. It happens that there is more literature on antisocial gangs than there is on the vastly favorable aspect of preadolescent society. I believe that a study of preadolescent society in the very worst neighborhoods would reveal tendencies other than those leading toward becoming minor criminals. And in some very bad neighborhoods, while there are gangs which are antisocial, there are also gangs which are very much less antisocial, if not actually constituting a constructive element in the neighborhood. In any event, the socialization is bound to happen; and if the setting is bad enough, it's quite possible that the organization will be against the world and will tend to implant that attitude as a reasonable purpose for social action.

Some juveniles arrive in preadolescence strikingly marked with the malevolent transformation of personality which I have discussed previously at some length. All too many of them, because of this malevolent transformation, take their time in establishing a chumship, or may actually fail to do so. But the drive connected with this need for intimate association with someone else is so powerful that quite frequently chumships are formed even by malevolent people. And the entrance into one of these two-groups, which in turn is integrated into the preadolescent gang, provides experience which definitely opens the mind anew to the possibility that one can be treated tenderly, whereupon the malevolent transformation is sometimes reversed, literally cured. More commonly, it is only ameliorated, because the malevolent transformation is apt to have quite a cramping effect on the very easy amalgamation of malevolent two-groups into larger organizations.

There is a variety of other peculiarities that more or less survive the juvenile period. For example, there is the person who feels that something is wrong with others if they don't like him—in other words he really feels perfectly entitled to being universally liked. This kind of person never learns, in the juvenile era, that that is not a reasonable attitude toward life. In the school society, such a person ordinarily has to handle his disappointments by derogatory rationalizations and disparagement of others, for which he generally is set as an excellent example in his home. These folk, getting into the preadolescent socialization, quite often gain enough in security from the intimacy with their chums to enable them to really open their minds and discuss these other unpleasant people who don't seem to like them, in a fashion that is illuminating, both as to the real worth of the others and as to some of their own traits which may not be very endearing. Thus preadolescence tends actually to correct to a notable extent one of our most vicious forms of morbidity—the tendency to pull people down because
one isn’t quite big enough to be comfortable with them. Needless to say, preadolescence does not always cure this, but it tends to mitigate it.

Isolated juveniles, people whom one would expect to go on indefinitely in a rather ‘schizoid’ way of life, sometimes, by a very fortunate preadolescent experience, come out remarkably well able to handle themselves, to develop the social accommodation which did not really reach them in the juvenile period; and this is because of the peculiarly intimate consensual exchange which goes on in preadolescence. On the other hand, social isolation may make it very difficult to establish the type of intimacy which preadolescence calls for; and it may often delay preadolescence so that there is only a brief time, before the puberty change, in which to consolidate the benefits of the preadolescent period.

One of the more warped kinds of juveniles is the one who will not grow up. He is sometimes popular, but often he is unpopular. In any event, he is apt to become increasingly unpopular as the juvenile era wears itself out. This kind of person can properly be called irresponsible. He doesn’t want to take on anything that he can avoid; he wants to remain, if you please, juvenile. He wants to be as young as possible, in that he has a real unwillingness to bend the knee to our society’s necessities with respect to others. Here again maturation of the need for intimacy sometimes has very marked beneficial effect; on the other hand, it may not work out that way, and he may get into an irresponsible gang. But I do not want you to think that antisocial gangs are in any notable proportion of instances made up of people who were irresponsible juveniles. Whether the gang activity is constructive or destructive in its relationship to the larger society which houses it has nothing in particular to do with the types of warp in the personalities involved in it, but is more a function of what is acceptable as leadership.

In summing up these various warps, one might say that, as long as the warp is not so great as to preclude any undergoing of the preadolescent era, the formation of these new intimacies will provide some consensual validation for all of the warps—that is, one gets a look at oneself through the chum’s eyes. To the extent that that is accomplished, the self-system concerned is definitely ex-
panded, and its more troublesome, inadequate, and inappropriate functions are reduced to the point that they become unnecessary.

I should like to mention a few more things that are not quite warps but which might come to be the basis for inadequate and ineffectual living, were it not for the preadolescent influence. Some people go through the juvenile phase with a very favorable record; they are wonderful in sportsmanship, they are very skillful in compromise, or they are just so bright that everybody in the juvenile society profits. Now comes the preadolescent need for intimacy. Any one of these people is apt to be integrated in a two-group with a more average person. And in this interchange in the preadolescent society, some of these very successful juveniles get the first great clue to the fact that they are not going to be carried through life on a silk cushion, and they learn to accept this fact. They discover that if they are lucky enough to have gifts, these gifts carry responsibilities; and that insofar as gifts are used for the discharge of social responsibilities, one is to a certain extent spared the great evil of envy and all the destructive practices which envy carries in its wake.

A somewhat similar group of juveniles are those who have very high intelligence and rate well with teachers, but who are unpopular and unsuccessful with other juveniles—a fact which teachers seldom notice, since they are mainly preoccupied with their pupils’ learning. In preadolescence, the drive of the need for intimacy may turn this high intelligence to good use, and literally provide the ex-juvenile with an opportunity for using his intelligence to learn how to be one with others.

Finally, perhaps, I should touch on those who, because of illness or social handicaps or what not, have hung behind all through the juvenile era. Here too the preadolescent intimacy may literally give them, as it were, so much of a helping hand that they come near to catching up with what they have missed in the juvenile era in the way of competition, compromise, and socialization.

The factors that count in the two groups of preadolescence are: the personal suitability of the people thrown together and then tied together by their need for intimacy, the intensity of the relationship which is achieved, and the durability of the relationship, or the progressive direction of change in those instances.
in which the relationships have not proved durable throughout preadolescence. This last might result from change of residence of the parents, or there might be factors in the two-group itself that make for disintegration, each of the components then becoming integrated with someone else.

I want particularly to touch on the intensity of the relationship, because it is easy to think that if the preadolescent chumship is very intense, it may tend to fixate the chums in the preadolescent phase, or it may culminate in some such peculiarity of personality as is ordinarily meant by homosexuality—although, incidentally, it is often difficult to say what is meant by this term. Actual facts that have come to my attention lend no support whatever to either of these surmises. In fact, as a psychiatrist, I would hope that preadolescent relationships were intense enough for each of the two chums literally to get to know practically everything about the other one that could possibly be exposed in an intimate relationship, because that remedies a good deal of the often illusory, usually morbid, feeling of being different, which is such a striking part of rationalizations of insecurity in later life.

Perhaps I can illustrate this point by telling you how, by an extraordinary concatenation of events, I was once able to find out something about the adult lives of a onetime preadolescent group who had attended school together in a small Kansas community. I first had access to this information through a man who had been one of the preadolescents in the school, and I was later able to follow this up and get rather complete information on the group. This particular man was an overt homosexual. During his preadolescence, he had been distinctly in the out-group, if only with respect to so-called mutual masturbation and other presumably homosexual activity, which went on in this group of boys as preadolescent pals; that is, he had not participated in any of the mutual sexuality which went on in the terminal phase of preadolescence in this group. There was one other preadolescent who had not participated in it, and I was able to track him down. I found that he also had become an overt homosexual. Those who had participated in mutual sexuality were married, with children, divorces, and what not, in the best tradition of American society.

In other words, relationships of what might be described as illegiti-

mate' intimacy toward the close of the preadolescent period had not conduced to a disturbed type of development in adolescence and later; the facts showed something quite different.

The great remedial effect of preadolescence occurs not only by direct virtue of the intimacy in the two-group, but also because of the real society which emerges among the preadolescents, so that the world is reflected in the preadolescent microcosm. The preadolescent begins to have useful experiences in social assessment and social organization. This begins with the relationship which the two-groups come to have to the larger social organization, the gang. The chums are identified as such, and are literally assessed by all other two-groups—and this is not in terms of who they are, but of how they act, and what you can expect from them in the social organization. This is an educative, provocative, and useful experience in social assessment. The fact that one looks out for oneself and is regarded as incredibly individual and what not begins very strikingly to fade from the center of things; and that is an exceedingly fortunate experience to have had. And the gang as a whole finds that it has a relationship to the larger social organization, the community, and that it is assessed by the community. Community acceptance of the gang is likely to depend on whether or not the gang is antisocial, and it may also depend on how widely representative the gang is.

Within the gang, experience in social organization is reflected in how closely integrated the gang is, how stable its leadership is, and how many leaders for different things there are. Sometimes there are preadolescent gangs in which you would find, if you made a careful study, that the members maintain subordination to a number of different leaders, each for different circumstances, which is really pretty refined social organization in miniature.

**Disasters in Timing of Developmental Stages**

As the preadolescent goes on toward the puberty change, the effect of previous experience on rate of maturation becomes peculiarily conspicuous. The time of the puberty change may vary considerably from person to person—in contrast to the time for the convergence of the eyes in infancy, for instance, which can be predicted almost exactly. This difference in time of puberty matu-
ration may occur partly because of certain biological and hereditary factors; but I know, from considerable data, that factors of experience are also involved. Certain peculiarities of earlier training are so extraordinarily frequent in cases of so-called delayed puberty that one suspects that this training has literally delayed the maturation of the lust dynamism.

One of the lamentable things which can happen to personality in the preadolescent society is that a particular person may not become preadolescent at all promptly—in other words, he literally does not have the need for intimacy when most of the people of about the same age have it, and therefore he does not have an opportunity of being part of the parade as it goes by. But then this person, when preadolescence is passing for most of his contemporaries, develops a need for intimacy with someone of his own sex and may be driven to establishing relationships with a chronologically younger person. This is not necessarily a great disaster. What is more of a disaster is that he may form a preadolescent relationship with an actually adolescent person, which is perhaps more frequently the case in this situation. This does entail some very serious risk to personality and can, I think, in quite a number of instances, be suspected of having considerable to do with the establishment of a homosexual way of life, or at least a 'bisexual' way. And, as I have already hinted, there is definitely a possibility of going no further than preadolescence. The fact that one can be preadolescent for perhaps two years longer than others in one's particular group of young people is nowadays frequent enough to be a study in itself. The number of instances of schizophrenic disorder which are precipitated by one of the chums' getting well into adolescence while the other remains preadolescent is, in my experience, notable.

If adolescence is delayed, it would not have any particular importance, and might actually be somewhat advantageous, as long as one were sure of having a reasonable number of equally delayed people with whom to maintain the type of intimacy which characterizes preadolescence. It is only when chumships are broken up, and the preadolescent society is disorganized by the further maturation of nearly all the members, that great stress may be applied to the personalities which are not able to move on the same time schedule. Sometimes these people who are delayed in puberty have a progression of chums from people of their own age to younger ones, which is somewhat hard on the status of both in the preadolescent organization, tending to exclude both from what would normally be the society of the younger. I suppose the best thing that can happen—next to having a number of confidantes who are also slow in maturing—is to be able to take the early stage of adolescence before one has really gotten to it, which is sometimes possible; that is, the adolescent change means a moving of an interest toward members of the other sex, but one can often find an eccentric member of the other sex who also has not undergone the puberty change, but is glad to go through the motions. That reduces the stress on one's feeling of personal worth and security which delayed adolescence may otherwise bring. The delayed completion of the preadolescent phase of personality, together with a shift from the group with which the preadolescent has been developing to marginal groups of adolescents, is, I think, apt to be pretty hard on this younger person; that is, he is, in a sense, the victim of marginal groups of adolescent people, who are actually having plenty of trouble themselves and who are apt to develop a very lively interest in sexual operations with this preadolescent whose adolescence has been delayed. In certain instances, at least, these operations are very costly to the personality when finally the puberty change and the phases of adolescence begin.

In a given person, the beginning of adolescence, as far as personality development is concerned, takes place at an indefinite time; that is, although it does not take place overnight, it is observable at the end of a matter of months, instead of years. Early adolescence, in my scheme of development, is ushered in by the beginning of the array of things called the puberty change, by the frank appearance of the lust dynamism. And the frank appearance of the lust dynamism is, in a great many instances, manifested by the intrusion, into fantasy or the sleep-life, of experience of a piece with the sexual orgasm; in other instances, where there has been preliminary genital play, and so on, it is manifested by the occurrence of orgasm in certain play. Last is the last to mature of the important integrating tendencies, or needs for satisfaction,
which characterize the underlying human animal now well advanced to being a person.

In our society, the age when early adolescence appears varies within three or four years, I think. This remarkable developmental discrepancy which is possible among different people of the same chronological age—a vastly greater discrepancy than occurs in the maturing of any of the previously discussed needs—is one of the important factors which makes adolescence such a time of stress. And incidentally, only by studying a different social organization from ours could one see how much less a time of stress the period of adolescence might be. In certain other societies, where the culture provides a great deal more real preparation for adolescence than ours does, the extraordinarily stressful aspect of adolescence is not nearly so conspicuous. There are, however, certain elements of the puberty change and its associated adolescent phase of personality organization that are not to be overlooked in any social order; those are the ones associated with the remarkable speeding up of certain growth factors which, for example, makes people clumsy and awkward who were previously quite skillful and dexterous. Thus there are always, or almost always, some stresses concerned with this very rapid maturation of the somatic organization which is ushered in by the puberty change. But so far as the psychological stresses are concerned, they are more apt to result from disasters in timing than from anything else.

The Experience of Loneliness

Before going on, I would like to discuss the developmental history of that motivational system which underlies the experience of loneliness.

Now loneliness is possibly most distinguished, among the experiences of human beings, by the toneless quality of the things which are said about it. While I have tried to impress upon you the extreme undesirability of the experience of anxiety, I, in common apparently with all denizens of the English-speaking world, feel inadequate to communicate a really clear impression of the

experience of loneliness in its quintessential force. But I think I can give you some idea of why it is a terribly important component of personality, by tracing the various motivational systems by developmental epochs that enter into the experience of loneliness. Of the components which culminate in the experience of real loneliness, the first, so far as I know, appears in infancy as the need for contact. This is unquestionably composed of the elaborate group of dependencies which characterize infancy, and which can be collected under the need for tenderness. This kind of need extends into childhood. And in childhood we see components of what will ultimately be experienced as loneliness appearing in the need for adult participation in activities. These activities start out perhaps in the form of expressive play in which the very young child has to learn how to express motions by successes and failures in escaping anxiety or in increasing euphoria; in various kinds of manual play in which one learns coordination, and so on; and finally in verbal play—the pleasure-giving use of the components of verbal speech which gradually move over into the consensual validation of speech. In the juvenile era we see components of what will eventually be loneliness in the need for companions; and in the later phases of the juvenile era, we see it in what I have not previously mentioned by this name, but what you can all recognize from your remembered past, as the need for acceptance. To put it another way, most of you have had, in the juvenile era, an exceedingly bitter experience with your companions to which the term “fear of ostracism” might be justifiably applied—the fear of being accepted by no one of those whom one must have as models for learning how to be human.

And in preadolescence we come to the final component of the really intimidating experience of loneliness—the need for intimate exchange with a fellow being, whom we may describe or identify as a chum, a friend, or a loved one—that is, the need for the most intimate type of exchange with respect to satisfactions and security.

Loneliness, as an experience which has been so terrible that it practically baffles clear recall, is a phenomenon ordinarily encountered only in preadolescence and afterward. But by giving this very crude outline of the components that enter into this driving impulsion, I hope I have made it clear why, under continued
privilege, the driving force of this system may integrate interpersonal situations despite really severe anxiety. Although we have not previously, in the course of this outline of the theory of personality, touched on anything which can brush aside the activity of the self-system, we have now come to it. Under loneliness, people seek companionship even though intensely anxious in the performance. When, because of deprivations of companionship, one does integrate a situation in spite of more or less intense anxiety, one often shows, in the situation, evidences of a serious defect of personal orientation. And remember that I am speaking of orientation in living, not orientation in time and space, as the traditional psychiatrists discuss it. I have already given my conception of orientation in living in discussing the juvenile era. Now this defective orientation may be due, for instance, to a primary lack of experience which is needed for the correct appraisal of the situation with respect to its significance, aside from its significance as a relief of loneliness. There are a good many situations in which lonely people literally lack any experience with things which they encounter.

Loneliness reaches its full significance in the preadolescent era, and goes on relatively unchanged from thenceforth throughout life. Anyone who has experienced loneliness is glad to discuss some vague abstract of this previous experience of loneliness. But it is a very difficult therapeutic performance to get anyone to remember clearly how he felt and what he did when he was horribly lonely. In other words, the fact that loneliness will lead to integrations in the face of severe anxiety automatically means that loneliness in itself is more terrible than anxiety. While we show from the very beginning a curiously clear capacity for fearing that which might be fatally injurious, and from very early in life an incredible sensitivity to significant people, only as we reach the preadolescent stage of development does our profound need for dealings with others reach such proportion that fear and anxiety actually do not have the power to stop the stumbling out of restlessness into situations which constitute, in some measure, a relief from loneliness. This is not manifest in anything like driving force until we arrive at the preadolescent era.

Chapter 17

Early Adolescence

The earlier phase of adolescence as a period of personality development is defined as extending from the eruption of true genital interest, felt as lust, to the patterning of sexual behavior which is the beginning of the last phase of adolescence. There are very significant differences, in the physiological substrate connected with the beginning of adolescence, between men and women, but in either case there is a rather abrupt change, relatively unparalleled in development, by which a zone of interaction with the environment which had been concerned with excreting waste becomes newly and rapidly significant as a zone of interaction in physical interpersonal intimacy. In other words, what had been, from the somatic viewpoint, the more external tissues of the urinary-excretory zone now become the more external part of the genital zone as well. The change, from the psychological standpoint, pertains to new needs which have their culmination in the experience of sexual orgasm; the felt tensions associated with this need are traditionally and quite properly identified as lust. In other words, lust is the felt component of integrating tendencies pertaining to the genital zone of interaction, seeking the satisfaction of cumulatively augmented sentience culminating in orgasm.

There is, so far as I know, no necessarily close relationship between lust, as an integrating tendency, and the need for intimacy, which we have previously discussed, except that they both characterize people at a certain stage in development. The two are strikingly distinct. In fact, making very much sense of the complexities and difficulties which are experienced in adolescence and subsequent phases of life, depends, in considerable measure, on the
clarity with which one distinguishes three needs, which are often very intricately combined and at the same time contradictory. These are the need for personal security—that is, for freedom from anxiety; the need for intimacy—that is, for collaboration with at least one other person; and the need for lustful satisfaction, which is connected with genital activity in pursuit of the orgasm.

The Shift in the Intimacy Need

As adolescence is ushered in, there is, in people who are not too much warped for such a development, a change in the so-called object of the need for intimacy. And the change is from what I shall presently be discussing as an isophilic choice to what may be called a heterophilic choice—that is, it is a change from the seeking of someone quite like oneself to the seeking of someone who is in a very significant sense very different from oneself. This change in choice is naturally influenced by the concomitant appearance of the genital drive. Thus, other things being equal and no very serious warp or privation intervening, the change from preadolescence to adolescence appears as a growing interest in the possibilities of achieving some measure of intimacy with a member of the other sex, rather after the pattern of the intimacy that one has in preadolescence enjoyed with a member of one's own sex.

The degree to which the need for intimacy is satisfied in this heterophilic sense in the present-day American scene leaves very much to be desired. The reason is not that the shift of interest toward the other sex in itself makes intimacy difficult, but that the cultural influences which are borne in upon each person include very little which prepares members of different sexes for a fully human, simple, personal relationship together. A great many of the barriers to heterophilic intimacy go back to the very beginnings of the Western world. Just to give a hint of what I am talking about, I might mention the so-called double standard of morality and the legal status which surrounds illegitimate birth. One can get an idea of the important influence of cultural organization and cultural institutions on the possibilities of relationships in adolescence which are easy and, in terms of personality development, successful, by studying a culture very significantly different from our own in this respect. For some years I have recommended in this connection Hortense Powdermaker's *Life in Lesu.* There, the institutions bearing on the distinction between the sexes are very significantly different from ours, and the contrast between our institutions and theirs perhaps sheds some light in itself on unfortunate aspects of the Western world.

But to return to our culture: The change in the need for intimacy—the new awakening of curiosity in the boy as to how he could get to be on as friendly terms with a girl as he has been on with his chum—is usually ushered in by a change of covert process. Fantasy undergoes a rather striking modification—a modification almost as abrupt and striking as the sudden acceleration of somatic growth which begins with the puberty change and leads, for instance, to the awkwardness which I have mentioned. And there may also be a change of content in overt communicative processes, both in the two-group and in the gang. That is, if the preadolescents are successfully progressing toward maturation and uniformly free from personality warp, this interest in members of the other sex also spreads into the area of communication between the chums, even though the one chum may not be quite up to the other and may be somewhat opposed to this new preoccupation with girls. In the more fortunate circumstances, this is presently a gang-wise change, and those who are approximately ready for it profit considerably from this last great topic of preadolescent collaboration—the topic of who's who and what's what in the so-called heterosexual world. If the group includes some members whose development is delayed, the social pressure in the group, in the gang, is extremely hard on their self-esteem and may lead to very serious disturbances of personality indeed. As I have previously hinted, it is not uncommon for the preadolescent phase to fade imperceptibly into the early adolescent phase, and for gang-wise genital activity to become part of the pattern of the very last stage of preadolescence or the verge of adolescence. Thus one not uncommonly finds at this point that the lust dynamism is actually functioning and governing a good part of group activity, but this

is very definitely oriented to that which is to follow with members of the other sex.

In this change from preadolescence to adolescence, there has to be a great deal of trial-and-error learning by human example. A considerable number of those at the very beginning of adolescence have some advantage in this learning by virtue of having already acquired data from their observation of and experience with a sibling of the other sex not very far removed from them in developmental age; these data which had been previously unimportant are now rapidly activated.

I believe that according to conventional, statistical experience, women undergo the puberty change somewhat in advance of men; in a great many instances, this leads to a peculiar sort of stutter in developmental progress between the boys and the girls in an age community so that by the time most of the boys have gotten really around to interest in girls, most of the girls are already fairly well wound up in their problems about boys. From the standpoint of personality development, it would be convenient if these things were timed slightly better; but I suppose that in the beginning when everything was arranged—I’ve never had any private information on the subject, by the way—procreation was fully as important as a feeling of self-esteem is now in a highly developed civilization. And so women get ready for procreation quite early; in fact one of the important problems of adolescence is how to avoid the accident of procreation.

Various Collisions of Lust, Security, and the Intimacy Need

After lust gets under way, it is extremely powerful. In fact, if one overlooks his experience with loneliness, he may well think that lust is the most powerful dynamism in interpersonal relations. Since our culture provides us with singular handicaps for lustful activity rather than with facilitation, lust promptly collides with a whole variety of powerful dynamisms in personality. The most ubiquitous collision is naturally the collision between one’s lust and one’s security; and by security I mean one’s feeling of self-esteem and personal worth. Thus a great many people in early adolescence suffer a lot of anxiety in connection with their new-found motivation to sexual or genital activity—and I use those words interchangeably. Besides the puzzlement, embarrassment, and so on, which the culture practically makes certain, there are lamentably too many instances of people who already have a rather profound warp with respect to the general area of the body which is concerned. I have called this the primary genital phobia, which is not entirely to be interpreted on the basis of the usual ideas about phobia. By primary genital phobia I refer to an enduring warp of personality which is often inculcated in late infancy and early childhood and practically converts that area of the body into something not quite of the body. In discussing the excretory function and the exploratory power of the hand, I have commented on the incredible efforts made by certain parents to keep the young child from handling the genitals, from exploring and getting sensations from them. In cases in which this is successful, that area of the body becomes distinctly related to that area of personality to which I long since referred as the not-me. It is almost impossible for the adolescent who has this type of warp to arrive at any simple and, shall I say, conventional type of learning of what to do with lust. Therefore, as that person becomes lustful, he has the energy of the genital dynamism added to loneliness and other causes for restlessness; thus his activity with others becomes comparatively pointless, which almost certainly is humiliating and is not a contribution to his self-esteem. Or he may actually have some fairly serious disturbance of personality because of the outstanding power of the lust dynamism and the comparative hopelessness of learning how he, in particular, can do anything about it. Thus a person in this era may know a good deal about what other people do, but if he finds he can’t do it himself, he doesn’t feel quite up to the average.

Not only does lust collide with the need for security, but the shift in the intimacy need may also collide with the need for security. In early adolescence, the need for intimacy, for collaboration with some very special other person, reaches out toward, and tends to settle on, a member of the other sex. Now the ways in which this may collide with self-esteem are numerous, but there are a few particular instances that I want to bring to your attention. Quite often we discover that the young reach adolescence very
much to the discontent of their elders in the home. In those situations it is not uncommon to find that there has been no serious taboo by the family group against the development of a chum relationship or even against membership in a gang; but now as the interest begins to move toward members of the other sex, there does begin to be strong repressive influence brought to bear on the adolescent by the family group.

One of the most potent instruments used in this particular is ridicule; many an adolescent has been ridiculed practically into very severe anxiety by parents who just do not want him to become, as they think of it, an adult interested in such things as sex, which may get him diseases or what not, or may result in marriage and his leaving home. Ridicule from parents and other elders is among the worst tools that are used on early adolescents. Sometimes a modification of ridicule is used by parents who are either too decent to use ridicule or are unaware of its remarkable power; and this modification takes the form of interfering with, objecting to, criticizing, and otherwise getting in the way of any detectable movement of their child toward a member of the other sex. This can go to the point of being a pathological performance which we call jealousy, in which the parent literally gets incredibly wrapped up in the rudimentary two-group that the adolescent is trying to establish with some member of the opposite sex. We will touch on jealousy again when we get around to discussing the particular group of difficulties in living which are called paranoid states. It should merely be noted at this point that jealousy is invariably a matter of more than two people, and that very often everyone concerned in jealousy is pretty fantastic—that is, there are a great many parataxic processes mixed up in it. Sometimes the third person concerned is purely a parataxic delusion on the part of the jealous person. So much for merely a few high spots on the type of collisions between the feeling of personal worth and the change in the direction of the need for intimacy.

There are also collisions between the intimacy need and lust. In establishing collaborative intimacy with someone, four varieties of awkwardnesses are common, of which the first three—embarrassment, diffidences, and excessive precautions—make up one group. The fourth represents one of our magic tricks of swinging to the other extreme to get away from something that doesn’t work, which I call the not technique. In other words, you know what an apple is, and if you were under pressure enough you could produce an imaginary truth, not apple, made up entirely of the absence-of-apple characteristics. Thus, one of the ways of attempting to solve this collision between the intimacy need and lust is by something which is about the opposite of diffidence—namely, the development of a very bold approach in the pursuit of the genital objective. But the approach is so poorly addressed to the sensitivities and insecurities of the object that the object is in turn embarrassed and made diffident; and so it overreaches and has the effect of making the integration of real intimacy quite improbable.

A much more common evidence of the collision of these two powerful motivational systems is seen among adolescents in this culture as the segregation of object persons, which is in itself an extremely unfortunate way of growing up. By this I refer to the creating of distinctions between people toward whom lustful motivations can apply, and people who will be sought for the relief of loneliness—that is, for collaborative intimacy, for friendship. The classical instance is the old one of the prostitute and the good girl. The prostitute is the only woman who is to be thought of for genital contact; the good girl is never to be thought of in that connection, but only for friendship and for a somewhat nebulous future state referred to as marriage. When this segregation has been quite striking, this nebulous state takes on a purely fantastic character. Nowadays, the far more prevalent distinction is between sexy girls and good girls, rather than this gross division into bad and good women. But no matter how it comes about that the other sex is cut into two groups—one of which can satisfy a person’s loneliness and spare him anxiety, while the other satisfies his lust—the trouble with this is that lust is a part of personality, and no one can get very far at completing his personality development in this way. Thus satisfying one’s lust must be at considerable expense to one’s self-esteem, since the bad girls are unworthy and not really people in the sense that good girls are. So wherever you find a person who makes this sharp separation of members of the other sex into those who are, you might say, lustful and those who
are nonlustful, you may assume that this person has quite a cleavage with respect to his genital behavior, so that he is not really capable of integrating it into his life, simply and with self-respect.

These sundry collisions that come along at this stage may be the principal motives for preadolescents or very early adolescents getting into "homosexual" play, with some remarkable variations. But a much more common outcome of these various collisions—the difficulties in developing activity to suit one's needs—is the breaking out of a great deal of autosexual behavior, in which one satisfies one's own lust as best one can; this behavior appears because of the way in which preadolescent society breaks up, and because of the various inhibitions which have been inculcated on the subject of freedom regarding the genitals. Now this activity, commonly called masturbation, has in general been rather severely condemned in every culture that generally imposes marked restrictions on freedom of sexual development. That's very neat, you see; it means that adolescence is going to be hell whatever you do, unless you have wonderful preparation for being different from everyone else—in which case you may get into trouble for being different.

Incidentally, problems of masturbation are sufficiently common, even among the wise, so that a word might be said here regarding what seems to be a sound psychiatric view of the matter. The question sometimes arises as to whether masturbation is good or bad. Now whenever a psychiatrist is confronted by such a question, he may well take it under advisement to see whether he can reformulate it into a question that he can, as a psychiatrist, deal with; psychiatrists don't dispense these absolute qualifications of good or bad. The nearest we can approach such values is to decide whether a thing is better or worse in terms of the interpersonal present and near future. From this approach, one can note that in this culture the developmental progress in connection with the adolescent change is handicapped by both lack of preparation and absolute taboos on certain freedoms, but just combined with the need for intimacy frequently does drive the victim toward correcting certain warps in personality and toward developing certain abilities, in interpersonal relations. There is no way that I know of by which one can, all by oneself, satisfy the need for intimacy, cut off the full driving power of loneliness, although loneliness can be manipulated or reduced to a certain extent. But through autosexual performance one can prevent lust from reaching tension sufficient to break down one's barriers. For that reason, the entirely exclusive use of autoerotic procedures can contribute to the prolongation of warp, which in turn contributes to the continued handicap for life of the person concerned. It is from this viewpoint alone that I would consider that masturbation, as the only solution for the sundry collisions that lust enters into, is worse than almost anything else that is not definitely malevolent. Needless to say, such an argument becomes meaningless if, as is so often the case in genital behavior, the autoerotic performance is not fixed and exclusive but is incidental or occasional. Arguments against masturbation based on anything other than this particular reason seem to me to smack of unanalyzed prejudice on the part of the arguer than of good sense.

Fortune and Misfortune in Heterosexual Experimentation

My next topic is the rather important one of the fortune and misfortune which the early adolescent has in his experimentation toward reaching a heterosexual type of experience. In the olden days when I was distinctly more reckless than now, I thought that a good many of the people I saw as mental patients would have been luckier in their adolescence had they carried on their preliminary heterosexual experimentation with a good-natured prostitute—that is, this would have been fortunate in comparison to what actually had happened to them. Not that I regard prostitutes as highly developed personalities of the other sex, but if they happen to be in the business of living off their participation in genital sport and are friendly, they at least will know a good deal about the problems in this field that earlier adolescents encounter, and will treat them with sympathy, understanding, and encouragement; but unfortunately, a great many of these experiments are conducted with people who are themselves badly, though differently, warped. The number of wretched experiences connected with adolescents' first heterosexual attempts is legion, and the experiences are sometimes very expensive to further maturation of per-
sonality. If there has been a lively lustful fantasy and little or no overt behavior with respect to the genitals—which incidentally will tend very strongly to characterize everyone who has this primary genital phobia I have spoken of—then it is almost certain that on the verge of an actual genital contact, precocious orgasm will occur in the man; and this precocious orgasm suddenly wipes out the integration and just leaves two people in a practically meaningless situation although they had previously made immense sense to each other. Such an occurrence reflects very severely on the self-esteem of the man concerned and thereby initiates a still more unfortunate process which is apt to appear as impotence. The recollection of so disastrous an occurrence, which has been in terms of anxiety pretty costly, is quite apt to result in either of two outcomes: there may be an overweening conviction that that's the way it's going to go; that one just hasn't any 'virility,' that one's manhood is deficient; or there may be frantic attempts to prove otherwise, which, if they were kept up long enough, would work. Unless there has been some genital activity, or unless the woman is quite expert in reducing the anxiety of the male, or even his sexual excitement, this precocious orgasm is very apt to be a man's introduction to heterosexual life. Needless to say, it has about as much true significance as drinking a glass of water—that is, if one could accept it in perfectly calm and rational fashion, it would prove absolutely nothing except that it had occurred once, and one could subsequently see whether it was going to be typical behavior or whether it was an accident. It usually isn't typical unless its effects are disastrous, in which case it can be stamped in as a sort of morbid way of handling one's incapacity to integrate true lustful situations, or as a channel for various other things which I shall discuss presently.

In other instances in which there is a lack of experience and considerable warp in the personalities concerned, just may carry things through to orgasm, usually of only one partner; but immediately upon the satisfaction of the lust dynamism and the disintegration of the situation as a lustful situation, the persons concerned may become the prey of guilt, shame, aversion, or revulsion for each other, or at least this may be true for one of the people concerned. And this experience is not a particularly fortunate addition to one's learning how to live in the world as it is. A much less usual, but also unfortunate, event in this initial experimentation in genital activity is that if it has gone pretty well it may become a high-grade preoccupation. This is usually to be understood on the general theory of preoccupation and is just as morbid as any other preoccupation. Since lust has a peculiarly strong biological basis, and, in some people, may be an ever recurrent and very driving force in early adolescence, this preoccupation with lust can lead to serious deterioration of self-respect because of the unpleasant situations one is driven into, because of the disapproval one encounters, and because this type of preoccupation literally interferes with almost any commonplace way of protecting one's self-esteem. A great many people whose self-esteem has been somewhat uncertain, depending on scholarship only, find their standing as students rapidly declining as they become completely preoccupied with the pursuit of lust objects. Thus they become the prey of severe anxiety, since their only distinction is now being knocked in half.

With truly distressing frequency, these sundry problems connected with early adolescence cause the persons concerned to turn to alcohol, one of the great mental-hygiene props in the culture, with unfortunate results. I sometimes think alcohol is, more than any other human invention, the basis for the duration and growth of the Western world. I am quite certain that no such complex, wonderful, and troublesome organization of society could have lasted long enough to become conspicuous if a great number of its unhappy denizens did not have this remarkable chemical compound with which to get relief from intolerable problems of anxiety. But its capacity for dealing with those problems naturally makes it a menace under certain circumstances, as I scarcely think I need argue. Like a good many other props which temporarily remedy but do not in any sense favorably alter cultural impossibilities, it is costly, not to all, but to too many. A peculiarity of alcohol is that it interferes very promptly with complex, refined referential operations, particularly those that are recent—that have not been deeply and extensively involved in the whole business of living—while it does not particularly disturb the older and more essential dynamisms of personality. It definitely poisons the
of personality development by striking up one of these pseudosibling relationships, which can be mistaken by others for a satisfactory move toward developing a solution for the problems of lust and loneliness. Another change of this kind is, we might say, a prolongation and refinement of the separation of good and bad girls: All women are good—too good; they are noble, and one cannot approach them for anything so something-or-other as genital satisfaction. And there is the alternative of that, in which all women are regarded as extremely unattractive, unsuited to anything but a particular kind of hateful entanglement which becomes practically official business.

In the process of trying to separate one's need for intimacy from one's need for genital integration, certain peculiarities of personality appear which we will later discuss as dissociation. Among the people with these peculiarities of personality pertaining to the need for intimacy, there is the one who feels pursued by the other sex and actually spends a lot of time in trying to avoid being hounded by the other sex. There is also the true woman-hater— that is, the man who literally feels the most strenuous antipathy to any but the most superficial relation with members of the other sex. When lust is dissociated—and components in lust are quite frequently dissociated—such things occur, even from early adolescence, as the celibate way of life, in some cases with accessible lustful fantasies, and in other cases with no representation of lustful needs in awareness. This latter can go so far that actually there are no recollections of any content connected with what must have been the satisfaction of lust in sleep; in other words, there are nocturnal orgasms, but there is never any recollectable attent at all. When one encounters that sort of thing, one thinks immediately that something has gone very radically wrong with the personality. Another manifestation in this field is what I call, in terms of a man's viewpoint, horror of the female genitals, even though the man considers that women are all right, and in fact, in many instances, may make a very good approach to them, the actual attempt at a physical intergenital situation causes the man to be overcome with a feeling which is literally uncanny, which is quite paralyzing. As I have already hinted, all these uncanny feelings refer to the not-me, and are, by this stage of per-
sonality, practically always signs that there is serious dissociation somewhere in personality. Another solution of this kind is to fall into a homosexual way of getting rid of lust; this is accompanied either by liking, by indifference, or by aversion toward the partner, or by revulsion or by fascination for the whole type of situation.

In this special group of disturbances of development, there are also the instances in which the genital drive is discharged with infrahuman or nearly infrahuman participation—that is, some of the lower animals are used as genital partners, or people are used whom the person has so much prejudice against that he scarcely considers them to be human. Very occasionally human ingenuity leads people who suffer from primitive genital phobia to invent what are called masturbating machines. This is a phenomenon that gets a good deal of attention, more than it deserves, and is, supposedly, very interestingly connected with paranoid states. As a matter of fact, it does coincide more than occasionally with later paranoid states, but this relation has been vastly overaccentuated.

The Isolated Adolescent

Finally, I want to mention here the misfortune of isolation in early adolescence, which is quite different from the developmental disturbances I have just discussed. This misfortune of isolation in adolescence has affected quite a number of the people whom you meet in ordinary life, or whom the psychiatrist encounters in his practice. Perhaps because the community is very small, or perhaps because of peculiar home circumstances or something of the sort, the isolated adolescent does not have other adolescents with whom to fraternize, is not thrown into contact with members of the other sex of approximately the same developmental phase. Such people are, from a theoretical standpoint, rather interesting because of the progression of their reverie processes; as they go from preadolescence into adolescence, the chief characters in their long-continued fantasies shift toward the other sex. The extent to which lustful covert processes are added to their fantasies depends, to an extraordinary degree, on the extent to which mediating educational influences have provided some basis for covert processes. Sometimes one finds people who, simply because of their isolation, have not reached the point of having particularly lustful reverie processes, so that when the lust dynamism comes along, it discharges itself largely in sleep; and this in itself may not represent a grave disturbance of personality. If we could study some of these isolated people—or rather if they were, in spite of entire lack of experience, clever at communication, which is almost unheard of—it would be interesting to see what the nocturnal development of covert processes connected with the satisfaction of lust is like. Some of these isolated early adolescents suffer a particular handicap from this reverie substitution for interpersonal experience, in that they develop quite strongly personified imaginary companions; and the singularly personal source of the idealized characteristics may be a severe barrier later on to finding anybody who strikes them as really suitable for durable interpersonal relations.

Failure to Change the Preadolescent Direction of the Need for Intimacy

I have said that, along with the maturation of the lust dynamism, but by no means in absolute temporal coincidence with it, there is, in the fortunate, a shift in the intimacy need toward seeking friendship with a person who is different, a member of the other sex. But I now want to consider the accidental development in which the lust dynamism matures but there is no change in the preadolescent direction of the need for intimacy. In this case there is added to the impulse which makes for the cultivation and cherishing of a friend of the same sex, all the force of the lust dynamism with its drive for genital interaction with someone or something. And in these instances transient or persisting homosexual organization of the interpersonal relations is usual, with the genital drive handled in a variety of ways. The first of these ways is by known homosexual reverie processes that are surrounded by precautions which protect the self-esteem, at least partially, of the person who entertains them. This is generally accompanied by autogenital discharge of lust, coupled with an avoidance of, or an indifference to, members of the other sex, and social distance toward members of the same sex. Thus, while there is a movement toward satisfying lust in the isophilic or monosexual two-group,
there is either no encouragement for mutual genital satisfaction or no capacity to recognize such encouragement—or in some cases there is even such great fear of the perineal area that mutual genital satisfaction would be impossible. Thus the coincidence of lust with the continuing preadolescent direction of the intimacy need leads to fantasies of what we can call a homosexual character, coupled with various guarding operations, security operations, to prevent their being discovered or suspected. But in order that this may succeed, there must be some satisfaction of lust; and the way that almost all people find for that is self-manipulation. Along with this there is, in boys, usually either an active avoidance or a definite indifference toward girls, although one of the best precautions invented by these delayed people is finding an accepted woman who gives the social appearance of normal-development, but who has no expectations of the man. And almost invariably, in these solutions, we see an increase in the social distance between the person concerned and certain boys other than the chum who is the object of the reverie processes. And incidentally, while I have been discussing this largely from the viewpoint of boys, the parallel is perfectly possible in women.

Another of the ways by which the genital drive is handled in this situation is by known—that is, conscious—homosexual reveries which are associated with inadequate precautions to conceal them and with severe anxiety as a result of rebuffs, fancied or real. This often leads to hateful behavior, or to “masturbation-shame,” and to a variety of other miseries which are hard for the person to express; but he knows, or can very readily come to know, that these miseries are associated with his homosexual reverie practices.

A third of the difficulties to which man is heir at this juncture and under these circumstances is a situation in which there are covert processes not accessible to awareness—in other words, unconscious processes, to use the old-fashioned term—which are attended by pseudo-heterosexual practices with or without an attenuation of the contact with members of the same sex. This sort of thing is often a precursor of a lifelong course of searching for the ‘ideal’ woman—or the ‘ideal’ man, if the person concerned is a woman—with the recurrent discovery of serious imperfections in each candidate for this ideal role. And this type of situation is the classical field for the appearance of the extremely unpleasant tension of jealousy. Jealousy is, I think, in some ways even less welcome than anxiety; and when I say that, I am almost engaging in hyperbole, because anxiety, if at all severe, is utterly unwelcome. But jealousy, in my experience with people who really suffer it, seems to come very close to providing an adequate picture of the now old-fashioned Christian hell.

Yet another solution of this failure of the intimacy urge to change its objective to the other sex is the turning to homosexual ways of life which are either so anxiety-ridden as to be scarcely distinguishable as achieving lustful satisfaction, or are definitely admixed with hateful, malevolent motivation, so that while lust may be satisfied more or less incidentally, what is most vividly remembered is the malicious mischief connected with the thing. And finally, as an outcome of this continuation of the isophilic intimacy need, a satisfying and relatively secure homosexual way of life may be established, sometimes by trial-and-error learning, quite often from example.

Any of these five typical outcomes which I have mentioned may come presently to include unsatisfactory, but security-giving, heterosexual performances. The outcome which is least apt to culminate in this sort of elaborate masking operation is the anxiety-ridden and hateful homosexual practice. But there are plenty of instances in which these people also finally either set up housekeeping with a common-law wife, or go through the motions of marrying, and even have children, but mostly for security reasons.

**Maturation of the Lust Dynamism in the Chronic Juvenile**

In addition to those situations in which there has been no change in the preadolescent need for intimacy as the lust dynamism has matured, the situation arises in which there is maturation of the lust dynamism in those not yet preadolescent. In other words, a person who is chronically juvenile reaches the time when the lust dynamism matures and goes into action. Arrest in the juvenile era is not by any means an extraordinarily unusual developmental disorder among people in this culture and in these times. The striking instance of this, as seen later in life, is what I call the juvenile ladies'
man. You probably are familiar with the story of Don Juan and know how much the conception of Don Juanism has appeared in some of the psychiatric literature; to the extent that I have studied such people, they have proven to be these lustful juveniles. I might describe another outstanding manifestation of this kind by the use of slang terms—women who are customarily called "teasers" and men whom I call "hymen hunters." These people in general engage in more or less refined boasting, frequently have an insatiable interest in pornography, and have simply an overweening necessity for being envied for their women or their men. In fact, I have known some of them who really kept something very like a stable, for different occasions using different people, some of whom were supposed to be appropriate for public appearance.

This is the sort of thing which happens when lust matures in a person whose preadolescent expansion of personality has simply been foredoomed and thus has failed to occur. In the sort of outcomes I have described, the person has done something with lust other than falling rather gravely ill—which, incidentally, is not an uncommon outcome of adolescent maturation in those who have serious warp of personality.

The Lust Dynamism as a Psychobiological Integrating Apparatus

I have already discussed some of the more or less typical outcomes that occur in people whose difficulties in development become very seriously complicated, in early adolescence, by the addition of the lust dynamism, although they have not passed into grave disturbances of personality. Now at this point, because we shall presently be moving into the area of difficulties of living rather than of difficulties in development, I should like to review lust as a dynamism, hoping that you remember something of our now fairly distant discussion of the concept of dynamism. Lust is in many ways a peculiarly illuminating example of a dynamism, partly because it comes along when so much of one's referential apparatus, so much of one's capacity to think and to communicate, is pretty well established and pretty well perfected. You may recall that in discussing the concept of dynamism we said that human dynamisms are relatively enduring patterns which manifest, in some cases at least, postnatal origin by maturation and, in all cases, change by experience in the occurrence of which they are significant factors. We then said that these dynamisms can be conceptualized from two viewpoints: first, with primary reference to the sundry recurring tensions manifesting as integrating, disjunctive, and isolative tendencies; and second, with primary reference to the energy transformations characteristic of the particular zones of interaction involved.

The lust dynamism—the last and the most conspicuous and illuminating of all the dynamisms, but nonetheless probably a model of every one of them, may most simply be considered as an organization of apparatus provided by the underlying human organism. This is a purely psychobiological consideration, but nonetheless important. We find that, considered solely as the property of an organism—that is, from the standpoint of psychobiology—lust can be broken up immediately into three kinds of integrating apparatus. By integrating apparatus I refer to organizations of tissue and function which hold the psychobiological organism in an organic unity. These three kinds of integrating apparatus are the autacoid system—that is, the endocrine or ductless gland system; the vegetative nervous system; and the central nervous system.

The first, the autacoid system, provides a tying together of the whole, by the simple device of pouring potent chemicals into a circulating fluid. In the lust dynamism, the pouring of this potent chemical into the blood stream determines whether you can have outward manifestations of lustful excitement, or whether you will fail therein. Thus the autacoid element is such that the administering of testosterone propionate, which is a synthetic chemical closely related to some of the testicular hormones, produces the appearance of something very like lust in a man; and a corresponding native hormone can be isolated which, injected into a woman, produces something very like lust. Now a person who was not at all given to very minute study of his interpersonal impulses would report to you, if he were a male, that testosterone made him lustful. However, the autacoid mechanism is not the whole thing; these very powerful chemical agents circulated in the blood stream and lymph are not all there is to being lustful.

The next great integrating apparatus involved in the lust dy-
The Lust Dynamism as a System of Zones of Interaction

Now I pass to a field much more appropriate to psychiatry—that of considering the lust dynamism as a system of zones of interaction. When we touched on zones of interaction before, we suggested that all zones of interaction with the environment, considered in the borderline area of psychobiology and psychiatry, were characterized by three significant groups of characteristics: their receptor aspects, their eductor aspects, and their effector aspects. And now let me throw out only a few hints of the aspects of the lust dynamism—the late-comer among the great dynamisms of life—that fit into this frame of reference as zones of interaction with the environment.

In the receptor aspect of the lust dynamism there are the genital-tactile, the genital-visceral, and the aspect pertaining to the “erogenous areas.” The peculiar tactile sensitivities of the genitals are such that if something touches the delicate mucosa of the genitals—whether it be the hands of a partner, a fly, or merely microscopic organisms like Trichomonas—there is an acute central awareness of specially marked sensations very clearly associated with the genital area. Although such sensations begin at an early age, in some cases practically in late infancy, they become part of the lust dynamism itself only later, when the two other types of receptor function mature.

In addition to the genital-tactile influx, there is the genital-visceral influx, which is carried over entirely separate channels, but is just as apt to provoke lust as the other. That is, lust, as experienced, is as often a result of tensions in unstripped muscles as it is of the stimulation of local tactile units. For example, a man can be excited, with lust as a result, by tension suffered by either the seminal vesicles or the prostate or both; or a woman, by tension suffered by the Fallopian tubes, the uterine mucosa, and the vaginal mucosa.

Quite exterior to these two fields of influx to the central nervous system, there are, after the maturation of the lust dynamism, very important influxes from other areas—the so-called “erogenous areas” of the body, some of which are fixed by the structure of the organism, and some of which are fixed by the experience that one has had earlier in life. In everyone, this erogenous zone is rather diffusely spread over the region of the perineum. In women, the nipples are quite generally erogenous zones. In other words, anything moving about on the surface of the nipples is apt, just like stimulation of the genitals or tension in the viscera, to be accompanied by the activation of the lust dynamism. But in either sex, any area of the body may be involved, although individual variation is wide and depends on previous experience. So much for the receptor aspect of the zones of interaction.

Next we shall discuss briefly the eductor aspect of this system of zones of interaction called the lust dynamism. It was Spearman ² who formulated the eduction of relationships from the data that

² (See Chapter 5, footnote 1.)
flow into the mind as the basis for knowing—one of the most profound observations, so far as the needs of psychiatrists are concerned, of the nature and manifestations of human intelligence. When I speak here of the educor aspect of the zones of interaction, I am referring to the knowing—the understanding, interpretation, recognition, and contemplation of goals—which is involved in the lust dynamism considered from the standpoint of a system of zones of interaction. There are three grand divisions of what happens in the region that we call our “mind,” by which we ordinarily refer to our capacity to grasp what is the case, and what should be done about it. These are facilitory, precautiousy, and inhibitory referential processes. The first of these processes facilitates the identifying of situations which might be appropriately integrated by the lust dynamism. And incidentally, most people seek diligently to cultivate their facilitory symbol operations with respect to achieving lustful integrations. Precautionary measures have been taught us by the difficulties of dealing with tenderness and other motivations which calls for the kindly intervention of others. Precautionary activities enable us to conceal the fact that we are motivated by lust, and tend to protect us from very brutally making fools of ourselves. And frankly inhibitory processes make it difficult or impossible to add up the activities of the receptor apparatus into a statement that lust is present. Any denizen of the Western world has plenty of elaborate apparatus for inhibiting integration in the interest of lust; when such integration would collide with the self-system, or with particular aspects of it. I think that everyone, carefully searching his past, may remember times when he was singularly restless and uncomfortable, which, in retrospect, he will see meant the unrecognized presence of lust; and this lust was unrecognized not because it is hard to know lust, but because there was some powerful impulse active to inhibit its recognition.

And we finally come to what one is more likely to know about from personal experience—the effector aspects of the zones of interaction concerned in the lust dynamism. The effector aspects of the zones of interaction connected with lust—to offer the crudest kind of an analysis, leaving out unnumbered interesting aspects—are five in number. The first is the vasomotor-erectile effector aspects of the urethro-genital zone of interaction with the environment, which is often first manifest at birth—but perhaps not consciously—and which is manifest recurrently, from birth onward. This is a complicated performance of obstructing venous return and increasing blood supply, which is illustrated not only in the genitals but also in the nose and sundry other parts of the body—the genitals and the nose being the most troublesome, in this climate at least. Besides the vasomotor-erectile—and appearing very much later, around the time of the puberty change—are the purely secretory effector aspects of the urethro-genital zone of interaction and its system of zones, consisting in the male of such things as the production of a dense but highly lubricant mucus by the Cowper’s glands, the production of an anything-but-dense albuminous fluid by the prostate, and the production of a complex nutritive albuminous fluid by the epididymis and probably the seminal vesicles. In the female, there is the secretion of mucus and the hydrogen ion concentration proper for the spermatogenesis.

As another very important aspect of the effectors, there are those massive patterns of skeletal behavior which we lump scientifically under the rubric “copulatory posture and movement.” The copulatory posture and movements are very complicated. They are one of the few things which faintly support the notion that the concept of instinct is not utterly irrelevant to human beings, for they come without calling, almost as if a little instinct still survived in our incredibly culture-ridden life.

Among the effector apparatus there is also the orgasmic complex of integrated movements, which, again, matures in the puberty change; to some extent this existed before as parts, but these are now suddenly integrated. The orgasmic movements are built up in men, primarily on the capacity for clonic spasm in the prostatic urethra, with which a man is born so that he is able to expel urine. But this becomes, suddenly in the puberty change, very closely and emphatically (from the sensory or receptor standpoint) coordinated with spasm of the walls of the seminal vesicles, which had not previously occurred. So here we find movements of unstriped muscle, which earlier were used only to expel the last drops of urine, suddenly integrated with the explosive activity of the container of semen in the male—a coordination which had
not been present at all before the puberty change. This is accompanied by the most vivid central representation, comprising that extremely strongly marked experience which represents the satisfaction of the lust dynamism.

But there are still further effector aspects of the zones of interaction which make up the lust dynamism. If the lust dynamism is successfully satisfied, a series of changes restores the apparatus to, shall I say, a resting condition which is called, traditionally, detumescence. There seems to be evidence that in women detumescence is a somewhat longer process, but here too the women’s erogenous zones, including the breasts, also shrink and come to rest in comparative insensitivity after the orgasm. In both men and women, after the apparatus has been restored to a resting condition, the lust dynamism, under external or internal provocation, can again become a very powerful organizer of a remarkable part of our capacity for contact with external events.

The Lust Dynamism as a Pattern of Covert and Overt Symbolic Events

Now I wish to consider the lust dynamism neither as an integrating apparatus nor as a system of zones of interaction, but as a pattern of covert and overt symbolic events—that is, events meaning something, if you please, which are either inferable or observable. The covert and overt symbolic events which are included in manifestations of experience with respect to the lust dynamism include experience in the prototaxic, the parataxic, and less often in the syntactic modes. Experience in the prototaxic mode, while it is particularly obvious in the instance of primary genital phobia, is present in any case. The parataxic mode is perhaps more apt to be the major element in the symbol operations connected with lust than it is with any other dynamism, because the culture is so very hard on consensual validation and syntactic operations with respect to lust. Experience of covert and overt symbolic events is concerned with six major rubrics. The first rubric is the observation and identification of the following: (a) the felt aspects of the integrating tendency—that is, lust per se; (b) the interpersonal situation as including an ‘object’—presumably another person with whom a lustful situation can be integrated, if only in

fantasy; (c) the interpersonal situation as otherwise characterized—that is, not merely as to the other person, but with respect to the suitability of the situation for probable satisfaction, the collateral factors which may make lustful excitement strangely irrelevant (for example, the unwisdom of getting intensely sexually excited about your opponent in the traffic court); and (d) the interpersonal situation as characterized with respect to anxiety, which is very important indeed in the lives of most of us.

Now these aspects of observation and identification are, in fortunate situations, supplemented by foresight, which is the second of these six rubrics. That is, after observation and identification, there comes foresight, although it is sometimes only rudimentary, and is often by no means extended. And, following the foresight, which is in a sense my way of referring to decision, there comes, third, activity in pursuit of or in avoidance of the goal, which is the discharge of lust. At the same time, there are in all real situations—and this is my fourth rubric of experience—sundry, often seemingly irrelevant, covert accompaniments of the last-mentioned—that is, processes which can be detected only by inference, which accompany action in pursuit of or in avoidance of the goal. In other words, I refer to a good deal that is going on in the ‘mind.’

Regardless of whether integration by the lust dynamism has been effected or avoided, and regardless of the extent of the discharge of lust, there is, later on, retrospective and prospective, witting and unwitting analysis of this particular experience, which is my fifth rubric. That is, there is analysis of what has happened recently, with a view to what may happen again. And incidentally, if, in the days of the Puritans, everyone’s development of acquaintance with experience regarding lust had depended on witting analysis, I think that lust might have disappeared, along with the human race. How much is witting and how much is unwitting depends on one’s cultural background, and not on anything else. Thus whether one has pursued the goal of lustful satisfaction, or avoided it, there is always in the experience concerned with any particular episode some review and prospective analysis, with the idea of improving one’s capacity for achieving contentment and success in this field of life. Finally, and this is my sixth rubric, in some instances—and, fortunately, this is not always the case—
there are more complex processes concerned in the experience, which may replace the retrospective and prospective analysis, or may just complicate it. And these reflect, however obscurely, the personality warp of at least one person concerned in the situation in which the lust dynamism is the principal system of integrating tendencies.

The Lust Dynamism as a System of Integrating Tendencies

And this brings me to my next and more important point. Having reviewed the lust dynamism as a system of covert and overt symbolic events, I should now like to discuss it as a system of integrating tendencies—that is, as an integration of those characteristics of people which integrate situations with other people. In other words, this is an elaborate system of motives which get us involved with others or lead us to avoid them.

The lust dynamism is a system of integrating tendencies:

(1) of which the unanalyzable elements have matured in earlier stages of development and have been modified by experience of satisfaction or experience with anxiety, or both, and in some cases with signs of disintegrative change or elaboration in dissociation.

(2) in which the anxiety-marked components are widely varied from person to person, because of inadequacies in the culture complex and their accentuation by resulting family-society and school-society peculiarities.

(3) of which some components are almost always, in this culture, unrepresented in focal awareness, whether their lack of representation be due to selective inattention, to masking processes, to misinterpretation, or to the manifestation of a dissociative process in the self.

(4) which is often related to acute or persisting disorientation in living, and to the disastrous disturbance of self-esteem.

(5) which, in the handicapped, may come to channel the partial satisfaction of a variety of other integrating tendencies—and thus may come to seem preternaturally important.

(6) of which the recurrent partial satisfaction leaves residual motivation to be discharged in sleep and in waking reverie processes in a way that may undermine self-esteem, or may call for precautionary processes or social distance—which in turn seriously reduce the chances of fortunate experience in life.

Statement (1) is the simplest of these possible views of the lust dynamism. In other words, the integrating tendencies which are systematized in the lust dynamism have matured over various stages of one’s past, and have, since maturation, been subjected to experience and to the various characteristics of experience which we have considered thus far, such as change to avoid anxiety, disintegration to avoid anxiety, or actually development in dissociation.

Statement (2) reflects the fact that our culture is the least adequate in preparing one for meeting the eventualities of sexual maturity, which is another way of saying we are the most sex-ridden people on the face of the globe. In (4), I suggest that the lust dynamism is the system of integrating tendencies often related to acute or persisting disorientation in living.

When I mention the handicapped in statement (5) I refer to those people who have had disasters in the stages of development before adolescence. I might illustrate this rubric by saying that if your resentment at authority should find in lustful activities a discharge which, though only partial, was better than nothing, then, insofar as you suffered authority, lust and lustful activities would come to be unreasonably, extravagantly important in your life. Thus in those who have had serious warp in personality, the lust dynamism is a system of integrating tendencies which may provide a channel for the obscure and unrecognized satisfaction of many thwarted integrating impulses having no direct connection with lust. The persistently juvenile person who finally reaches genital maturity advertises this fact to the high heavens to those who investigate him. Psychiatrists have tended to overlook the very rich source of data on this particular point because of the seeming essential dullness of the persistently juvenile person and the social insignificance of his life with others.
Patterns of Manifestation of the Integrating Tendencies of the Intimacy Need and Lust

Now I have given you, with a feeling of deep apology for the condensation that has characterized it, something like a theoretically justifiable, if not definitive, variety of approaches to the meaning of the lust dynamism. It is important to realize that everything said of the lust dynamism applies to every dynamism; but because the lust dynamism happens to come along so late in life, it is a particularly informative example of dynamisms in general. I shall presently try to suggest the rich variety of human life with respect to every dynamism by some cold mathematical adumbrations of the possible patterns of adjustment called out in part by the lust dynamism. But first, since these things do not stand alone, I would like to go back to the idea of orientation of living and to defects therein as they are related to the two very powerful integrating tendencies that characterize adolescence—lust and the need for intimacy. In discussing disturbed or inadequate orientation in the later phases of adolescent living and thereafter, one cannot, except for purposes of clarity of thinking, separate the manifestation of these two very powerful motivating systems of human life. But though these systems are intricately interwoven, at the same time they are never identical.

I have already tried to suggest something of the broad basis in the developmental history of everyone, for the feeling ordinarily called loneliness, which is the exceedingly unpleasant and driving experience connected with inadequate discharge of the need for human intimacy, for interpersonal intimacy. Since it seems to me that no amount of emphasis will be extravagant in this connection, let me again comment on the major integrating tendencies which gradually come to be concerned with the experience of loneliness. It begins in infancy with an integrating tendency that we know only by inference from pathological material later, but which we nonetheless accept unhesitatingly—a need for contact with the living. And its next great increment is a need for tenderness—for protective care delicately adjusted to immediate situations. This need continues into childhood. But in childhood a need for adult participation is added—that is, a need for the interest and participation of significant adults in the child's play. This activity takes the form of expressive play necessary to provide the child with equipment for showing what he feels, in manual play necessary for the coordination of the very delicate and intricate relationships of vision and the prehensile hands, and so on, and in verbal play, which is the basis of all the enormously important acquisitions to personality which are reflected by verbal behavior and abstract thought. All of these activities become more pleasure-giving to the child because of the adults' participation. By the juvenile era, there is added the need for companions, as indispensable models for one's learning by trial and error; and this is then followed by a need for acceptance which is perhaps to most of you known by its reverse, the fear of ostracism, fear of being excluded from the accepted and significant group. And added to all these important integrating tendencies, there comes in preadolescence the need for intimate exchange, for friendship, or for—in its high refinement—the love of another person, with its enormous facilitation of consensual validation of action patterns, of valutalional judgments, and so on. This becomes, in early adolescence, the same need for intimacy, friendship, acceptance, intimate exchange, and, in its more refined form, the need for a loving relationship, with a member of the other sex. Now this is the great structure which is finally consolidated, made meaningful, as the need for intimacy as it characterizes late adolescence and the rest of life.

I have now reviewed the history of one powerful integrating tendency—the need for intimacy—and I have already given my views of lust, the other of these major integrating tendencies. At this point I shall endeavor to give some idea of the possible varieties of intricately interwoven patterns of these tendency systems.

The theoretical patterns of manifestation of the two powerful integrating tendencies, the need for intimacy and lust, may be classified:

(1) on the basis of the intimacy need and the precautions which concern it—as autophile, isophile, and heterophile;
(2) on the basis of the preferred partner in lustful integrations,
or the substitute therefor—as autosexual, homosexual, heterosexual, and katasexual.

(3) on the basis of genital participation or substitution—as orthogenital, paragenital, metagenital, amphigenital, mutual masturbation, and onanism.

In creating the rubrics with respect to the need for intimacy (1), I have turned to the old Greek term philor, meaning “loving,” since the need for intimacy in its highest manifestations is unquestionably love—and while love has been many things to many people, the common denominator pertains to interpersonal intimacy. All the manifestations, morbific and successful, of this need for intimacy, may be grossly classified under the three rubrics of autophilic, isophilic, and heterophilic. We will use these three rubrics to describe a ‘person’—and I use person here in the sense of that which we hypothesize to account for what we see or experience. In the autophilic person, there has been no preadolescent development; or such preadolescent development as took place has been disintegrated because of profound rebuff, and he has been returned to a state before preadolescence in which the capacity to love is, if manifest at all, concentrated within his personification of himself. The autophilic is always a misfortune and a deviation of development. An isophilic person has been unable to progress past preadolescence, and continues to regard as suitable for intimacy only people who are as like himself as possible, in significant fashions—that is, members of his own gender. A heterophilic person has gone through the preadolescent period and made the early adolescent change in which he has become intensely interested in achieving intimacy with members of what, in this culture, is most essentially different—the other sex. The isophilic is, for a period of two-and-a-half to three-and-a-half years, a normal phase of every successful development; but this phase may continue through life. And the heterophilic represents the last stage of development of the need for intimacy; many achieve this phase even though they are unable to leave late adolescence.

Now I invite you to consider (2) and (3), which underlie all that I have already said of the lust dynamis. The first of these refers to the gross characteristics of integrations which seek the discharge of the lust dynamis, which are directly related to recognized lust and its satisfaction; for these I use the term sexual—and do not confuse this with the term “erotic.” In my classification of sexual behavior on the basis of the preferred partner, the homosexual and the heterosexual are obviously related to preadolescent and early adolescent phases of development. The autosexual represents an earlier stage—that is, although lust has matured, the preadolescent and adolescent eras have not been reached. The katasexual refers to passing beyond the confines of the human species—that is, the dead or infrahuman creatures are the preferred lustful partners—and this represents a very complex substitution for things which one experiences as impossible to want.

And finally, I would like you to consider the lust dynamis in terms of (3) the participation of the genitals in covert and overt, witting or unwitting, lustful performances; and here I am talking about a region of the body. Situations principally integrated by lust are sexual situations; but at the same time the patterning of this behavior depends on the part played by the genitals, as well as the lustful character of the situation. On the basis of one’s genital participation with another, or with a substitute, I have named six rubrics, most of which are neologisms of my own invention. Orthogenital situations are characterized by a preferred integration of one’s genitals with their natural receptor genitals—genitals of the sexually opposite type. In paragenital situations, one uses the genitals as if they were seeking an appropriate opposite type of genitals, but does so in behavior which is not related to the procreation of one’s kind. A common example is being masturbated by someone else, in which case the hand is the paragenital receptor of one’s genitals; other examples are the passive role in fellatio or the active role in pederasty. In metagenital situations, one’s genitals need not be involved at all, but the other person’s genitals are involved. The most obvious example is masturbating someone else; other examples are taking the passive role in pederasty or the so-called active role in fellatio. In amphigenital situations, for which the French have adopted the term “soixante-neuf,” either homosexual or heterosexual groups of two people take a singularly analogous if not identical relationship to the genitals of
each and the substitutes of each. Besides these, there are the relatively primitive performance of *mutual masturbation* and the quite primitive performance of *onanism*.

Now I do not like to coin freak terms, but what these terms represent is terribly significant. And the terrible significance is this: In this culture the ultimate test of whether you can get on or not is whether you can do something satisfactory with your genitals or somebody else's genitals without undue anxiety and loss of self-esteem. Therefore the psychiatrist who has to consider the life problems presented by people who come to him has to have some way of organizing thought regarding this last phase of interpersonal adjustment. To accomplish that I have had to set up what are, so far as I know, unique inventions: the resolute separation of the need for intimacy from the lust dynamism; and the distinction between the general interpersonal objective of the lust dynamism, and the *particular activities* which the genitals—the center of the lust dynamism, one might say—have in preferred adjutative effort.

Since I have set up three classifications of intimacy, four classifications of the general interpersonal objective of the integration of lust, and six classifications of genital relationship, this results in seventy-two theoretical patterns of sexual behavior in situations involving two real partners. As a matter of fact, there are only forty-five patterns of sexual behavior that are reasonably probable; six are very highly improbable, and the rest just aren't possible. From this statement, I would like you to realize, if you realize nothing else, how fatuous it is to toss out the adjectives "heterosexual," "homosexual," or "narcissistic" to classify a person as to his sexual and friendly integrations with others. Such classifications are not anywhere near refined enough for intelligent thought; they are much too gross to do anything except mislead both the observer and the victim. For example, to talk about homosexuality's being a problem really means about as much as to talk about humanity's being a problem.

The reason why I attempt to set up careful classifications in this field is this: It is almost always essential for the psychiatrist, when he ventures into remedial efforts for serious developmental handicaps, to pay attention to the place of lust in the difficulties of the person. And let me make it clear that lust, in my sense, is not some great diffuse striving, 'libido' or what not. By lust I mean simply the felt aspect of the genital drive. And when I say that the psychiatrist must usually pay attention to this, I do not mean that problems in living are primarily or chiefly concerned with genital activity. But I am saying, of people in this culture who are chronologically adult, that their problems in interpersonal relations quite certainly will be either very conspicuous in, or exceedingly well illustrated by, the particular circumstances governing their handling of the emotion of lust. While this statement is, I believe, strikingly true of Northwestern European culture, I would say, although I have no evidence on the matter, that it is not true of certain other cultures.

By the time a person has plunged into early adolescence, he has either largely overcome all the crippling handicaps to personality that he has encountered, or his development in adolescence will be badly warped. And since lust cannot be eliminated from personality any more than hunger can, data on personality warp as seen in a person's sexual behavior is bound to be useful to the psychiatrist, for instance, I mean here the broad conception of sexual behavior, including reverie processes and any evidences of dissociated processes, which I shall discuss presently. But to think that one can remedy personality warp by tinkering with the sex life is a mistake, even though it is a very convenient doctrine for psychiatrists who are chronic juveniles. It may provide them with fees for enjoying their interest in pornography; but if one is a serious psychiatrist, it is apt to be the hardest possible way to tackle one's task. When difficulties in the sex life are presented by a patient as his reason for needing psychiatric help, my experience has demonstrated rather convincingly that the patient's difficulty in living is best manifested by his very choice of this as his peculiar problem. In other words, people don't go to psychiatrists to be aided in their sexual difficulties; but they do sometimes present this as their problem, and such problems show, when properly understood, what ails their living with people. It is only an exceptional person who is able to have his sex life as his major interpersonal activity; only such a person could correctly present to a psychiatrist, as his greatest difficulty in living, a sexual prob-
lem. Thus let me warn my fellow psychiatrists: If you want to do psychiatry that can well be crowded into a lifetime, see if you can't find something besides the sexual problem in the strangers that come to you for help. Quite frequently it is no trick at all to find something very much more serious than the sexual difficulty; and quite often the sexual difficulty is remedied in the process of dealing with the other problems. You may notice that there is a slight difference here between my views and some of the views that have been circulated in historic times.