Spine Width: 3.0 mm

Trim Size: 215 X 280 mm

VOLUME 27 2018 NO 1

International Forum of Psychoanalysis

German Themes in Psychoanalysis. Part Three

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL FORUM OF PSYCHOANALYSIS VOLUME 27 NO 1 2018

ISSN 0803-706X

VOLUME 27 2018 NO 1

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF PSYCHOANALYTIC SOCIETIES

International Forum of Psychoanalysis

German Themes in Psychoanalysis. Part Three

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

SPSY 27_1 Cover.indd 1-3

28/02/18 7:20 PM

International Forum of Psychoanalysis

International Forum of Psychoanalysis (IFP) is a peer-reviewed journal, published under the auspices of the International Federation of Psychoanalytic Societies (IFPS). IFP is a member of the International Council of Editors of Psychoanalytic Journals (ICEPJ). In accordance with the objectives of IFPS, the journal will be open for all new and creative contributions to the development of psychoanalysis. Papers presented at fora, scientific conferences and workshops arranged by IFPS will be considered for publication with high priority.

Manuscripts will be reviewed for possible publication on the understanding that they have not been published, simultaneously submitted or accepted for publication elsewhere. Case material must be followed by a signed statement that the material is presented with consent from the patient. This statement form and detailed instructions for authors can be found at the journal web site at: www.tandfonline.com/spsy. These instructions should be strictly followed for manuscripts to be considered for publication.

Consulting Editor
Christer Sjödin – Stockholm, Sweden
E-mail: sjodin.christer@telia.com

Coeditors-in-Chief
Marco Conci – Trento, Italy/Munich, Germany
E-mail: marcoconci@aol.com
Grigoris Maniadakis – Athens, Greece
E-mail: gmaniadakis@hotmail.com

Founding Editor
Jan Stensson – Älghult, Sweden

Associate Editors
Per Einar Binder – Bergen, Norway
Carlo Bonomi – Florence, Italy
Franco Borgogno – Turin, Italy
Michael B. Buchholz – Göttingen, Germany
Harald Kamm – Bamberg, Germany
Zivile Paulauskiene – Kaunas, Lithuania
Eystein Victor Våpenstad – Oslo/Bergen, Norway

Corresponding Editors
Christopher Bollas – London, UK
André Haynal – Geneva, Switzerland
Per Magnus Johansson – Gothenburg, Sweden
Henry Zvi Lothane – New York, USA
Luiz Eduardo Prado de Oliveira – Paris, France

Regional Editors
Central Europe (German): Klaus Hoffmann – Reichenau, Germany
Southern Europe (Roman lang.): Romulo Aguillaume – Madrid, Spain; Miguel Angel Gonzalez Torres – Bilbao, Spain
Northern Europe: Christer Sjödin – Stockholm, Sweden
North America: Valerie Tate Angel – New York, USA
South America: Eliana Rodriguez Pereira Mendes – Belo Horizonte, Brazil; Ricardo Azevedo Barreto – Santos, Brazil

Editorial Readers
A. Ávila Espada, Spain; F. Balbuena Rivera, Spain; I. Benou, Greece; A. Berle, Norway; E. Brabant-Gerõ, France; S. Buechler, USA; S. Caruso, Italy; P.R. Ceccarelli, Brazil; H. Deserno, Germany; A.A. Døske, Norway; J. Drescher, USA; I. Erhardt, Germany; E. Falzeder, Austria; G. Ferrari, Italy; J. Frankel, USA; E. Frank-Rieser, Austria; R. Frie, USA; R. Garcia, Spain; B. Gerisch, Germany; S. Gojman-Millán, Mexico; E. Gould, USA; S. Haaramo, Finland; M-L. Heinonen, Finland; K. Hoven-Buchholz, Germany; J. Ihanus, Finland; A. Jemstedt, Sweden; L. Joelson, Sweden; H. Kächele, Germany; J. Kanter, USA; H. Karamonlaki, Greece; R. Krause, Germany; A. Kulak, Lithuania; D. Kyriazis, Greece; D. Leskauskas, Lithuania; E. List, Austria; A. M. Loiacono, Italy; C. Mann, USA; L. Mayers, USA; J. Mészáros, Hungary; S. Millán, Mexico; I. Miller, Ireland; T. Molino, Italy; M. Moreno, Brazil; C. Mucci, Italy; J. Myyrä, Finland; E. Papiasvili, USA; M. Peciccia, Italy; B. Piovano, Italy; J. Reeder, Sweden; M. Schroeter, Germany; E. Schweidson, Brazil; A-L. Silver, USA; R. Skelton, Ireland; F. Soriano, Spain; R.M. Stanton, UK; A. Sweet, UK; F. Tagliatti, Italy; S. Tournis, Greece; F. Vanni, Italy; G. Vaslamatzis, Greece; G. Ventimiglia, Italy; J. Vida, USA; A. Wagner, USA; C. Weber, Italy.

International Forum of Psychoanalysis (www.tandfonline.com/spsy) is a peer-reviewed journal published quarterly in March, June, September and December by Routledge Publishing, an imprint of Taylor & Francis, an Informa Business, 4 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN, UK.

Indexing: *International Forum of Psychoanalysis* is indexed in: Psychoanalytical Literature Index; EMBASE/Exerpta Medica; Elsevier Bibliographic Databases; Psychological Abstracts; PsychLIT; PsycINFO and PEP-Archive/PEP-web.

Subscription Information
International Forum of Psychoanalysis (USPS permit number 021679), ISSN (print) 0803-706X (online) 1651-2324, Volume 27, 2018.

For information and subscription rates please see www.tandfonline.com/pricing/journal/spsy

Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group, has a flexible approach to subscriptions enabling us to match individual libraries' requirements. This journal is available via a traditional institutional subscription (either print with online access, or online-only at a discount) or as part of our libraries, subject collections or archives. For more information on our sales packages please visit www.tandfonline.com/page/librarians.

All current institutional subscriptions include online access for any number of concurrent users across a local area network to the currently available backfile and articles posted online ahead of publication. Subscriptions purchased at the personal rate are strictly for personal, non-commercial use only. The reselling of personal subscriptions is prohibited. Personal subscriptions must be purchased with a personal cheque or credit card. Proof of personal status may be requested.

Ordering Information: Ordering information: Please contact your local Customer Service Department to take out a subscription to the Journal: USA, Canada: Taylor & Francis, Inc., 530 Walnut Street, Suite 850, Philadelphia, PA 19106, USA. Tel: +1 800 354 1420; Fax: +1 215 207 0050. UK/Europe/Rest of World: T&F Customer Services, Informa UK Ltd, Sheepen Place, Colchester, Essex, CO3 3LP, United Kingdom. Tel: +44 (0) 20 7017 5544; Fax: +44 (0) 20 7017 5198; Email: subscriptions@tandf.co.uk.

Dollar rates apply to all subscribers outside Europe. Euro rates apply to all subscribers in Europe, except the UK where the pound sterling price applies. All subscriptions are payable in advance and all rates include postage. Journals are sent by air to the USA, Canada, Mexico, India, Japan and Australasia. Subscriptions are entered on an annual basis, i.e. January to December. Payment may be made by sterling cheque, dollar cheque, euro cheque, international money order, National Giro or credit cards (Amex, Visa and Mastercard).

Back Issues: Taylor & Francis Group retains a two-year back issue stock of journals. Older volumes are held by our official stockists to whom all orders and enquiries should be addressed: Periodicals Service Company, 351 Fairview Ave. Suite 300 Hudson, New York, 12534, USA. Tel: +1 518 537 4700; Fax: +1 518 537 5899; E-mail: psc@periodicals.com.

Copyright © 2018 The International Federation of Psychoanalytic Societies. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, or disseminated, in any form, or by any means, without prior written permission from Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group, to whom all requests to reproduce copyright material should be directed, in writing.

Disclaimer: The IFPS and our publisher Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group, make every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in our publications. However, the IFPS and our publisher Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by the IFPS or our publisher Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. The IFPS and our publisher Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group, shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions.

Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group, grants authorization for individuals to photocopy copyright material for private research use, on the sole basis that requests for such use are referred directly to the requestor's local Reproduction Rights Organization (RRO). In order to contact your local RRO, please contact International Federation of Reproduction Rights Organizations (IFRRO), rue du Prince Royal, 87, B-1050 Brussels, Belgium; email ifrro@skynet.be; Copyright Clearance Center Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, USA; email info@copyright.com; or Copyright Licensing Agency, 90 Tottenham Court Road, London, W1P 0LP, UK; email cla@cla.co.uk. This authorization does not extend to any other kind of copying, by any means, in any form, for any purpose other than private research use.

Airfreight and mailing in the USA by agent named Air Business Ltd, c/o Worldnet Shipping Inc., 156–15, 146th Avenue, 2nd Floor, Jamaica, NY 11434, USA. Periodicals postage paid at Jamaica NY 11431. US Postmaster: Send address changes to [insert journal name or acronym], Air Business Ltd, c/o Worldnet Shipping Inc., 156-15, 146th Avenue, 2nd Floor, Jamaica, NY 11434, USA.

Subscription records are maintained at Taylor & Francis Group, 4 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, OX14 4RN, United Kingdom

Copyright and authors' rights: To assure the integrity, dissemination, and protection against copyright infringement of published articles, you will be asked to assign to The International Federation of Psychoanalytic Societies via a Publishing Agreement, the copyright in your article. Your Article is defined as the final, definitive and citable Version of Record, and includes: (a) the accepted manuscript in its final form, including the abstract, text, bibliography, and all the accompanying tables, illustrations, data; and (b) any supplemental material hosted for The International Federation of Psychoanalytic Societies by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group. Our Publishing Agreement with you will constitute the entire agreement and the sole understanding between you and us; no amendment, addendum, or other communication will be taken into account when interpreting your and our rights and obligations under this Agreement. Copyright policy is explained in detail at http://authorservices.taylorandfrancis.com/copyright-and-you/.

For more information on Taylor & Francis' journal publishing program, please visit our website: www.tandf.co.uk/journals.

All Taylor and Francis Group journals are printed on paper from renewable sources by accredited printers.

The International Federation of Psychoanalytic Societies (IFPS) was founded in 1962. At present, 24 psychoanalytical societies in 17 countries are members of IFPS. Complete organizational and scientific autonomy as well as equal standing of all Member societies are essential principles of the Federation. According to its statutes IFPS "is committed to the concept of pluralism in psychoanalytic theory and practice as well as to the interdisciplinary exchange in matters of micro- and macro-social interest." The training at the institutes of the member societies "shall be based on psychoanalytical theory and theory as initiated by Sigmund Freud and advanced by others, i.e. on the recognition and understanding of unconscious mental processes and the therapeutic use of transference and resistance."

The XIX IFPS FORUM took place between May 12th and May 15th 2016 in New York City at the Roosevelt Hotel and it was centered around the theme "Violence, Terror and Terrorism Today: Psychoanalytic Perspectives". See the report by Marco Conci published in Issue 1/2017.

The XX IFPS Forum will take place on October 17–20, 2018 in Firenze, Italy and will be centered around the theme: "The New Faces of Fear: The Transformations Under Way in Our Society and in Psychoanalytic Practice". For Information go to ifps-forum2018.com.

International Forum of Psychoanalysis, 2018
Vol. 27, No. 1, 1–4, https://doi.org/10.1080/0803706X.2018.1442056

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

EDITORIAL

German themes in psychoanalysis. Part three

Michael Ermann's readiness to accept my invitation to undertake the interview that opens this issue of our journal stimulated me to find a whole series of papers that could be published with it, in a third monographic issue on psychoanalysis in the German-speaking world. The first two issues I edited came out as No.4/2013 and No.2/2015.

The first of these contained the following contributions: Werner Bohleber (Frankfurt) on the history and role of the journal *Psyche* (1946)*;* Harry Stroeken (Utrecht) on the fate of the German-Jewish psychoanalyst refugees in the Netherlands; Ulrike May (Berlin) on Freud's 1920 essay "Beyond the pleasure principle"; Hans-Jürgen Wirth (Giessen) on the "militant" and "peaceful" use of nuclear power; and, last but not least, an interview I held with Horst Kächele, together with Ingrid Erhardt, in February 2013.

The second issue centered around the following authors and themes: Michael Ermann (Munich) on the history and role of the journal *Forum der Psychoanalyse* (1985); the Israeli colleague Ilany Kogan on her analytic work with the children of Holocaust's survivors; Siegfried Zepf (Saarbrücken) on Freud's concept of conversion; Michael Buchholz (Göttingen) on conflicts and their reconciliation, both in the history of psychoanalysis and in our clinical work; Horst Kächele, Ingrid Erhardt, Carolina Seybert, and Michael Buchholz on countertransference as the object of empirical research; and, last but not least, an important and still unpublished paper written by Helmut Thomä (1921-2013) in 2010 by the title "Remarks on the first century of the International Psychoanalytic Association and a utopian vision of its future", with a short Introduction by Horst Kächele.

In my Editorials to these issues (Conci, 1913 and 1915), I tried to introduce readers to the contemporary German psychoanalytic landscape, both in terms of how it was shaped by the only very gradual and problematic elaboration of the tragedy of the Nazi Regime (1933-1945), and in terms of its not yet so well-known areas of excellence. A recent useful book on the relationship between past history and present reality of psychoanalysis in Germany, written by competent New York City colleague Emily Kuriloff (2014), is *Contemporary psychoanalysis and the legacy of the Third Reich.*

Having worked in Munich as a *Kassenpsychoanalytiker* since 1999, I am an active participant in and, at the same time, careful observer of the German analytic community, and this has allowed me to see more clearly how the past still shapes the present. This is for example the case with the German *Kassensystem*, a public insurance system unique worldwide, which was created in the late 1960s and still covers psychoanalytic treatment of up to 300 sessions at the frequency of 3 sessions a week (see also the above-mentioned interview with Horst Kächele). Colleagues around the world still know relatively little about this system, not only because of the still relative scarcity – at our international congresses, of both the International Federation of Psychoanalytic Societies (IFPS) and the International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA) – of small discussion groups centered around our actual work with our patients. But also because many of those German colleagues who participate in international conferences tend to adopt as a model the British so-called "open-ended concept of analytic treatment" (see, for example, Sabbadini, 2014), and do not feel at ease with how the *Kassensystem* shapes our German daily practice, including the existence of predetermined time frames. Such an orientation, shaped as it is also by the difficult elaboration of the German past, makes it hard for many German colleagues to be as proud as they could be of how well their society can put psychoanalysis at the disposal of many of its citizens - exactly in the way that Freud himself had dreamed of in 1918 (see Freud, 1919).

On the other hand, contemporary German psychoanalysis has other areas of excellence - which are easier to talk about than the controversial *Kassensystem.* I have already presented these in the two previous monographic issues, but of course they deserve to be discussed further, as I will be doing in this one. I am referring here to the Ulm School of empirical research founded by Helmut Thomä; to the Tübingen School of historical research that has grown around Gerhard Fichtner (1932-2012) and the journal *Luzifer-Amor* (founded in 1988); to the

© 2018 The International Federation of Psychoanalytic Societies

socio-analytical tradition originally created by Alexander Mitscherlich (1908-1982) and Hans-Eberhard Richter (1923-2011), as inherited not only by Hans-Jürgen Wirth (Giessen) and his journal *psycho-sozial* (originally founded in 1978), but also by the journal *Psychoanalyse. Texte zur Sozialforschung* (see below); and, of course, to the German traditional capacity of both founding new institutions (think of the Berlin Institute founded by Max Eitingon, in 1920), and also subjecting them to significant critical scrutiny, as I myself was taught to do by Johannes Cremerius (1918-2002) and Paul Parin (1916-2009).

To such an institutional tradition belong two of the six contributions in this issue: Lilli Gast on the International Psychoanalytic University (IPU) founded in Berlin in 2009; and Ross Lazar (1945-2017), with his radical critique of the present analytic training system and the ways in which it heavily limits our capacity to make psychoanalysis attractive for the younger generations and for society as a whole. The Munich colleague Herbert Will's paper on the 50-minute hour and my paper on my own clinical work with Italian patients in Munich are meant to illustrate further positive aspects of the *Kassensystem*. The paper by Galina Hristeva and Philip Bennet (a Bulgarian historian working in Stuttgart and a North American historian) deals with a little-known aspect of Wilhelm Reich's (1897-1957) activity, that is, a central episode in his relationship with Soviet Russia. Our corresponding editor Henry Zvi Lothane closes the issue with a book review of the issue of the journal *Psychoanayse - Texte zur Sozialforschung* specifically dedicated to the seventieth birthday of one of its five editors, i.e., the analyst Bernd Nitzschke (Düsseldorf).

One of the most interesting aspects of my interview with Michael Ermann is what I can call the "interinstitutional" character of his professional life. He was, on the one hand, president of the Deutsche Psychoanalytische Gesellschaft (DPG) between 1987 and 1995, and, on the other hand, a member of the executive committee of the IFPS between 1983 and 2016. He was the pioneer of the long and complex operation that brought the DPG back into the IPA in 2009, and, at the same time, contributed to keeping the IFPS alive and well. This interinstitutional character was also one of the specific ingredients underlying the success of *Forum der Psychoanalyse,* the journal he founded in 1985 with Jürgen Körner (DPG president, 1995-2001) and Sven Olaf Hoffmann; this was an important model for the foundation of our own journal, in 1992 – a connection documented by the name, *Forum,* that we share. Before leaving the IFPS, Michael Ermann provided the decisive impulse for the creation of the Individual Members Section, also becoming its first chair.

In a world where an analytic session mostly lasts 45 minutes, the 50-minute hour is as peculiar to Germany as the *Kassensystem* itself. This topic is dealt with by Herbert Will, a former director of training of the Munich Akademie für Psychotherapie und Psychoanalyse, and the author of two very well received books on analytic technique such as *Was ist klassische Psychoanalyse?* (2003) and *Psychoanalytische Kompetenzen* (2006). A biographer of Georg Groddeck (1866-1934), the German pioneer of psychosomatic medicine (see Will, 1984), Herbert Will continues to deal also with historical and cultural topics, as he did in his latest book, *Freuds Atheismus im Widerspruch* (2014). Such a distinguished scientific production recently allowed him to become a member of the new editorial board of the journal *Psyche* (Werner Bohleber having retired as editor-in-chief in the summer of 2017), and this is a further reason why his contributions and his name deserve to be known also outside of Germany as well.

Another positive aspect of the German *Kassensystem* is the possibility that migrant patients can not only go through a psychotherapeutic treatment covered by the social insurance system, but also do this in their mother tongue. I have been doing this kind of work since 1999, as I show in the paper, "Working with Italian patients in Munich – The case of Penelope", included in this issue, which I had originally presented at the 2009 Chicago IPA Congress. Among the pioneers of the importance of working in the patient's mother tongue and of the concept of a multi-lingual treatment, Jacqueline Amati Mehler, Simona Argentieri and Jorge Canestri, played a major role through their book *The Babel of the unconscious*. For this reason, together with Hediaty Utari-Witt, in 2010, I promoted its German edition, accompanying it with a detailed Introduction (see Conci, 2010). For many years, Hediaty (an Indonesian colleague who trained and lives in Munich) and I worked on this topic with Ilany Kogan, with whom Hediaty in 2015 edited an anthology of Munich contributions on the topic of the psychoanalysis with migrant patients with the title *Unterwegs in der Fremde,* for which they asked me to write a Preface (see Conci, 2015b).

The growing international interest in this topic – which has dominated not only German political life in the last years – has been demonstrated by the publication of books such as the anthology *Immigration in psychoanalysis,* edited in 2016 by Julia Beltsiou (a Greek-German colleague who trained and works in New York City), and Vamik Volkan's 2017 book *Immigrants and refugees.* Today we know that every language we are familiar with catalyzes the development of a peculiar specific self dimension, which needs to be specifically explored and dealt with in

every analytic treatment. Freud was himself multilingual, and so also should we be.

In her contribution to this third monographic issue, Lilli Gast presents the IPU as the realization of Freud's utopia to have the university teach and promote psychoanalysis. A private university, the IPU was established in 2009 through a very generous donation of Christa Rohde-Dachser (an emeritus professor of psychoanalysis at the University of Frankfurt) and because of thanks to the passion put into such an important project by Jürgen Körner, an emeritus professor of social pedagogy at the *Freie Universität* in Berlin (who also played such an important role in the life of the DPG; see above).

The daughter of a famous German businessman, Christa Rohde-Dachser was such a good analyst and scholar that she was invited to become Alexander Mitscherlich's successor at the University of Frankfurt in 1987, where she taught till her retirement in 2003 (see also her biography in Wikipedia). The author of pioneering books on the borderline syndrome and on the psychoanalysis of femininity (see Rohde-Dachser, 1979, 1991), in 1994 she founded the Frankfurt DPG Institute, which she chaired for 10 years. Having been able not only to live a very creative and successful life outside of her family of origin, while, at the same time, not losing touch with it, she ended up being in the unique position of utilizing a part of her father's inheritance to finance the foundation of the Berlin IPU.

This new institution was recognized by the German State in 2014, and in the academic year 2015/2016 it had 583 students and 112 scientific collaborators, 59 of whom had a permanent appointment. The IPU offers several BA and MA programs both in German and in English, and it has already become an important research center attended by highly motivated and bright students coming from all over the world. These will hopefully grow into a new generation of researchers and analysts capable of promoting psychoanalysis in many different countries.

According to Ross Lazar, if we want to succeed in keeping psychoanalysis alive and well, we need do our best in terms of the re-organization of our training programs, including the transformation of the so-called training analysis into a personal analysis, and the abolition of the training analyst status and its substitution by a group of competent analysts ready to apply to play such a function. The author's critique and his proposals are based on the long critical tradition represented by the important contributions of Otto Kernberg, Johannes Cremerius, Kenneth Eisold, and Douglas Kirsner (see Lazar's reference list), as well as mainly on his own experience as a supervisor and consultant for many German-speaking analytic institutes.

Horst Kächele and Helmut Thomä themselves had in 2000 clearly expressed their position in support of "a radical disentanglement of the professional curriculum from the self-experience", given a situation in which "none of the contemporary models and practices secure the autonomy of the candidate's personal analysis" (Kächele and Thomä, 2000, p.807). Also focusing on this topic is the book *The future of psychoanalysis. The debate about the training analyst system* recently edited by the Munich colleague and friend Peter Zagermann, with a Foreword by Stefano Bolognini. In this, the former IPA president (2013-2017) emphasizes the need for a "quadripartite model" of analytic education, centered around "the capacity to work together, to share constant working through with the colleagues, and to actively participate in institutional life" (Bolognini, 2017, p.XIX).

Ross Lazar, a North American Jew who grew up in a suburb of New York City, graduated from Harvard University in the field of education, and at the beginning of the 1970s, went to London to do his analytic training at the Tavistock. Here he worked in particular with both Esther Bick (1902-1983) and Donald Meltzer (1922-2004), whose so-called "atelier model" (see Meltzer, 1971-1994) played a fundamental role in his supervisory and teaching activity. Lazar's German wife Gisela (they had married in the USA in 1969) came with him to London, where their two children were born, the family then moving to Munich at the end of the 1970s. Here Ross Lazar worked several years at the department of child psychiatry chaired by Jochen Storch, a pioneer of child psychoanalysis in Munich, before moving into full time private practice in 1982. At the time, the work of both Klein and Bion was very little known in Germany, and Ross Lazar played a crucial role in introducing their important psychoanalytic contributions. The same is true of the methodology of baby observation, and for the Tavistock model of analytic work with groups and institutions (see, for example, Lazar, 1998) – as Mathias Lohmer underlined in his *Trauerrede* on July 31, 2017. Having worked with him myself for many years in both analysis and supervision, I was also very saddened by his sudden death at age 72, on July 23, 2017, from a form of cancer that he had been heroically struggling against in the last couple of years of a very busy life – one almost totally centered around his huge passion for and commitment to psychoanalysis.

"Wilhelm Reich in Soviet Russia: Psychoanalysis, Marxism and the Stalinist reaction" is an original historical paper that we received from Galina Hristeva and Philip Bennet. I have known and valued Galina Hristeva's work in the field of historical research in

psychoanalysis since I chaired the panel (at the 2011 IPA Congress held in Mexico City) in which she presented the paper that won the IPA Sacerdoti Award – the award financed by Cesare Sacerdoti, the Florentine Jew better known as the former owner of Karnac Books, London. Thanks to Hristeva's knowledge of Russian, the paper includes as an Appendix her translation of the summary of both the lecture "Psychoanalysis as a natural science", held by Reich in Moscow in September 1929, and of the five major responses it received, originally published in the journal of the Communist Academy. According to Hristeva and Bennet, in the negative reactions that Reich's paper received are planted the seeds of the negative concept of psychoanalysis originally formulated in the 1935 edition of the *Great Soviet encyclopedia*. Furthermore, they also express the opinion that the report which Reich wrote of his trip to Russia for the journal *Die Psychoanalytische Bewegung* was so heavily biased in favor of Soviet Russia as to most probably represent "the first step along the path that eventually led to his expulsion from the IPA in 1934".

Being one of the last Jewish New York City colleagues to be fluent in German, Henry Zvi Lothane's review of the No.2/2015 issue of the journal *Psychoanalyse - Texte zur Sozialforschung* is meant as a tribute to his friend Bernd Nitzschke, whom he defines as "one among Freud's oppositional heirs". That issue contains papers by André Karger (the editor of this current issue, together with Bertram von der Stein) on Nitzschke's life and work; a paper by Bertram von der Stein on interdisciplinary dialogue; a paper by Albrecht Götz von Ohlenhausen on the anti-conformist analytic pioneer Otto Gross (1877-1920); a paper by Andreas Peglau on Wilhelm Reich, on whose drama Nitzschke edited a book together with Karl Fallend in 1997; a paper by Galina Hristeva on Georg Groddeck; a paper by Thomas Anz on the relationship between psychoanalysis and modern literature; and a paper by Helmut Dahmer on Marx and Freud. As readers can see, this *Festschrift* is also a good proof of how much psychoanalysis in Germany is still cultivated by an enlightened intellectual elite.

References

Beltsiou, J. (ed.) (2016). *Immigration in psychoanalysis. Locating ourselves*. London: Routledge.

Bolognini, S. (2017). Foreword. In P. Zagermann (ed.), *The future of psychoanalysis. The debate about the training analyst system* (pp. xvii–xix). London: Karnac.

Conci, M. (2010). *Geleitwort* [Introduction]. In J. Amati Mehler, S. Argentieri, and J. Canestri, *Das Babel des Unbewussten. Muttersprache und Fremdsprachen in der Psychoanalyse* (pp. 13–26). English edition: *The Babel of the unconscious. Mother tongue and foreign languages in the psychoanalytic dimension*. Madison, CT: International Universities Press. Original Italian edition, 1990. English edition, 1993.

Conci, M. (2013). Editorial. German themes in psychoanalysis. Part one. *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, *22*, 195–198.

Conci, M. (2015a). Editorial. German themes in psychoanalysis. Part two. *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, *24*, 57–59.

Conci, M. (2015b). *Vorwort* [Preface]. In H. Utari-Witt and I. Kogan (eds.), *Unterwegs in der Fremde. Psychoanaltische Erkundungen zur Migration* [On our way in a foreign dimension. Explorations on the theme of migration] (pp. 9–23). Giessen: Psychosozial-Verlag.

Freud, S. (1919). *Lines of advance in psychoanalytic therapy*. SE 17: 157–168.

Kächele, H., & Thomä, H. (2000). Letter to the editor. On the devaluation of the Eitingon-Freud model of psychoanalytic education. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, *81*, 806–807.

Kuriloff, E.A. (2014). *Contemporary psychoanalysis and the legacy of the Third Reich*. London: Routledge.

Lazar, R.A. (1998). *Das Individuum, das Unbewusste und die Organisation: Ein Bion-Tavistock Modell von Beratung und Supervision in Organisationen* [The individual, the unconscious and the organization: A Bion-Tavistock model of counseling and supervision in organizations]. In R. Eckes-Lapp and J. Körner (eds), *Psychoanalyse im sozialen Feld* [Psychoanalysis in the social field] (pp. 263–291). Giessen: Psychosozial-Verlag.

Lohmer, M. (2017). *Trauerrede* held at R.A. Lazar's funeral, Munich-Pasing, July 31, 2017.

Meltzer, D. (1971). Towards an atelier system. In A. Hahn (ed.), *Sincerity and other works* (pp. 285–289). London: Karnac, 1994.

Rohde-Dachser, C. (1979). *Das Borderline-Syndrom* [The borderline syndrome]. Bern: Huber.

Rohde-Dachser, C. (1991). *Expedition in den dunklen Kontinent* [Expedition in the dark continent]. Berlin: Springer.

Sabbadini, A. (2014). *Boundaries and bridges. Perspectives on time and space in psychoanalysis*. London: Karnac.

Volkan, V. (2017). *Immigrants and refugees: Trauma, perennial mourning, prejudice and border psychology*. London: Karnac.

Will, H. (1984). *Georg Groddeck. Die Geburt der Psychosomatik* [Georg Groddeck. The birth of psychosomatic medicine]. Munich: Urban & Schwarzenberg.

Will, H. (2003). *Was ist klassiche Psychoanalyse?* [What about classical psychoanalysis?]. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Will, H. (2006). *Psychoanalytische Kompetenzen* [How to become a competent psychoanalyst]. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Zagermann, P. (ed.) (2017). *The future of psychoanalysis. The debate about the training analyst system*. London: Karnac.

Marco Conci
IFP Coeditor-in-chief

International Forum of Psychoanalysis, 2018
Vol. 27, No. 1, 5–13, https://doi.org/10.1080/0803706X.2017.1333140

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

Marco Conci interviews Michael Ermann

MARCO CONCI

A short introduction, by M.C.

I am writing these few words of introduction after finishing and reviewing this interview in preparation for submission to our editorial board. The interview was conducted by email (directly in English) and its realization took more time than we had thought it would, that is, from October 2013 until February 2017. There were several intervals during which no exchange was going on, but I can say that we kept thinking about each other and that this project was always important for us.

In the first place, it was important for me because of the way in which my meeting and collaboration with Michael changed my personal and professional life. Our meeting through the International Federation of Psychoanalytic Societies (IFPS) in Stockholm in August 1991 (at the conference organized by our Swedish colleagues, on the topic "Male and female themes in psychoanalysis," the VIth IFPS Conference overall) was followed by the development of such a good relationship that not only was I able to work (from fall 1997 to fall 1999) as a guest professor at the Department of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy, which Michael directed at the University of Munich, but I also ended up moving to Munich as a psychoanalyst. I became in 2002 a member of the Deutsche Psychoanalytische Gesellschaft (DPG; the German Psychoanalytic Society), in 2007 a co-editor-in-chief of this journal, and in 2010 (after the DGP's readmittance to the International Psychoanalytical Association [IPA]) a member of the IPA. In other words, I also personally experienced many of the events and developments in which Michael was a protagonist.

From this point of view, I want to say how much I value Michael's unique capacity for international dialogue and collaboration, that is, his unique role in such apparently contradictory enterprises as the rapprochment of his society, the DPG, with the IPA, and his important role in the life of our Federation (the IFPS), of whose executive committee he was an active member for almost 35 years until his resignation at the IFPS New York Forum of May 2016. Among his legacies to us are this journal (which he had started thinking about with his friend Jochen Kemper, Rio de Janeiro), the IFPS Archives (originally started by Carlo Bonomi and now chaired by Klaus Hoffmann), and the IFPS Individual Members Section (now chaired by Ian Miller).

In other words, I believe we share what I would call "the common passion for international psychoanalysis," that is, for the international dialoque and exchange we can develop as individuals and colleagues, thus bridging a whole series of linguistic and cultural barriers, and this independently of the nature of the medium in which it takes place – a fancier one like the IPA, or a more simply furnished one like the IFPS. To illustrate this with a musical metaphor, it is not only a big symphony orchestra that can produce good music, but also a little band or choir – and we feel good about and are happy to join both groups.

This is also the spirit in which I have been working as a co-editor-in-chief of this journal (until 2014 with Christer Sjödin, and then with Grigoris Maniadakis since the Kaunas Forum), further developing the dialogical, integrative, and very fruitful legacy of our founding editor, Jan Stensson.

The interview

Q1: You were born during World War II, in the fall of 1943. This makes you a *Kriegskind*, that is, a "child of the war" – to use a word that you yourself contributed to introducing into present-day German scientific and everyday discourse. I would like you to tell us about some of the main facts of your first years of life, with special reference to those which might have shaped your later life and personality.

A1: There are three milestones of extraordinary significance for characterizing that "childhood in the

Correspondence: Marco Conci, Pettenkoferstrasse 4, D-80336, Munich. E-mail: marcoconci@aol.com

(*Received 13 March 2017; accepted 17 March 2017*)

© 2017 The International Federation of Psychoanalytic Societies

war." The first occurred when I was three months old, when my siblings and I were evacuated to the East of Pomerania, which was considered to be secure, for more than a year. Then we had to flee back westward to our home city, which in the meantime had been destroyed. It took years of self-reflection for me to understand that this was a separation of traumatic extent from my parents, which later resulted in certain attachment problems in my personality.

The second occurrence was a period of hunger and frightening anxiety after the Polish occupation of my home city Stettin, nowadays Szczecin, in 1946. My father was taken away as a prisoner, and I fell ill with diphtheria, at a time and in a place where no medication was available. But then a military man from the Russian Red Army who had fallen in love with my mother brought us serum from Moscow, which saved my life.

The third constellation of events of special importance was the fact that, after our displacement to Western Germany, a period of frequent changes of location followed. We had six addresses within the decade following 1946, and I have a vivid memory of the pain of separation brought about by the interruption of relationships that took place when we had to move.

Q2: Could you tell us more about this last third phase, the addresses you moved between and the painful separations you went through?
A2: We lived in different small towns in the north of Germany, always for two or three years, until my father found a job in Hamburg, where we went in 1956. At that time, I was 12 years old. This was a difficult period in my life. My friends and I, in the small town from which we came, were still children. In Hamburg, my classmates were already in full puberty. I was full of confusion and felt alone and inferior. At that time, I developed a depression. It took me five years before I overcame this crisis and found friends. Then my life changed for the better.

Q3: When exactly and how did this turn come about? What do you remember about it? And what is still relevant about it for you and your later development?
A3: I think that I was 16 or 17 when I became a good friend of the "star" among the boys in school. He admired my knowledge of literature and classical music, and I was full of admiration for his charm, his playing of jazz trumpet and his success with girls. Then we started to share sports, training together in rowing and spending our afternoons in the sports yard. It only took me some months then until I became the class speaker, and at last even our school's delegate in the regional student parliament. I was also an outstanding athlete, and I fell in love with a Swedish girl, our relationship lasting nearly 10 years.

The big change happened in the context of experiences of ambivalent emotions, doubts, and a deeply felt sense of luck and despair. This made me sensitive to the complexity of our internal processes, and also furthered my empathy and understanding, especially of narcissistic phenomena.

Q4: Thanks very much for your openness and for giving us such a touching picture of what you were like in the crucial years of adolescence. Now, before we go on with the further development of your personality, I would like to hear a little more about your family of origin. What about your parents?
A4: My family had lived in Prussia for generations. The conflict between German and Polish people ran right through the my father's family. His father, who came from the Eastern (Polish) part of Prussia, founded a chemical factory in Stettin, so my father became a chemist and took over that factory, even though he wanted to become a doctor. My mother came from a merchants' family that had been settled in Stettin for three generations. Her father was a well-known ship builder.

My parents married when they were both rather young, and my mother, in line with the tradition of the time, became a housewife, and then the mother of four children. Until the capitulation to the "Third Reich," my family enjoyed an elegant lifestyle in Stettin, as the factory was "important to the war" and supported by the regime. After breakdown and displacement, however, my parents had to struggle to re-establish the family's economic basis in Northern Germany.

I think my parents never overcame the loss of their home, friends, and property. Despite that, they died at advanced ages in Hamburg, where they had succeeded in building a satisfying new life for us and for themselves.

Q5: And what about your siblings? What was the age difference among you all? And to which of them did you feel closest?
A5: I loved my nine-years-older sister the most. She often took the place of my mother and cared for me, especially during our evacuation in my first and second years and during the post-war years. Also my brother, who was eight years older, was very important for me. He took responsibility for the family when my father, as a German, had been taken prisoner by the Polish military after the occupation of Stettin. But I also felt close to my other sister, five years older than me. We were more like friends and fought all those brother–sister wars that are typical for siblings: rivalry, envy, ambivalence …

Q6: As the states of mind you mention in relationship to your second sister may be easily connected with our psychoanalytic work, let me ask you, when did you first hear about psychoanalysis?
A6: As an aside, during all my psychoanalytic self-exploration – training analysis and others – I never got the impression that sibling envy and rivalry was a prominent topic for me.

But to answer your question, I came into contact with psychoanalysis as a medical student in Freiburg, when my first gay friend made contact for me with the head of the psychosomatic department, Professor Hau. He was the first to teach me psychodynamics, and I was fascinated with his case presentations, which opened my eyes to "the other dimension." That was in the late 1960s. Later, as a young doctor, I visited Günter Ammon's group in Berlin; he was a psychodynamic psychiatrist and an outsider to the analytic community, but his authoritarian personality prevented me from being convinced by him. This was in 1968, at the time of students' anti-authoritarian protests in Europe, in which I had been active as a member of the students' parliament at the university.

But in short, having been in Berlin, I found a job as an MD in a psychoanalytically oriented psychosomatic hospital in Southern Germany, where I had tremendous experiences with patients. That motivated me to sign up for psychoanalytic training with the DPG in Stuttgart in 1970 and to start my training analysis.

Q7: I remember you once telling me that you did a part of your medical studies in Vienna. I would be curious to know what universities you studied in, and what moved you from one to the other. This will allow us to better understand both you and probably also the Zeitgeist of the time.
A7: I started university with studies in philosophy and history of the arts in Würzburg, a choice aimed more at the ideal of personality formation than at systematic study. Then, under the influence of my father, who always wanted me to realize his "dream profession" of being a medical doctor, I moved to medicine after one year. So I went to Freiburg, which had one of the leading medical schools at that time, and there I completed most of my medical studies. Incidentally, I also heard Heidegger there, giving his final lecture, and studied rethoric.

At that time, studies were much less regulated than they are today in my country, and changing university was usual. So I spent one year in Vienna and Hamburg to see other places and other medical schools, but then went back to finish my examination and write my thesis in forensic pathology in Freiburg.

Q8: Since you mentioned Günter Ammon (1918–1995), I also know that he was one of the first members of the German Psychoanalytic Association (Deutsche Psychoanalytische Vereinigung [DPV]) to spend many years in the USA, particularly at the Menninger Clinic, where he came in touch with the pioneering work being done there on personality disorders. Is it possible today to try to formulate a more objective evaluation of his contribution than the one directly connected with his difficult personal style?

I ask you this question since you certainly are an important witness to and protagonist in many of the most important chapters of contemporary German psychoanalysis – and also because I know some colleagues belonging to the institute founded by Ammon whom I value.
A8: I was totally disturbed by Ammon's personality, so I very soon withdrew from his circle. But surely, he was one of the pioneers of dynamic therapy for psychoses in Germany and, on behalf of his connections with US psychiatry, he dealt with concepts that were unknown in Germany at the beginning of the 1970s.

Q9: Going back to the main steps of your professional development, let me ask you a couple more questions. How was it that you chose Stuttgart and the DPG for your training analysis? And can you tell us something about it, since the training analysis represents such a fundamental experience in our professional life?
A9: Looking for advice in a personal crisis in the 1970s, I got in contact with Friedrich Beese in Stuttgart; he was the head of a well-known psychoanalytic hospital and had taken the initiative to found an analytic training institute there. He advised me to train at that new institute, so I did.

There was no special procedure for personal evaluation in this initial phase of the institute, and so I started my training analysis some days later with Beese and was the institute's first candidate. This was a great experience in a very personal setting – for some time, we were only three candidates, with all the advantages and disadvantages that you can imagine.

Q10: What was the situation of the DPG in the early 1970s, as you began your training? Later on, in 1985, you not only became president of the DPG, but also contributed much to the revisitation and reelaboration of its history. This is why I would like to now invite you to present your point of view on the history of the DPG – also considering the fact that not all of our readers have heard of the Göring Institute or of how crucial the IPA Congress held in Zurich in 1949 was for the history of the DPG.
A10: When I started my training in Stuttgart in 1971, the DPG was completely dominated by the concepts

of the Berlin School of neo-psychoanalysis, which had been founded by Harald Schultz-Hencke in the 1920s. He had been very critical of the Freudian concept of libido, and had conceptualized an integrated approach combining Freud's ideas with the theories of Alfred Adler and Carl Gustav Jung. As I understand this approach, it was focused on the preconscious, neglecting such phenomena as transference and regression, and making no therapeutic use of them.

It was crucial for its influence after World War II that this doctrine was tolerated by the Nazis, when German analysts, after excluding the Jewish members from their society (the DPG), were integrated into the Nazi Institute for Psychotherapy, the so-called *Reichsinstitut*. There, Freud's ideas and writings and even the term "*Psychoanalyse*" were defamed.

The history of German psychoanalysis during the Third Reich is a history of compromises and collaboration through silence or even active participation. International connections, especially to the IPA, had been cut out. So there emerged much restraint and contradiction when the DPG applied for readmission to the IPA in the late 1940s. It was Anna Freud who, during the IPA Congress in Zürich in 1949, brought it to a head with the formula "They have to separate from Schultz-Henke – or they will not be accepted."

This was a landmark in the history of German psychoanalysis. One year later, the Freudians among the analysts formed a separate group, the DPV, which was accepted by the IPA. The bigger group of remaining DPG analysts looked for alternative international connections, and this led them to collaborate in the foundation of the IFPS. I talked about these dynamics in my 50-year anniversary speech in Mexico and also in an editorial in 1999, both of which were published in this journal (see Ermann, 1999, 2014).

So when I started my training, the situation was totally dominated by the split in German psychoanalysts. "We" (the DPG) were the lost children, cut off from the "real" (international) psychoanalysis and reduced to making use of concepts that were "not psychoanalytical" (that is, Schultz-Hencke's ideas). And "the others" (the DPV) were enlightened and legitimated as analysts because of their membership of the IPA.

This was a destructive dynamic that weakened the stand of psychoanalysis in my country until the middle of the 1980s. A reintegration then took place by a revision of both the concepts and the history, and I am proud to have been able to lead the DPG as its president, together with my friend Jürgen Körner, through a significant part of this development.

Q11: And what kind of a person, what kind of an analyst, what kind of a leader was Dr. Beese? I am asking you this because I have the feeling that he played an important role in the history of the DPG, and that you are one of the few people who can give him the credit he deserves.

A11: Beese was a very honorable man, but a complex person – very liberal and tolerant on the one hand, and in some way conservative and traditional on the other. In our professional field, he was good at building bridges between diverging concepts and tendencies, and he was a great promoter, convincing by his sincerity.

He was one of Schultz-Hencke's prominent pupils and, as an analyst, he was bound to his concepts. He was loyal to his teacher, although critical in regard to his proximity to the Nazis. There are documents in which he expressed his conviction (and perhaps this was his desire) that Schultz-Hencke was not contaminated by Nazi ideology. For me – relying on the publications of Schulz-Henke in the 1940s – this judgment was not convincing.

I am sure that Beese suffered from the critiques of Schultz-Hencke as a person and in regard to his concepts that emerged in the 1980s, when he was president of the DPG. But then it happened that he opened up to the conversion of the DPG and to its rapprochment with the international mainstream of psychoanalysis. This was a crucial turning point, and it must have been a huge step in his personal development. In the long run, it opened the process of reintegration of the DPG into the IPA.

Q12: I am glad that your answer confirmed to me my fantasy that Dr. Beese was an important model for you, in terms of his liberal and tolerant attitude.

But let me now ask you the following question concerning your professional career. How did your university career start and/or come about? Who were the professors you collaborated with? On what research projects? And what was the topic of your *Habilitationsarbeit?*

A12: I have already mentioned the unconventional way in which my analytic training in Stuttgart began. In that respect, I had another piece of good luck when Helmut Enke offered me the position of his assistant in the Research Institute for Psychotherapy there. In fact, I started the same week in which I was accepted as a trainee by Beese. Thus, Enke became my first academic teacher. He was a very inspiring thinker who integrated medicine, psychology, sociology, and psychoanalysis in his ideas. He was especially well known as a group analyst.

My task was a follow-up study after inpatient psychotherapy, but as well as that I worked with psychosomatic patients and started a project on the

psychodynamics of patients suffering from somatoform disorders. This later became my *Habilitation* thesis. I completed it out in Mannheim, where I was senior doctor for psychosomatic medicine at the World Health Organization (WHO) Center of Mental Health.

My promoters there were Heinz Schepank, head of the department, who was known because of his sibling research and epidemiological studies, and Heinz Häfner, the director of the center, an internationally prominent social psychiatrist. But I must say that, even though we had a good personal understanding, their professional influence on my thinking was limited as I was more interested in the psychoanalytic than in the academic field.

Q13: Yes, allow me to tell you that you indeed had an enviable series of teachers! I also believe that the combination of your identity as a psychoanalyst and your identity as a university researcher and professor must have played an important role in allowing you to do such good work in the service of the DPG.

But here is my question: how did it happen that you got interested and/or involved so much in the life of the DPG to become (at the rather young age of 42, in 1985) its president?

A13: As you can imagine from my biography, I had severely suffered, as had so many people and colleagues of the post-war generation in Germany, from the terrible German history and its impact on our personal lives. So, when I finished my training in the DPG, I felt a responsibility to consider the roots of the hurt identity of the DPG and to contribute to its restoration. I was always identified with and became an advocate of the "inferiors." This sensibility of mine has to do with my own identity problems that I experienced as a post-Nazi German.

When I began to travel as a young man, I felt the hurt German identity intensely when I went abroad and found closer contact especially with Jewish colleagues and friends. Once a Jewish colleague called me "my Hitler," after I had read a paper on the history of the DPG in Stockholm, and he invited me to work with him on the Jewish–German relationship.

When I became president of the DPG, the society was going through a severe crisis, and it was my conviction that we would overcome it only by questioning our history, our concepts, and our identity, and that was what happened during my chairmanship.

Q14: I am very thankful to you about being so open about your personal motivations to embark on such important work as you did in and for the DPG. Let me now ask you to try to describe the "severe crisis" that the DPG was facing at the time of your commitment to it.

A14: I think I have already mentioned the main topics. But let us look at them all together: the feeling of inferiority in connection to the DPV, the quarrels over the historical responsibility of the DPG, the debate concerning new theoretical models and concepts, the turning away from Schultz-Hencke as the leading idol, and, last but not least, the new interest in and turning toward the international psychoanalytic mainstream.

All this caused conflicts of loyalty, paranoid anxieties, and an aggressive and sometimes even hostile atmosphere. All these factors threatened the coherence of the society and its development.

Q15: At this point, I am of course very curious to learn from you how you found the courage to face such a big challenge and/or how you went about solving such a difficult situation.

A15: Certainly one source of my motivation were the discussions I had with Gisela Klinckwort, my former wife, about the processes in the DPG, as we both were dissatisfied with our situation. Another important source of my work was my friendship with Jürgen Körner, who, as vice president, was deeply involved in the new developments.

But there was another important factor. Because of my academic position and my engagement in health policy, I had multiple contacts with colleagues from other societies in Germany and abroad who encouraged me to rethink our situation in the DPG. I learned a lot from Anna Antonowsky, Gerard Chrzanowski, and Otto Kernberg from New York, and from Anne-Marie Sandler from London. They were especially supportive in reflecting upon the history of the DPG during the "Third Reich" and its relationship to the IPA.

Q16: Before asking you about the most important turning points of your presidency of the DPG, let me at last take up one of the topics of major interest for our readers, our Federation. For the benefit of our readers, let me add the fact that the DPG had in 1962 itself been a founding society of the IFPS (together with the the William Alanson White Institute, the Austrian Arbeitskreise fuer Psychoanalyse, and the Mexican group around Erich Fromm).

When did you originally come in touch with IFPS? And what were your impressions of it ?

A16: I think it was in the fall of 1983, when the DPG sent me, as a substitute for Friedrich Beese, to the Executive Commitee Meeting in New York. The IFPS was at that point in a severe crisis, looking for a new secretary general to follow Jacky Katwan – a DPG colleague from Berlin – and for a place and support for another forum.

I was enthusiastic about the idea of an international organization of liberal exchange of heterogeneous

psychoanalytic concepts – especially as the DPG had very few international links at that time. But from the course of the negotiations in New York, I realized quickly the weakness of the IFPS as a decentralized federation of societies that had more or less no direct communication with the members of its member societies. I soon understood that it never could serve well enough as a body for identification and belonging.

Surely, this was not a good precondition for getting in touch and working with the organization. But I also soon felt that this was a challenge for me to take over some responsibility. And so I tried to support and organize regional conferences between the biannual fora, a newsletter, a central roaster, and a mailing list. The only projects that were successful are the *International Forum of Psychoanalysis* journal, initiated by Jochen Kemper from Rio de Janeiro and Jan Stensson from Stockholm, and the IFPS Archives. Most of the other activities did not overcome the lack of interest and support of the IFPS member societies.

Q17: As far as I am concerned, our federation played the important role of bringing us in touch with each other, and this is something I feel very grateful for. I remember getting to know you in Stockholm in August 1991, as a member of the IFPS commission from which I received the J. Barnett Candidates Award for my paper on Freud's letters to Eduard Silberstein.

But I also remember attending the regional conference you organized in Munich in September 1992, its inauguration at the Alte Pinakothek, and the gala evening at Starnberger See. In fact, this conference represented an important step in terms of my later move to Munich, in the fall of 1997, as a guest professor at the Department of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy that you chaired at the University of Munich, the LMU. At the same time, these events represent an important ingredient in our relationship and in this interview – and this is why I am including them in it.

But your answer also stimulated in me another set of thoughts: what about the Section of Individual Members (SIM), which you were able to have the IFPS Assembly of Delegates approve at the Forum of Mexico City of October 2012? I am very grateful to you for such an initiative, and I hope it can help us play a more important role in the international analytic community. What can you tell our readers about it ?

A17: I am not so sure, Marco, that the IFPS was indispensable for promoting our relationship. Sure, there were IFPS activities supporting it, for example the journal, the archives, and others. But even more than all these things, I suggest it was the natural attraction between the four of us: you and your wife Doris, and me and my partner Lars. I think that is what makes friendship!

But, as far as the SIM is concerned, as I said before, I was never convinced that a federation of societies could develop such an attractive group dynamic as to form a strong international organization. The emotional distance among the individual members is too great. There is no coherence between the members from different countries and societies, or in regard to the central organs. Initially, the IFPS was proud to be pluralistic and nonbureaucratic. That is fine. But I feel that in the long run it missed dealing with the consequences of such an ideology and organization. What we need is a visible representation of the organization on an individual level: a roster, round-mails (we do not even have a central register of e-mail addresses of the members), reports from local events, and so on.

This is why I thought to create a group in which the members would be more linked one to the other, an alternative to the traditional indirect IFPS membership. We founded the SIM in 2012. Several applicants from all over the world joined, and now we have 40 members. But the main problem was not tackled until now: how can the group be filled with a vivid life? How can we use the new means of technology to come closer together?

One general problem is that the IFPS statutes provide a membership in the SIM only for those analysts who are not members of a member society. This means that the idea of an alternative approach is limited to analysts from non-IFPS societies. This limitation may be overcome only if the majority of the IFPS accept the two access models that I plead for.

Q18: And how did your contacts with IFPS influence your way of working? At the IFPS forum held in Rome in 2006, you presented a touching clinical paper under the title "'You touched my heart' : Modes of memory and psychoanalytic technique" (Ermann, 2007). At the time, I felt that this represented an important stage in your movement in the direction of what in North America is called "relational psychoanalysis." Was I right?

A18: Yes, that is right. In recent years, I was more and more influenced by the intersubjective approach, and meanwhile I wrote some papers and a book in German on that topic. It has changed my style of working, and you are right that the paper given at the forum in Rome was an important step in that direction.

On the other hand, I must say that very little influence came from the side of the IFPS. My development was a kind of a home-made development, against a background of discussions with colleagues like Erhard Künzler and Jürgen Körner. We were

critical of the conventional style of interactions in psychoanalysis, so we set up our own trials .

Q19: What you have just said about your own development in the direction of an intersubjective psychoanalysis and the part that your colleagues Künzler and Körner had in such a development sounds very interesting. I ask you – if you would like to – to tell me something more about it.
A19: You know, when I undertook my training in the early 1970s, I became very familiar with post-Freudian ego psychology and with the German neo-psychoanalytic school of that time. This influenced my therapeutic style, and I think I was a very "abstinent," not a responding, analyst in the beginning. There was little influence of object relations psychology at that time in my institute. When I "treated" my patients, I tried to be not involved; I tried to be "neutral."

Then, as many of my generation, I had to learn that – as I would say today – interpretation and insight are not the instruments that really help in psychoanalysis. It is the struggle really to meet the patient, to come together, to play together, to get involved with your whole personality, and to work through your involvement and transference in the process – not only to work diagnostically with your countertransference, but to work *through* it.

As you can see, the influence of Winnicott had a strong impact on me since I translated his *Playing and reality* into German as a candidate.

Q20: Dear Michael, this also sounds as an interesting story, which I would like to hear more about. How did you happen to translate Winnicott's major work into German?
A20: Quite simple: I had to earn money to afford my training analysis, and so I asked a publisher – who lived in Stuttgart close to me – for a job. He was convinced by my translation sample and so we came to an agreement. It was a hard job, as I was a beginner in psychoanalysis and had to read a lot, especially from object relations theory. Of course, I also had to cope with the challenge of rendering Winnicott's very special style into the German language. From today's perspective, I would say that the result was acceptable, but, knowing more about the intersubjective dimension of the therapeutic relationship, I would translate some sections in a more Winnicottian way.

Q21: I now realize that one topic we have not specifically dealt with yet is your activity as a university professor and your scientific activity connected to it. Please tell us something about this.
A21: I never had an academic career in mind when I became a medical doctor. But when I was offered a position as a research assistant by Helmut Enke in Stuttgart, I accepted. The research institution was integrated into the Sonnenberg Psychotherapeutic Center, which was one of the leading institutions of psychoanalytically based therapy and research in Germany at that time. So it happened that I became engaged in outcome research and other projects that at last led to my thesis on psychosomatic disorders (Ermann, 1984), which was accepted as my *Habilitation*. So I was appointed professor of psychoanalysis and psychosomatic medicine at Heidelberg University. At that time, I worked at the WHO Center of Mental Health in nearby Mannheim.

My basic motivation as an academic teacher was to further psychodynamic and relational thinking in my students. Indeed, at the university I was more of a teacher than a researcher. But besides evaluating my clinical experience in papers and publications, I had of course my research projects. The most important ones were probably the investigations that we conducted on the psychosocial implications of AIDS (Ermann, 1989), which was a big project supported by the federal government; and our interviews with people born during World War II and the Nazi period, the so-called Munich War Children Project (Ermann, 2012).

Q22: Since you have already given us your personal biographical background connected to the Munich War Children Project, I can now limit myself to asking you only about its scientific dimension. Here are some possible questions: How was the research project structured? What were its results? What did you personally learn from it?
A22: Our group of researchers undertook standardized interviews with more than 100 "war children" born during World War II, and we evaluated these interviews from different methodological approaches (see http://kriegskindheit.de/themata.html): content analysis, speech analysis, psychosomatic health, nonverbal communication, and so on.

As was expected, our clients' childhood was characterized by a collective silence in their families, especially about the experiences of involvement in the Nazi terror, and the denial of the fate of the Jewish population and other persecuted minorities. But of course they were also characterized by the hidden presence of the unspeakable experiences that their fathers had lived to see as soldiers, especially during the occupation of Eastern Europe, as well as by the secret suffering of their mothers in the last period of the war and during the time of reconstruction thereafter.

The most important finding was that our clients very often were identified with that silence, and they themselves were silent facing the hidden sorrow and

mourning of the elder generation – and of their own fate. So they became alienated in regard to their lives and unfamiliar with their feelings. This is what we called the "hidden Nazi complex."

One of our topics was the impact of the childhood biography during World War II on the choice of profession as a psychoanalyst. There we found that, for four decades or longer, the special involvement of the second generation in the Nazi period did not play any particular role in training analyses or in the analytic treatment that the younger generation of analysts performed.

I personally learned a great deal from these interviews. The most startling and touching insight was that I had to learn and to accept that I was a "typical war child" myself in the sense of neglecting the fact of *being* a war child and denying its implications.

Q23: Before our interview comes to an end, let me ask you a further couple of questions. Here is the first: you devoted a part of your energies also to writing a handbook of psychosomatic medicine and psychotherapy, which you have worked hard to keep up to date and which has now reached its fifth edition, I believe. Why did you think it was important to do this?

Or, as an alternative question: why do you think that it is important for medical students to graduate from medical school with some idea about the psychogenesis and psychotherapy not only of mental, but also of somatic illnesses?

A23: Indeed, it was heavy work to keep this handbook up to date from the first to the recent edition, which is in fact the sixth (Ermann, 2016a). As a teacher of psychotherapy and psychosomatic medicine, it was my natural concern, and in some way a self-understanding, that I intended to forward knowledge about psychodynamics concerning *all* fields of medicine, and this includes knowledge about illness management and coping with somatic complaints. I am convinced that this is an indelible condition for each helping relationship in medicine and a necessary background for fruitful interviews with patients.

Q24: Very good, Michael! Now, before closing our interview, let me say that one thing I realize is that we have not yet spoken about the journal, the *Forum der Psychoanalyse*, which you founded in 1985, together with Jürgen Körner and Sven Olaf Hoffmann, I believe.

In fact, you have written a paper about it for our journal (Ermann, 2015), in which you explain the important role that the journal played in creating a new, pluralistic analytic climate in Germany. From this point of view, I know that the journal was also an important model for our own journal, the *International Forum of Psychoanalysis* – whose Volume 1 came out in 1992, with Jan Stensson (Stockholm) as editor-in-chief.

Now, I also happened to find a very interesting paper of yours in a recent issue of the journal, No. 4/2016, with the title "Psychoanalytic conflict psychology – obsolete or current?" (Ermann, 2016b) Since in it you deal in a new way with a problem that we will be discussing for some years to come, I would like – and this will be my last question – to invite you to present our readers with a summary of your point of view on this important topic.

A24: Working with patients with personality disorders, I was often discouraged by the results if I handled them primarily as suffering from repressed conflicts. So the question arose: do we still need psychoanalytical conflict psychology for understanding and working with these patients who are suffering from structural deficiencies of their personality?

In the paper that you have mentioned, I have proposed a model for an applied conflict psychology in which three categories of conflict manifestations find their place: first, the classical conflicts of the psychoanalytic theory of neurosis as Freud described them; second, the preverbal somatic and emotional conflict equivalents as early procedural manifestations of the post-Freudian developmental psychopathology that requires an implicit treatment with the emphasis on a development- and structure-oriented approach; and, as the third category of today's conflict work, the secondary conflicts that result from development disorders and that require a structure-oriented treatment of the underlying ego deficiencies. Thus, we now have a differentiated practice of conflict resolution in which classic conflict pathology as the modern development pathology has its place – which means the "modern" diseases of our time.

Q25: Dear Michael, since we conducted this interview by email, and often several weeks went by between our questions and our answers, I would now like to ask you if you have anything to add to our dialogue.

At the same time, now that I am writing these words, a further question has come to my mind, that is, in the fall of 2016 you moved from Munich to Berlin, and this makes me curious about how you see this new phase of your life – if you would like to tell us something about this.

A25: This move is another important step for me to withdraw from my active professional life as a psychoanalyst. In 2010, I retired from my job as head of the psychosomatic department at the Munich University. Five years later, I reduced long-term therapies with my patients, and one year thereafter I finished

exercising my function as a training analyst in Munich. Here in Berlin, I run a very small consulting and supervisory practice.

I chose Berlin as my seat for my older years for personal reasons. One may be that Berlin is closer to the northern places where I grew up, and the mentality of the people is very familiar to me. Here I also have opportunities to finish some of my projects, to cultivate my hobbies, and to develop new interests. And moreover, living in the center of the city, I enjoy participating in its social and cultural life.

Q26: Very good, Michael! I will be happy to visit you in Berlin whenever I am there with Doris. I think we have conducted a good interview and – if you do not have anything else to add – I will close it and thank you for sharing your thoughts. Among other things, I am very happy with our exchange because of the new light it throws on the history of the complex relationship between the DPG, IFPS, and IPA. And also because we have had the unique opportunity to better understand how your professional and personal lives intertwined.

A26: Yes, Marco, I also have a very good feeling about the work we did – and I thank you for it.

References

Ermann, M. (1984). A specific and taxonomic differentiation between psycho-vegetative disorders and psychoneuroses. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, *41*, 116–124.

Ermann, M. (1989). Psychosocial and psychosomatic aspects of AIDS-research. In R. Oehman, H. L. Freeman, A. Franck Holmkvist, and S. Nielzén (eds.), *Interaction between mental and physical illness* (pp.74–79). Berlin: Springer.

Ermann, M. (1999). Psychoanalysis in Germany. *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, *8*, 57–58.

Ermann, M. (2007). "You touched my heart": Modes of memory and psychoanalytic technique. *Internationl Forum of Psychoanalysis*, *16*, 222–227.

Ermann, M. (2012). Germans reporting about their childhood in the WW II and the Nazi era. *Adolescent Psychiatry*, *2*, 369–373.

Ermann, M. (2014). The changing face of psychoanalysis and the development of the IFPS. *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, *23*, 69–73.

Ermann, M. (2015). "Forum der Psychoanalyse"– A journal documenting the "normalization" of the psychoanalytic field in Germany. *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, *24*, 60–62.

Ermann, M. (2016a). *Psychotherapie und Psychosomatik. Ein Lehrbuch auf psychoanalytischer Grundlage* [Psychotherapy and psychosomatics. A psychodynamic textbook] (6th ed.). Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Ermann, M. (2016b). Psychoanalytische Konfliktpsychologie: obsolet oder aktuell? [Psychoanalytic conflict psychology – obsolete or current?]. *Forum der Psychoanalyse*, *32*, 431–442.

Author

Marco Conci, MD, is a psychiatrist (Rome, 1986) and a psychoanalyst (DPG, SPI, IPA) working in private practice in Munich. He has been the coeditor-in-chief of IFP since 2007 together with Christer Sjödin, and since 2014 together with Grigoris Maniadakis. He is also a member of the Milan Associazione di Studi Psicoanalitici and of the Munich Akademie für Psychoanalyse und Psychotherapie.

International Forum of Psychoanalysis, 2018
Vol. 27, No. 1, 14–23, https://doi.org/10.1080/0803706X.2017.1372627

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

The concept of the 50-minute hour: Time forming a frame for the unconscious

HERBERT WILL

Abstract
The 50-minute hour is a feature of psychoanalytic work that is most commonly discussed in the context of case reports. This paper examines it as a concept. The author starts by describing the origin of the 50-minute hour and its development as an element of the psychoanalytic setting or framework. Next, he considers the significance of the clock as a relational factor in the session and reflects on the alienness of the time of day to the unconscious, and the consequences of this alienness. He then uses a clinical example to illustrate the phenomenon of the stretching effect of time in analytic sessions. Finally, the author demonstrates how cleverly the 50-minute hour excises the time needed for unconscious processes from our accelerated present; he shows that it challenges the social convention of time, and has a structuring effect in that it "times" psychic processes.

Key words: *psychoanalytic frame, setting, time, 50-minute hour, unconscious, conceptual research.*

The clock says it's time

I recently ended a session with the words: "The clock says it's time." My patient replied: "The clock is always against me. It's my relentless enemy." He is the type of young person who does not wear a watch and displays a somewhat rebellious attitude to the dominion of time, but this does not seem to help him much. It suddenly occurred to me that I might have to agree with him – surely the clock is a relentless enemy to me, too. Then again, I thought, the clock is also a friend to me and to him: it fixes the duration of the analytic session, is not subject to the whims of the analyst or the patient, introduces a third (entity) into the analytic encounter as a point of reference, and provides a security without which both parties would be unable to engage emotionally.

At our next session, I told him that I had been wondering who he was actually referring to when he spoke of a "relentless enemy." The clock had announced the time, but it was I who actually uttered the message. Who says that it is time to stop – the clock or the analyst? Was the patient's sudden hostile transference directed at me or at the clock? Who was I thinking of when I inwardly agreed with him? Was I thinking of my own experience as a patient, or of the transience and finite nature of life, which I am confronted with? And who am I, in any case, when I say "It's time to stop"? Am I identified with the time shown on the clock? Am I glad that the session is over? Many questions arise and bring the relations between the patient, the analyst, and the clock into focus.

The discrepancy between the time of day and the subject also becomes palpable – the discrepancy between the physical time of day and the subject's inner experience of time. Elias (2007) explored how, during the civilizing process, the compulsion of time takes control of the modern individual's psychic structure, and an external constraint (e.g., the implacable tolling of the school bell) turns into a self-constraint, and finally into an individual time-conscience. The time of day insinuates itself into the subject's mindset and becomes a part of their superego or ego. Let us consider the implications of using the time of day to frame the psychotherapeutic session.

When time is discussed as a part of the framework or setting of psychotherapeutic treatment, it tends to be touched on rather parenthetically (see Bleger, 1967; Pollack, 2003; Stone, 1961). In contrast, the

This article was first published in with the title "Das Konzept der 50-Minuten-Stunde Zur Rahmung des Unbewussten durch die Uhrzeit" in *Forum der Psychoanalyse*, *31*, 2015, 267–281. © Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2015. We thank Springer-Verlag for the permission of publication.
Correspondence: Dr. Herbert Will, Gunzenlehstraße 10, D-80689 München, Germany. E-mail: herbert.will@gmx.de

(*Received 23 August 2017; accepted 23 August 2017*)
© 2018 The International Federation of Psychoanalytic Societies

clinical handling of time is examined in very great detail in case discussions, and it is central to a lot of clinical work. This discrepancy led me to take time as a topic in itself and explore the concept of the 50-minute hour. I have taken the term "50-minute hour" from Greenson (1974). I agree with Duparc (2005) when he identifies the framework as a crucial factor that enables the processes of reflection and working-through to take place in the analytic session. However, this would suggest that the parameters of the framework should, themselves, be the subject of sufficient symbolic analysis and theorization, rather than being established in a stipulative manner for reasons such as "that's just how psychoanalysis work," "my supervisor told me so," "that's how they do it in the association I belong to," or "that's usually how it's done."

This article sets out three theses. The first is *historical* and argues that the 50-minute hour was introduced by Freud for pragmatic reasons. It was not until later that its significance for the framing of the analytic process was recognized. This realization contributed to the tendency of psychoanalysts to impose the time frame more and more strictly, as if it were set in stone. The second thesis is *systematic* and argues that time acts as a regulating force that harnesses two disparate elements – a rationalized time of day and the subject's emotional experience. The mutual alienness of time and the subject creates a painful and productive dynamic. The third thesis is *clinical* and describes the stretching effect created by the time frame of the session. Like surgical hooks, the 50 minutes keep the patient's wound open and stretch it for the duration of the session.

Finally, there is also an interesting *sociopsychological* aspect to consider. Psychoanalysis uses an element of the rationalized modern age, time, to make room for something quite other – the emergence of the subjective unconscious with its emotions and relational patterns. In this way, psychoanalysis has inadvertently developed a *Kulturtechnik*, or cultural technique, that sets something in opposition to the modern pressure to accelerate. When the clock starts, the session is governed by different rules from those of social time.

The invention of the 50-minute hour

As far as we know, it was Sigmund Freud who first established a clear framework for the psychotherapeutic procedure (Schröter, 2001). His practice of daily sessions developed as a result of his home visits to seriously ill female patients. It was not until his reputation as a doctor allowed him to invite them to his own practice for a daily session that the clock started to set the tempo. All the evidence suggests that his motives for adopting the system of regular sessions were pragmatic and, in a sense, self-serving. The regular timing of the sessions contributed to the rational organization of his working day. It helped him to save time and manage his unusual work schedule.

In his paper "On beginning the treatment," Freud compares analysis to a chess game. He writes about the "rules of the game" and describes a generally pragmatic approach on the part of the doctor, which he proposes to give advice about (Freud, 1913). He does not use the term *Rahmen* ("framework"). He introduces his principle of leasing a definite hour as one of the rules of the game. For Freud, the time frame of a session was inextricably linked to the payment he would receive for it. He organized his practice so that every patient was allocated a specific hour of the available working day, for example ten o'clock in the morning or four o'clock in the afternoon, and would turn up every day at that time. The 50-minute hour came about as a by-product of Freud's rationalization of his personal work schedule. In this historical moment in the last decade of the nineteenth century, the origin of psychoanalysis connected itself with the social significance of time, with consequences Freud could never have foreseen.

May (2008) analysed Freud's patient calendars and showed how flexibly and pragmatically he handled this "rule of the game." His basis was the working hour, which was made up of the session itself and a short break. He wrote to Ferenczi, who was looking for new quarters in Budapest at the time, "I wish you a beautiful place to live, so that you, dear friend, each time between two [analytic] hours, can go over to where your wife is keeping house" (cited according to May, 2008, p. 44). Wherever the wife was keeping house was clearly a good place to take a break.

The majority of Freud's patients had six regular sessions a week – one a day. Surprisingly, however, some patients did not have only one hour a day, but one and a quarter, one and a half, two, two and a half, or even three. Thus, some patients actually had a total of 12 or more hours' analysis a week. May (2008, p. 84) writes: "The great flexibility in the weekly hours … is surprising. It does not conform to the idea of a fixed framework that we emphasize so much nowadays." Freud himself had only his pocket watch in his jacket pocket on which to check the time. Jofi, his chow chow, was often the first to stand up at the end of the sessions – she must have been very keenly attuned to the nonverbal signals of humans. Presumably Freud, like the other analysts of his day, did not time sessions to the minute.

Although he established the duration of approximately 50 minutes per session as a basis for his work, Eitingon, based at the Berlin Psychoanalytic

Polyclinic, wrote a report in 1922 about attempts to reduce session times:

> It was originally our intention systematically and in every case to reduce the length of the analytic sitting from one hour to half-an-hour, but we have had to give up this idea. It could be managed only in the case of a small class of persons who were still, in spite of their neuroses, amenable to discipline, cases such as are not seldom to be found in Prussian Germany amongst civil servants and others. Generally we give three quarters of an hour or the classical full hour. (1922, p. 262)

The 50-minute hour becomes part of the concept of the framework or setting

The 50-minute hour emerged from Vienna in triumph and established itself throughout the world in the decades that followed. As a frame, it seemed to benefit the analytic process and suit both analysts and patients. The main reason for this was probably that it allows for the human concentration span of about 45 minutes. "It's like playing football," said one of my patients, "You always get half-time; 45 minutes with injury time. And just as strenuous." In many countries, lessons at school also have a similar duration. The 50-minute hour is not the subject of much reflection in clinical psychoanalytic literature. Instead, the practice of it is passed down as part of day-to-day working life.

Greenson (1974) points out that where there is a 50-minute hour, there is also a 10-minute break. He considers this to be in the interests of the patient and the analyst. According to Greenson, there are a number of reasons why the analyst needs a break of several minutes between two patients. He deplores the increasing prevalence of an assembly-line approach among some analysts, who shorten the break or leave it out altogether in order to pack even more sessions into their working day and earn more money. He considers that this is harmful to their patients and may have consequences that cannot be analysed. Greenson mentions that when Glover sent his questionnaire to British psychoanalysts in 1938, only four out of 29 of them scheduled a break between two patients. According to Greenson, the assembly-line approach is now rampant in America too.

Over the course of the decades, psychoanalysts discovered the immense significance of the phenomenon that they started to call the "framework" or "setting" of analytic work. They found that the framework provides security and enables regression, invites transferences and makes them easier to interpret, and displays symbolic qualities in that it introduces a third. The framework was recognized as a fundamental curative factor alongside interpretation and object relations (Duparc, 2005; Pollack, 2003). Stone's monograph on the *psychoanalytic situation* (1961) and Bleger's paper on the *psychoanalysis of the psychoanalytic frame* (1967) are oft-cited milestones of this area of reflection. As for the 50-minute hour itself, Stone listed it among the universal and consistent features of the analytic setting, and Bleger called it one of the constants of the frame. Now, the guidelines that Freud had originally referred to as the "rules of the game," and that the Freudians had interacted with flexibly, were developing into a more entrenched set of concepts (Will, 2003).

According to Stone (1961), the analytic situation requires a certain degree of "rigidity" in order for its essential functions not to be compromised. Bleger (1967) wrote about "norms" and even called the framework an "institution" and a "bulwark." The language of war started to creep in, turning the 50-minute hour into a rampart that patients would attack and analysts would have to defend with their interpretations. Just like the physical time of day, the concept of a time frame developed a tendency to become increasingly rigid, as if it were set in stone. From the late 1940s onwards, Jacques Lacan took a stand against this increasing rigidity of thought with his use of sessions of variable duration. He later radicalized these into short sessions – the famous *séances scandées*. Lacan's use of sessions of variable duration is the only attempt I am aware of at developing an alternative to the concept of the 50-minute hour. His use of these sessions was not arbitrary, but grounded in a different conception of the unconscious, the analytic relationship, and the analytic process (Langlitz, 2005). The debate between Lacan and other analysts led to a very nuanced theoretical treatment of the framework – *le cadre* – in French psychoanalysis (Duparc, 2005).

The French author Pierre Rey recalls the controversy that raged around Lacan at the time. He writes about a television programme in the 1970s in which he took part alongside a Swiss psychoanalyst – a highly regarded figure, white-haired, respectable, grey, didactic, and dogmatic (Rey's description). "The way I work is quite simple," he quotes her. "The sessions last 45 minutes. I put a sand timer on my desk. As soon as the last grain of sand has trickled through, the session's over." Rey quivered with indignation: how could the punctuating effect of ending the session be surrendered to the whim of a grain of sand? From the lofty heights of her 40 years of conviction, she tersely put him back in his place – the very lowest – in a tone of irritated contempt (Rey, 1995, p. 84 f.). It seems that the question of session length and its handling can give rise to very strong affects indeed.

Having explored the topic from a historical perspective, I will now come to my second, systematic, point: what are we doing when we give the psychoanalytic encounter a time frame? What does it mean when we let the clock dictate the pace of the session?

The clock as a relational factor in the session

Elias (2007) bemoans the lack of a German verb to match the noun *Zeit* – "time." English is fortunate to have the verb "to time" or "timing," which it can use to describe the process – the human activity – of relating time to a situation. What are we doing when we "time" the psychoanalytic encounter, when we connect it with an external time-telling device – a clock? We are creating relations. "Timing" is relating: we are relating two subjects and their encounter to a clock. We are bringing the clock into the session as a relational factor.

A young patient of mine recounted the following dream:

> We've just come from an analysis session and we're driving along in a car. You tell me that our Friday session is only going to last 10 minutes now. I protest and say, "But how's that going to work?" You say, "Go ahead, talk about it, that's important!" I say "But talking about it isn't going to change anything!"

The patient said that the 50 minutes, and the fact that she could rely on them, were so wonderful. In the dream, that security was gone. We came on to the fact that our next session was on a Friday, and was also our last session before the Christmas holidays, which she was very apprehensive about. The separation during holiday periods was very problematic for her. She felt ashamed and insecure that her neediness manifested itself so clearly. With the holidays looming, she split her image of me in her dream in two – I was both someone who was bringing her into his private life in the car, and someone who was drastically cutting down the amount of professional attention he was willing to give her in the final session from 50 minutes to 10 minutes.

Two months later, she had the following dream:

> I'm meeting up with a lot of people I know and they're coming along to our analysis session. I'm not happy about it but I daren't say anything. You're a bit surprised, but you run the session as usual. Somehow, 10 minutes before the end, you tactfully get them to leave the room. I am able to explain everything to you so we're on good terms again. In the end, you say that we still have so much to discuss that you'll do me a favour and give me an extra 25 minutes. Everything was so good between us after that.

What does the relation to the clock mean here? In both dreams, the patient and the analyst are aware of the time boundaries of the session, but the analyst overrides them. In the first dream, they are overridden by a hostile analyst who cuts the session down to 10 minutes, while in the second dream, they are overridden by a dedicated analyst who adds on an extra 25 minutes. The patient's unconscious is aware of the 50 minutes. It makes a clear distinction between the clock and the analyst, and casts the analyst as a powerful actor. The patient herself can sometimes influence him if she tries – in the first dream, by protesting, and in the second dream, by winning him over.

The clock and the 50-minute hour give her unconscious a framework that helps her to give figurative shape to her separation anxiety and her desire for closeness. The "timing" of the session – the act of relating it to the clock – allows the unconscious conflicts that occupy her to be represented figuratively (Will, 2012). The patient experiences the end of every session as a separation trauma on a miniature scale. Time manifests itself as an unfeeling abstract quantity that stands in opposition to her desire for a relationship. Therefore, the clock is an ideal object for negative and grandiose transferences. As unconscious thought has the tendency to personify abstract quantities; it conflates the clock and the analyst. The clock becomes a projection screen for separation anxieties. The connection between "timing" and death also becomes apparent here, as fear of the death of a relationship is one of the most fundamental anxieties that the unconscious associates with separation and loss. Time acts as a separator (Zimmermann, 1997).

The clock, not the therapist, determines the end of the session

The above cameo was intended to demonstrate that the 50-minute hour connects two elements that are alien to each other: the clock and the unconscious. This relationship of alienness has unforeseen consequences. In what other area of social life is the duration of a meeting between two people so strictly limited?

A strange authority is given to the clock. It determines when the session begins and when it ends. In this way, a fourth actor is introduced into the temporal relationship between the patient, the analyst and the clock. I would like to call it "professional authority." This authority determines that the meeting must have a connection with the time shown on the clock and that the session must last 50 minutes. These instructions are handed down through the personal example set by training analysts and supervisors. Thus, time also affects the unconscious of analysts. Their relationship with professional authority is very interesting. Some

analysts, as Rey portrays the Swiss analyst with the sand timer, identify entirely with it and take full ownership of the clock's decrees. Others cultivate a lifelong subversion of it and build small deviations from it into their practice. Lacan makes this subversion a principle. Others again waver between a flexible approach and a guilty conscience. Thus, the relationship between analysts and the clock's authority is shown to be a dynamic quantity.

On the one hand, then, the 50 minutes emerge as an important constant, a non-process (Bleger, 1967) that enables the analytic process in the session to take place. On the other hand, the analyst and the patient are, themselves, implicated in the 50 minutes. When analysts say, "It's time to stop" or "You're late," they assume a variety of roles (Sandler, 1976). They must ask themselves: "Who exactly am I when I say this? An educator, a persecutor, a realist, an egoist, a messenger of transience?" In his criticism of the working alliance concept, Deserno (1998) stresses that it would be a mistake to postulate a transference-free area or break point in analysis. In my opinion, this is also the case for the 50-minute hour: here, too, analysts are unable to position themselves outside the transference relationship. Their position with regard to the clock is one of certainty and uncertainty at the same time. The professional certainty, in the background, that the 50 minutes apply is precisely what enables them to endure the uncertainty of the analytic process as it takes place. As Zwiebel (2013) says, the ability to oscillate between certainty and uncertainty with regard to the 50 minutes should be a quality inherent to being an analyst.

The relations between the four actors (patient, analyst, clock and professional authority) are complex. They usually remain in the background and form something of a conflict-free sphere. Time then has a protective, nurturing effect as it cannot arbitrarily be changed and is safeguarded by professional authority. Sometimes, however, the relations of the other actors to the clock come to the fore, as they did in my patient's dreams.

Is the clock a gateway for societal demands to enter the session?

The alienness between the clock and the unconscious is also connected to a societal shift. Chronos, the ancient Greek god of time, has been secularized and turned into something prosaic – the time of day shown on the clock (Will, 2014). A search for "Chronos" brings up the chronometer. The scientific and technological concept of time has fully prevailed. The standardized system of time has established itself as a universally recognized criterion of social coordination and subjective self-knowledge. I would like to highlight the fact that, as a result, time has acquired the pseudo-objectivity of a thing that can be measured. The scientific and technological origins of time as we understand it have contributed to its reification, masking the extent to which our existing concept of time is just a convention, like all that have come before it.

Today, we live in timeless times. The clock, time famine, and time management have taken the place of the god Chronos. Sociological catchphrases such as Weber's "iron cage of modern rationality" and Rosa's "hamster wheel" of acceleration show how the external constraint of time has become a self-constraint, finally resulting in an individual time-conscience, which quite often has the tendency to plague its owner. This is not the clock's fault, though – the clock cannot help it. The fault lies rather with the societal equations it has become implicated in: time = money, and performance = work ÷ unit of time. Burdened with the notions of money and performance, time has become the vehicle for society's tendencies to economize, both in terms of life in general and in terms of the psyche.

Wellendorf (2000) examines how the temporal structure of the clock and that of the analytic process follow two fundamentally different patterns of logic, which come head to head in the analytic situation. Time is comparable to money in its abstractness and alienness (Wellendorf, 2013). Its indifference to all human concerns has a twofold effect on the analytic situation: it brings pain and joy. It brings pain because the patient's emotional experience cannot comprehend it, and because it continually imposes boundaries on the patient with its demands for a punctual start and end to the session. Even at the beginning of the session, some patients cannot help thinking about the fact that they will have to leave at the end and that the time they have is not enough. They feel cast out and alone. At the same time, they experience each session as a luxury, a period of time that is all about them. There is a fine line between the pain and the joy of the 50-minute hour. Ultimately, the 50-minute hour remains an enigmatic message, in Jean Laplanche's sense of the expression, and embodies a manifestation of the primacy of the alien other. It demonstrates the unavailability of the object and the threat of separation and death, which, to a large extent, cannot be processed.

It is the very fact that time is abstract that enables it to create a space protected from the mentality of acceleration and performance. It allows patients to develop the subjective experiences of time that are such a distinguishing feature of the analytic process. This brings us to the paradox that it is, in fact, the

50-minute framework itself that creates the free space that analysis desperately requires.

In addition, Loewald (1971) and Laplanche (1992) have shown how stimulating the confrontation with time limits is to patients' integrative capacities. Loewald calls time a "linking activity" because it reshapes experiences and connects them together by categorizing them as past, present, or future. Laplanche uses the term "temporalization" to describe the process by which the never-ending attempts to translate the unconscious result in a deferred (*nachträglich*) self-theorization that continually yields new perspectives. Both theorists address the constructive psychic activity that I referred to above as the process of "timing." Time, as well as space, must be symbolically represented, and both must be understood in terms of their function in regulating relationships so that they can be reflected upon adequately (Gutwinski-Jeggle, 2007; Pflichthofer, 2011). Thus, it is as an important organizer of psychic development that the clock, with its system of time, has come to be regarded in psychotherapy.

Let us return, however, to the rift between the modern system of time and the unconscious. It is not rare for analysts and patients to identify with the clock in a way that appears to gloss over this rift.

The friends of analysts, for instance, tend to remark with surprise on their punctuality and reliability, and say that they are unparalleled in this respect, turning up to their engagements almost exactly on the dot. When candidates come to my colleagues or me for supervision, it is noticeable how much they care about arriving on time. If ever they do happen to arrive late, they are embarrassed and make sincere apologies. This distinctive behaviour does not change, even after it has been discussed. The candidates themselves explain their punctuality by saying how tired they are of being continually confronted with interpretations about their late or early arrival in their own analysis sessions or their case discussion meetings. They develop a habit of punctuality as a way of avoiding this constant barrage of interpretations. Their behaviour is markedly different from that of other students in further education, such as language students, who have a much more casual attitude towards reliability. Could it be that identification processes, which have long since become second nature to older analysts, can be observed in those still in training? Perhaps, though, a time-conscience as strict as that is a peculiarity of German psychoanalysts, and would cause disconcertment in other cultures.

When analysts talk in case discussions about the scenic material that accumulates around the time limits of the session – patients arriving too late or too early, or trying to delay the end of the session – a particular tone often creeps in. It carries the implication that it would surely be better or healthier for patients to arrive and leave on time. It makes it sound as though it were an analyst's role to provide their patients with reality training, in this case in the reality of the clock. It construes the relationship between the time framing the session and the analytic process within it as one where the time frame represents the outward, material reality, and the deviation from it represents the patient's psychic reality, their desire and fantasy dynamic. In this way, analysts involuntarily objectify the time frame. It loses its character as a rule of the game and solidifies into a fact of nature that takes on a life of its own, as if the clock were an authority in its own right, and analysts had become its representatives.

Here, surely, the societally loaded time of day is impacting on the analytic session. This is an example of the naturalistic fallacy in action: it deceives us into regarding the 50 minutes no longer as a rule of the game – a convention – as Freud did, but as a law of nature, with which we then identify. Thus a kind of "50-minute conscience" comes into being, which develops the tendency to nag and dictate. I would like to contrast this with the richness of perspectives that psychoanalysis has elaborated with regard to time, and that I am attempting to display in this paper.

The phenomenon of the stretching effect of time

Finally, I would like to come to my third, clinical point, which is about the stretching effect of time. The 50-minute hour can be experienced as a cold and indifferent entity in contrast to the complexities of human involvement in the analytic relationship. The clock remorselessly indicates the start and end of a session, regardless of all the events and emotions it is witness to.

In this respect, it is reminiscent of Freud's surgical metaphor for the role of the analyst, since the clock is identified with the analyst, who acts as its representative and articulates its messages. A comparison can be drawn to the use of surgical hooks. The assistants who hold the hooks in the operating theatre have an important role. They usually hold a hook the length of a dessert spoon in each hand. They use these to pull open the wound so that the surgeon has a clear view of the area that needs to be operated on and can work unimpeded. In a similar way, the 50 minutes of the analytic session make an incision, so to speak, in the outer layers of the psyche, expose the patient's wound and keep it open, so that the unconscious is able to rise to the surface. During the 50 minutes, this process of keeping the wound open can evoke a stretching sensation. I would like to clarify

this with an example. (The following account has been anonymized in accordance with the recommendations of Gabbard & Willliams, 2001.)

Torsten

Torsten, who was about 40 years old, had a dream about male dignitaries, professors, who were far superior to him. We talked about his fear of failure, his deep insecurity in social interaction, and how deficiently he experienced his sexuality. In a second dream, he made fun of one of these professors. His third dream took place in an elevated hall, where two professors had died and been laid out in state. In the middle of the hall stood a bed, in which a younger man was lying. The man felt disturbed by all the hubbub and rolled over, snuggling down into the blanket. Torsten was forced to accept that he had presented himself in public, alive and well, quite familiarly lying in bed, while the great gentlemen were dead. In some way, he was proud of this development. He was full of life in these sessions, and I felt the same; the experience of time was relaxed and satisfying; there was no trace of the stretching sensation. I was curious to see what would come to life as a result in the immediate transference relationship in the next session.

The following session proceeded in a markedly halting fashion. Torsten did not have any ideas; he felt unhappy and addressed various issues without engaging with himself or me on a deeper level. He said that he felt as though he were floundering in a bog, and brought the conversation back to the topic of narcissism. "That's the hardest thing of all for me," he said, "It's so unpleasant when I see delusions of grandeur in myself. Self-congratulatory thoughts. Then I'm convinced that you'd be happy to have seen the last of me, that you just find me unbearable now." At last he sighed and said, "I hope the session's over soon, because this is so uncomfortable." I could sense that he was torturing himself and that he saw himself as trapped in the 50 minutes, unable to escape from them, from himself, or from me. The stretching effect of the 50 minutes would not relax its hold on him; the fixed time was stretching the wound and holding it open. Then I said to him:

> You have the feeling that I must find you unbearable when you flounder like this. It seems to me that, in actual fact, it is the other way around, and that you find me unbearable, because I get you into this situation and don't help you out of it. Almost as if I am willing to let you appear small and pathetic.

At the start of the next session, he mentioned that his legs had been cold on the previous day and that he had thought about the blanket on the couch. He reproached himself for being unable even to take the blanket here. After this, he fell silent, tension mounted, and time started to stretch again. Then he said that he had also had a pleasant experience. He had bumped into an acquaintance on the street earlier and she had said to him, "Wow, you're looking well!" He said he had blushed deeply because he was so embarrassed. He continued to reflect on this situation. The whole episode unfolded hesitantly, with intervals of silence. All along, I kept feeling the tension and stretching effect of time.

Then he remembered his dream about the two dead professors and the bed in the hall. "That does make me think: wow," he said, "what a good dream that was! Otherwise I often dream such rubbish. But what's the matter with me here? Here, I can't even manage to put the blanket over my legs." As he brought up the story of the quilt again, I sensed that this was where the immediate affect lay, the "point of urgency" that Strachey writes about. I told him that going from the bed in the dream to covering himself with the blanket here must be another step along the way in terms of overcoming barriers. Later, I asked him what the blanket stood for, and what it would be like if he put it over his legs. He had various ideas, and finally he said, "I don't know. Is it something sexually loaded? The connection to the dream … It was quite clear that it was a naked man in the bed." At last he said:

> Luckily, I don't have to cross that bridge today; our time's nearly up already; we're definitely onto something big there. The expression *unter einer Decke stecken*[1] has just popped into my head. But now the session's over, so that's enough of that for today.

He laughed, and so did I. The 50-minute limit was a relief to him.

The next session passed uneventfully in terms of the workings of time. Torsten said that he had been preoccupied with his body and with sexuality over the weekend, and that he had noticed he felt a little more relaxed about these matters now. He expressed the opinion that he had focused too much on dreams in the previous few sessions. I replied that he had perhaps felt lured (*verführt*) into that topic by me. He disagreed and said that, if anything, he had lured (*verführt*) me into it. Suddenly, the word *Verführung* ("seduction" or "enticement") developed a life of its own and became a "selected fact," in Bion's sense of the phrase. Our interaction became

[1]This literally means "to be under one blanket together." It is a metaphor meaning to conspire or collude with someone, or to be in cahoots with someone.

more relaxed and remained lighter and more open in the subsequent sessions.

In the sessions described above, transference love works its way out of the unconscious like the shoot of a plant pushing its way out of the ground towards the light. The subjective experience of the 50-minute limit oscillates between torture and relief. The fixed time induces resistance and dissolves it. The patient knows that he cannot get away and, unlike the surgical patient, is not anaesthetized. It is clear that the pain induced by the analytic framework is experienced as transference pain, with Torsten experiencing me as cruel and dismissive. Finally, the clock is useful in that it makes a period of time available in which the unconscious can rise to the surface and shape what is painful into an object, with the help of which it can be translated again.

Concluding thoughts: time off in an accelerated age

The conclusion that Freudian psychoanalysis needs an entirely "nonanalytic" element such as the time frame in order to be able to untangle the "analytic" material is a remarkable one. During this process, analysis transforms this "nonanalytic" element into a real analytic element of containment. Its gateway to the unconscious is anchored firmly in the modern age. The 50-minute hour emerges as a product of rationalization processes (the ordering of the working day and the dominion of the clock), and uses these to stimulate and work with their polar opposite – unconscious processes. In sum, it is only since the clock has been available as an organizer that it has even been possible for psychoanalysis, in its clinical framework, to come into being. The 50-minute hour anchors analysis in the objective time-measurement of the outer world and enables the existence of the time dimension that is experienced during the session (Pollack, 2003). Thus, analysis does not remove itself from the accelerating present at all, but develops as a particular form of interplay with it. It comes to a clever arrangement: it embeds itself in an increasingly rationalized and accelerated social environment, and excises a space for itself out of it in the form of the 50-minute hour. This space is, to a degree, extraterritorial to the social environment. It is removed from the pressures of the outside world and opens up totally different dimensions in the way that time is experienced. Even in itself, this change in the way that time is experienced has a curative effect on many patients today. A young patient of mine said:

> I live under constant stress and pressure. I have to perform, be on time, rush around. I'm already working 50 hours a week at the moment, and that's not even the end of it. I have to exercise; I have to do the shopping; I have to clean the house; I have to do the laundry; I have to see my friends; I have to spend time with my boyfriend. Why can't I ever just not have to? My boyfriend does even more. That's why I enjoy it here so much. This is a fixed point where I can simply get some peace and quiet, and some time to myself. Somehow it really calms me.

Rosa (2013), the sociologist of acceleration, asks if it is possible to have a good life in modern society and advocates moments of resonance. These are exactly what psychoanalysis offers, and the means by which it counters the pressure of time. It uses elements of the rationalized modern age to give time to acceleration's other – the self-will of subjective processes. It employs the clock as an organizer of psychic processes. One might wonder whether working with the 50-minute hour could be compared to meditating or smoking marijuana. Is psychoanalysis, perhaps, a variant of new cultural techniques (*Kulturtechniken*) that use something other to counter the dominion of time and money, or that elude it altogether? I am inclined to believe that it is, but I would add that analysis performs this function in a reflective and nonescapist way, because it can explicitly acknowledge the rift between the time of day and the unconscious, and works with this rift. It does not promote a "timeless paradise" but induces a confrontation between the opposing entities of the time of day and the subject. By this means, it stimulates psychic growth.

Conclusion for clinical practice: the concept of the 50-minute hour

Freudian psychoanalysis has developed a nuanced concept of the 50-minute hour. This concept stipulates a reliable, predefined arrangement with regard to time. It encompasses a vast range of perspectives on how this arrangement can be made, experienced, and interpreted. I would like to sum it up in the following points:

As a rule, sessions are scheduled to last one hour, inclusive of a break (usually 50 minutes of analysis and a 10-minute break.) Through this fixed scheduling, time becomes an important component of the psychoanalytic setting or framework.

For the patient, this has the advantage that they can make a clear plan and rely on receiving a specific amount of the analyst's time and, therefore, professional attention. However, it also has the disadvantage that once determined, the schedule is not flexible. For the analyst, it has the advantage that it structures their day and generates a reliable income, which does, however, remain limited (cf. the principle of leasing by the hour).

For the psychoanalytic process, the advantages of the 50-minute hour include the following: it facilitates emotional involvement by virtue of having a beginning and an end; it fosters a sense of security; it enables regression to occur; it stimulates transference; it introduces a third, which prompts symbolization; it provides the patient with a constant pattern of presence and absence, and encounter and separation; it enables the patient to experience finiteness. The conflict with the time frame encourages the symbolic representation of experiences of time and makes this representation accessible for reflection.

The clock relates four actors – the patient, the analyst, the clock, and professional authority – to one another and therefore becomes a relational factor. These actors' relations are complex and pervaded by unconscious motives. On the one hand, the analyst has the task of safeguarding the 50-minute time frame. In this respect, they represent professional certainty. On the other hand, by doing this, they assume a great variety of different roles. In this sense, their position is uncertain. Their task becomes to oscillate between these contradictory positions and continually reflect anew on them.

The clock and the emotional unconscious are alien to each other and follow different patterns of logic. Paradoxically, it is through their abstract nature that the 50 minutes are able to secure a space protected from the social mentality of performance and acceleration. Psychoanalysis uses an element of the rationalized modern age – the clock – to give time to the self-will of unconscious processes and be able to work with it. By "timing" the session, the clock becomes an organizer of psychic processes.

Opinions diverge on the question of how time should be conceived of and handled as a frame for the psychoanalytic process. Some analysts see the frame as something external and fixed, or even as a law that stands outside the transference relationship. According to them, it should not be analysed in terms of its creation, but only in terms of its effects. Others also take the time frame seriously, but see analysts, in their relationship to the clock, as participants in the immediate power play that takes place in the transference relationship. They reflect on and put into perspective the time-conscience that our social environment has ingrained into both analysts and patients. For them, the beneficial effect of the time frame is reliant on the analyst handling the time period of the session responsibly, as a human being with feelings. I personally incline to this second view.

References

Bleger, J. (1967). Psycho-analysis of the psycho-analytic frame. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, *48*, 511–519.

Deserno, H. (1998). *The analyst and the working alliance: The reemergence of convention in psychoanalysis*. Madison, CT: International Universities Press.

Duparc, F. (2005). *Die Konstruktion des Rahmens* [Constructing the framework]. *Zeitschrift für psychoanalytische Theorie und Praxis*, *20*, 60–78.

Eitingon, M. (1922). *Bericht über die Berliner Psychoanalytische Poliklinik* [Report on the Berlin psychoanalytical policlinic]. *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, *8*, 506–520.

Elias, N. (2007). *An essay on time*. Dublin: University College Dublin Press.

Freud, S. (1913). *On beginning the treatment. SE* 12: 121–144.

Gabbard, G.O., & Williams, P. (2001). Preserving confidentiality in the writing of case reports [Editorial]. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, *82*, 1067–1068.

Greenson, R.G. (1974). The decline and fall of the 50-minute hour. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, *22*, 785–791.

Gutwinski-Jeggle, J. (2007). *Pathologische Phänomene des Zeiterlebens. In den Vorhöfen von Zeiträumen* [Pathological phenomena of experiencing time. In the foreyards of spaces of time]. *Zeitschrift für psychoanalytische Theorie und Praxis*, *22*, 76–94.

Langlitz, N. (2005). *Die Zeit der Psychoanalyse* [The time of psychoanalysis]. *Lacan und das Problem der Sitzungsdauer* [Lacan and the problem of the duration of the session]. Frankfurt-am-Mein: Suhrkamp.

Laplanche, J. (1992). *Zeitlichkeit und Übersetzung* [Temporality and translation]. In J. Laplanche, *Die unvollendete kopernikanische Revolution in der Psychoanalyse* [The unfinished Copernican revolution in psychoanalysis] (pp. 66–88). Gießen: Psychosozial Verlag, 2003.

Loewald, H. (1971). *The experience of time*. In *The essential Loewald* (pp. 138–147). Hagerstown: University Publishing Group, 1980.

May, U. (2008). Nineteen patients in analysis with Freud (1910–1920). *American Imago*, *65*, 41–106.

Pflichthofer, D. (2011). *Zwischen Gesetz und Freiheit. Die Suche nach dem Rahmen und dem Objekt* [The frame between law and freedom]. *Psyche – Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, *65*, 30–62.

Pollack, T. (2003). *Das Setting – ein Essential der klinischen Psychoanalyse? Zur Geschichte und Aktualität eines Konzepts* [The setting, an essential of clinical psychoanalysis?]. *Zeitschrift für psychoanalytische Theorie und Praxis*, *18*, 352–372.

Rey, P. (1995). *Eine Saison bei Lacan* [One season with Lacan]. Vienna: Passagen.

Rosa, H. (2013). *Social acceleration: A new theory of modernity*. Columbia: Columbia University Press.

Sandler, J. (1976). Countertransference and role-responsiveness. *International Review of Psychoanalysis*, *3*, 43–47.

Schröter, M. (2001). *Psychoanalyse und ärztliche Psychotherapie. Zur Geschichte eines schwierigen Verhältnisses* [Psychoanalysis and medical psychotherapy. History of s difficult relationship]. *Psyche – Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, 55, 718–737.

Stone, L. (1961). *The psychoanalytic situation: An examination of its development and essential nature*. New York: International Universities Press.

Wellendorf, F. (2000). *Die Zeit der Psychoanalyse und die Psychoanalyse der Zeit* [The time of psychoanalysis and psychoanalysis of time]. *Forum der Psychoanalyse*, *16*, 189–203.

Wellendorf, F. (2013). "*Pecunia non olet*" – *Macht und Gleich-Gültigkeit des Geldes in der Psychoanalyse* ["*Pecunia non olet*" – Power and indifference of time in psychoanalysis]. In I. Focke, M. Kayser, and U. Scheferling (eds.), *Die phantastische Macht des Geldes* [The phantastic power of money] (pp. 27–44). Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.

Will, H. (2003). *Was ist klassische Psychoanalyse?* [What about classical psychoanalysis?]. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Will, H. (2012). *Die Suche nach Darstellbarkeit: Primärprozess-Denken in der analytischen Stunde* [The search for figurability. Primary process thinking during the analytical session]. *Psyche – Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, 66, 289–309.

Will, H. (2014). *Freuds Atheismus im Widerspruch. Freud, Weber und Wittgenstein im Konflikt zwischen säkularem Denken und Religion* [Freud's contradictory atheism. Freud, Weber and Wittgenstein torn between secularity and religion]. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Zimmermann, F. (1997). *Die Bedeutung der Zeit als Determinante des psychoanalytischen Rahmens* [The meaning of time determining the psychoanalytic framework]. *Psyche – Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, *51*, 156–182.

Zwiebel, R. (2013). *Was macht einen guten Psychoanalytiker aus?* [What defines a good psychoanalyst?]. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.

Translation

This paper was translated by Nathalia Chomel-Doe as part of the Specialised Translation MA course at the University of Westminster, London.

Author

Herbert Will, MD, is member and training analyst of the Deutsche Psychoanalytische Gesellschaft (DPG), International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA), and Deutsche Gesellschaft für Psychoanalyse und Psychotherapie (DGPT), and co-editor of *Psyche*, the German journal of psychoanalysis.

International Forum of Psychoanalysis, 2018
Vol. 27, No. 1, 24–34, https://doi.org/10.1080/0803706X.2017.1420232

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

Working with Italian patients in Munich – The case of Penelope[1]

MARCO CONCI

Abstract
With their book *Psychoanalytic perspectives on migration and exile* (1989), L. Grinberg and R. Grinberg (1984) opened up a new clinical field, which had been neglected for a long time in the psychoanalytic community, although Freud's multilinguistic competence had greatly contributed to the creation of psychoanalysis. With their book *The Babel of the unconscious*, Jacqueline Amati Mehler, Simona Argentieri, and Jorge Canestri were able to confirm the hypothesis that it is possible to help multilingual patients to integrate the different aspects of their self which are bound to their mother tongue and to their foreign tongue(s), and thus to allow them to develop a new identity. The author, who has been a psychoanalyst in Munich since 1999, works every day with his Italian patients in this new clinical field, that is in their common mother tongue and at the two levels of their old Italian and their new German identity. Through the detailed presentation of a clinical case, he furthermore shows how, on the one hand, the migration creates a new space in which therapy actually becomes possible, and on the other hand, not only therapy, but also the kind of relationship developed by the patients to their "new country" plays a decisive role in the whole process. Such a frame proved to be particularly good for the emergence, revisitation, and reelaboration of the transgenerational trauma around which the case of Penelope is centered. The author further assumes that the theme of "migration and identity" is becoming more and more important in our globalized world, with clinical consequences whose elaboration requires a specific cultural and technical preparation.

Key words: *psychoanalysis, migration, identity, mother tongue, transgenerational trauma, intercultural dialogue.*

In 1984, León and Rebeca Grinberg published *Psicoanálisis de la migración y del exilio*, which was translated into English in 1989 as *Psychoanalytic perspectives on migration and exile*. In his Foreword to the English edition, Otto Kernberg presented it as "the first comprehensive psychoanalytic study of the psychology of emigration and exile" (1989, p. vii). Working with Italian patients in Munich for the last 10 years, I have not only confirmed the authors' experience of helping many of these patients transform the crisis of migration into an experience of rebirth (cf. 1989, p. 15), but also reached a more precise definition of what the Grinbergs call "the predisposition to emigrate" (cf. p. 24).

Both in the case of Penelope, which I will tell you about after having introduced the topic of my paper, and in those of most of my patients, I was able to come to see how their decision to emigrate usually stemmed from two different realizations. First, that their psychological development was blocked; and second, that such a blockage was due to an obstacle which, after a long history of suffering, they had ended up internalizing and, at the same time, projecting upon their external environment. In this way, the outcome of their migration depends not only on "the baggage of their previous history," but also on "the quality of the environment that receives them"– as the Grinbergs write at the end of their book (1989, p. 194). As we shall see in the case of Penelope, I am referring here both to the quality of the society in which they may develop what we might call their "new German self," and to the nature of the analytic therapy whereby they may revisit their "old Italian self" in their mother tongue.

How the creation of such a bilingual setting is an intrinsic part of Freud's legacy and an essential ingredient of psychoanalysis was very eloquently demonstrated by Didier Anzieu in the paper he presented in 1985 in Hamburg, at the first International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA) congress held in Germany after the Wiesbaden congress of 1932, a paper by the title "The place of Germanic language

Correspondence: Marco Conci, MD, Pettenkoferstrasse 4, D-80336 Munich, Germany. E-mail: marcoconci@aol.com.
[1]This is a modified version of the paper given during the panel "Migration and identity: Different perspectives" at the XXXXVIth International Psychoanalytical Association Congress on July 30, 2009, Chicago, IL, USA. The original version came out in German in 2010 in *Forum der Psychoanalyse*, *26*, 151–173, under the title "*Der Fall Penelope. Migration und Identität am Beispiel meiner Arbeit mit italienischen Patienten in München*." We thank Springer-Verlag for permission to publish.

(*Received 8 December 2017; accepted 15 December 2017*)
© 2018 The International Federation of Psychoanalytic Societies

and culture in Freud's discovery of psychoanalysis between 1895 and 1900." "Freud was not a man of a single culture, but of the interlocking of cultures. This explains why [wrote Anzieu] he was able to think in terms of the interlocking aspects of the working of the psyche. … Even today, it is not possible to become a psychoanalyst without the ability to surpass (while retaining) one's culture of origin and to combine different cultural references" (Anzieu, 1986, p. 221). As we know, multilingualism had characterized Freud's work since his letters to Eduard Silberstein (whose Italian edition I edited in 1991). Furthermore, he was deeply influenced by his early migration from Moravia to Vienna, at age three.

André Haynal very concisely expressed how deeply the experience of migration has always shaped our identity as psychoanalysts at the congress of the European Psychoanalytic Federation held in Vienna in 2008 (70 years after Hitler's invasion of Austria), where he declared that if we looked back "to our history, to our *heritage*, we can raise the question: can you imagine a psychoanalyst who is not an *emigrant*? … We are, in a sense, all immigrants" (Haynal, 2008, p. 108).

Although Riccardo Steiner started discussing this topic in 1989, in his paper "It is a new kind of diaspora … ," 10 years later Salman Akhtar found still "striking the lack of literature" on the topic of the immigrant analyst (Akhtar, 1999, p.154). "This is even more notable in view of the fact that a large number of early analysts, both in England and in the United States, were immigrants," wrote Akhtar. "Perhaps this omission is due to the reluctance of mainstream psychoanalysis to deal with sociological, historical, and cultural factors in adult life … Wanting to forget their traumatic departures, deny cultural differences with their patients, and become quickly assimilated to a professional level, these analysts did not want to draw others' (and their own) attention to their ethnic and national origins" (p. 154).

Of course, Jacqueline Amati Mehler, Simona Argentieri, and Jorge Canestri have also tackled most of these problems in their book *The Babel of the unconscious*, originally published in Italian in 1990 – and whose German edition is in preparation upon the initiative of Hediaty Utari-Witt and myself. I believe that my work in Munich is in line with their attempt to show how "the process of 'adopting' a second language … represented" for their patients "a new opportunity for repeating the evolutive journey toward the acquisition of a more developed and less mutilated identity" (1993, p. 75). The authors conclude their very sophisticated journey – into the "mother tongue and foreign languages in the psychoanalytic dimension[s]," as reads the subtitle of the book – by connecting Goethe's concept of the person as a multiplicity with the new dimension of the self which every new language creates in us. Furthermore, they remind us of the lasting value of the so-called Sapir–Whorf theory, according to which society and culture deeply influence the meaning of the concepts we use. In Penelope's case, her positive experiences with German society, whose institutions protect the individual, contributed to give her a positive experience of the concept of society [*die Gesellschaft*, in German], at variance with the negative social experiences she had made in Southern Italy, where society [*la società*, in Italian] is centered more on the family than on the individual, whose rights are often neglected – as it had been true in her case.

Another finding that has been very stimulating for me in terms both of my work in Munich and of my personal experience (of the different aspects of myself which come to the surface depending on the language I am speaking, be it Italian, English, or German, but also Spanish and French), is the interdisciplinary and clinical evidence RoseMarie Pérez Foster presents in her 1998 book *The power of language in the clinical process*. This evidence allowed her to coin the concept of the "bilingual self." In her book, she explores the role of language as "characterological organizer," and defines bilingual people as "possess[ing] different experiences of the self that are organized by their respective languages" (1998, p.63). She writes of "language-bounded inner representations of the self" (p.75) and also makes reference to "the wide range of research offering compelling evidence for language-related differences in cortical organization, information processing, and manifest ego functioning" (p.64), research that supports the hypothesis of the so-called "language independence phenomenon" (p.12). I also found her concept of "cultural countertransference" (see Chapter 9) very useful for my work with my patients, and for acquiring a better knowledge of myself as well. Since Penelope and I are both critical of the society we come from, it was not always easy to keep the focus of our work on the intrapsychic dimension.

Salman Akhtar has greatly contributed to explaining the role played by reality in the treatment of migrant patients in the above-cited book *Immigration and identity*, where he talks about "adopting a developmental stance and conducting developmental work" (see Chapter 4). In other words, the analyst of immigrant patients "must bear in mind the relatively greater role he plays as a new object," as well as the fact that "the similarities between the developmental process and the analytic process might be

more marked in such analyses" (Akhtar, 1999, p. 119).

In addition to the concepts of "bilingual self" and "developmental work," Ilany Kogan's emphasis on the phase of mourning is of great relevance to our discussion. Kogan places this phase at the center of her therapeutic model, preceded by a first phase of "depression, confusion and lack of orientation," and followed by a final phase of "integration and new orientation" – as she wrote in the last chapter of the anthology which she edited in 2005 in German together with Peter Bründl, *Kindheit jenseits von Trauma u. Fremdheit*. In her own words, " … the mourning process made possible the reintegration of the dissociated parts of the self and the consolidation of the patients' identity. The parts of the self bound to two different countries, religions, and cultures were recognized as valuable and enriching aspects of the self. The emigrant stopped experiencing his conflict as something which would break him into pieces, and started seeing it instead as a chance to grow and mature as a person" (Kogan, 2005, p. 300; my translation). In her book *The struggle against mourning* (2007a), she systematically deals with this aspect of our work – and with the relationship between external and internal reality. In her little jewel of a book *Escape from selfhood* (2007b), Ilany Kogan focuses on another aspect of our work with migrant patients: their inability to establish firm identity boundaries as a motivating factor in their decision to migrate, and the transgenerational transmission of psychic traumas as one of the central aspects of our work. The case of Penelope can also profit from being considered from these two points of view.

Working with Italian patients in Munich

Since the spring of 1999, I have worked with Italian, German, and other foreign patients in Munich, the capital of Bavaria. The second German city in number of inhabitants after Berlin, Munich has about 1.4 million residents, of which about 20%, that is, about 280,000, are foreigners. Among them, Italians represent about 10%, in other words about 25,000 people. Included by Ernest Jones in his biography of Freud for having hosted the Fourth IPA Congress in September 1913, the congress of Freud's definite break with Jung, Munich has a big and pluralistic psychoanalytic community. The history of this community is rather complex and interesting (see the book edited by Thea Bauriedl and Astrid Brundke, 2008). It has been dominated by the tension between a desire for solid international connections and the typically Bavarian tendency to grow one's own garden, and it is characterized by the existence (since 1967) of a social security system which covers psychoanalytic psychotherapy up to three sessions a week, for a total of 300 sessions. The advantage of such "free psychotherapy for everybody" (the utopia which Freud had formulated at the Budapest Congress in the fall of 1918) has two disadvantages: its limited frequency, and the fact that the end of the analytic process is determined by criteria external to our own work.

To complete the picture I am portraying here, let me also say that both my patients and myself can enjoy such a privilege without becoming German citizens. Being members of the European Union, a new and fascinating political reality, is enough. Borders among member states were abolished in the fall of 1997 (passes are no longer necessary!), and EU citizens have utilized a single currency, the Euro, since January 2002. Both my patients and I have regular contacts with our native country, and globalization allows us to watch Italian television and/or to speak on the phone with our Italian relatives and friends every day at very little cost. Once limited to manual workers and waiters, the Italian population in Munich has undergone a process of great differentiation. The origin of my patients is also very heterogeneous. They come to Munich from all over Italy. And how do Italians and Germans get along with each other? The usual answer is that … Italians have a high consideration for Germans, but do not like them, while Germans (Bavarians especially) like Italians very much, but have little consideration for them.

My office certainly represents a peculiar kind of "Italian island in Germany," a transitory space where my Italian patients can not only get in touch with themselves, but also work at and make progress in their career and or/development as foreign members of the German community. In other words, through their therapy, most of them end up feeling more at home in Munich. At the same time, at variance with multiethnic places like London or Paris, almost none of them ever become German citizens. Most Italians do not like the idea, and Germany has always tried to make it very hard for foreigners to gain citizenship. Last but not least, who are my patients? Summarizing what I have been saying up to now, I might say that their common denominator is their difficulties in developing their identity. Such difficulty hinges not only on their family and social environment, but also – or rather, mostly – on the defense mechanisms they have developed in the course of their life. Coming to Munich gives them the feeling of eventually becoming themselves, until the time comes when they realize that their own "internal world" represents the major obstacle to the change and the new identity they have been

seeking. At this point, they come to me requesting a consultation or expecting to start a therapy. One last ingredient in this process is that I myself went through a similar experience – twice, as a matter of fact: first as a young Italian student in the United States, and later as a middle-aged Italian psychoanalyst in Germany.

Many other things obviously come to mind that would give you a better sense of the kind of work I do. I share my office with three very helpful German colleagues, who have always been supportive of me and of my work. In addition, I have the chance to discuss my work regularly with two women colleagues who also work with Italian patients, although not from the very same point of view – one of them came to Germany to train, and the other one was born here to Italian parents.

The case of Penelope

Let me start with my first contact with the patient and *her reasons for starting therapy with me*. Here, in a condensed form, is what Penelope told me the first time I saw her in November 2005, as a nice looking young woman in her mid-twenties: "I come from Southern Italy. I arrived in M. this summer and I'm studying foreign languages at the university. I was eventually able to leave my psychologically sick parents, who had made a scapegoat of me because of their own problems. Because of this I also became psychologically sick; I became depressive and hysterical. I have been suffering terrible headaches and lack of sleep for many years. I have a very conflicting relationship with men, and since I lived all my life with my parents, who had such a negative influence on me, I haven't finished my degree. I tried to leave them and live in an apartment with a group of students, but they didn't allow me to do that – neither in our town nor anywhere else. Germany is my last and only chance to eventually find my way in life and to leave all my ailments and problems behind. From this point of view, I can also tell you that in my own town I already worked with a therapist, but she wasn't good enough." I should add that Penelope had found me through a former patient of mine, another Italian university student, who had been very happy with our work and had recommended me to her.

Now, before telling you about the treatment, let us take a look at *Penelope's background*. She was the first and only child of young and immature parents (the father working in public administration and the mother, several years younger, being a housewife), who had married in their twenties in order to leave their unhappy and difficult families behind. The environment in which her father had grown up had been particularly violent, manipulative, and exploitative. His father, who had regularly beaten him, had suddenly died in an accident at work when Penelope's father was a young boy. The father's death happened the day after he had tied the son up against a tree for a whole afternoon, during which the son had ended up wishing him dead. Last but not least, after the father died, the mother forced him to leave school and go to work to help support the family (which included a little brother and a baby sister). She forced him to take up the same profession as the father, and did everything she could to prevent him from getting married. In other words, having been a prisoner of the father, he had then become a prisoner of the mother – as the patient and I would very slowly discover in the course of the treatment. This discovery hinged partly on the growing evidence of Penelope's tendency to make herself into a prisoner in her relationships, including her relationship with her analyst. Coming from a better-off and more educated family, the patient's mother was the youngest of four children. Due to her weak and hysterical personality, her parents not only spoiled her, but also treated her as a sick person, incapable of taking any responsibility.

Penelope portrayed her mother, who had not been able to breastfeed her, as somebody who was not at all motherly. Of her father, she said that he had manipulated and seduced her – manipulated her into taking care of her sick mother, and seduced her into seeing herself as his partner. The lack of clear intergenerational boundaries was also manifested in the fact that the parents did not close the door of their bedroom when they were making love. The patient brought up this fact in connection with her habit of daily masturbation, which had started before entering elementary school. The parents showed the same lack of privacy in their use of the bathroom. They would also leave the door open, and the patient could see her parents urinating and/or defecating. Finally, the table manners of both parents were so primitive (they would not use napkins, and would often eat with their fingers) that Penelope stopped eating with them at age seven – their behaviour simply disgusted her. For years the patient had dreams where her father would try to make love to her and she would both enjoy and be disgusted by it. Moreover, she used to be so concerned about her mother's recurrent illnesses and unhappiness as to think of her as "my daughter."

To distance herself from her parents, and from a situation in which she played such an important role, the patient insisted on starting elementary school at age five (instead of six), and always strived to be one of the best students in her class. Her actions both contributed to the development of her

very good intellectual skills and allowed her to obtain the kind of support and affection from her parents which they had apparently always denied her. Of course, their behaviour gave Penelope the feeling that she did not deserve their love. It is no wonder that in her adolescence she would often attend "necking" parties, where she would experience sexuality, as she herself told me, as "just an animal need completely dissociated from the interpersonal level." Only after one year of therapy with me was she able to overcome such dissociation. She started a relationship with a man she had met shortly after starting therapy. She had refused to have sex with him for quite a long time, until she felt she could do it without undergoing her old dissociation. At age 18, she had begun to study foreign languages at the university in her home town. Apparently because of the important role she played in their psychic economy, her parents did not allow her to live by herself or with other students – a choice only a minority of Italian university students studying in their home town make.

Only very gradually in the course of the treatment were we able to better understand the unconscious reasons which had caused Penelope to remain a prisoner of her parents for such a long time. Her unhealthy family situation, furthermore, led her to develop a whole series of physical, psychosomatic, and psychic symptoms, namely, recurrent headaches, digestive problems, and sudden sleepiness, and depressive and hysterical disturbances. She became some kind of an invalid. She was so sick that her parents allowed her to find a psychotherapist – a woman who helped her begin to understand the possible connection between her condition and her complex relationship with her parents. This experience did help her to try again to leave them, which she was able to do in the summer of 2005, three months before I first saw her.

I will now *summarize Penelope's treatment*, and then describe some of its crucial phases, including the group of sessions that will be the focus of my report. In our first interviews, when she started telling me the story I have just relayed, her diffused (and dissociated) identity was evinced in her tendency to present a different aspect of herself every time I saw her: the very good student, the little girl hungry for love, the prostitute, and/or even the ascetical woman with anorexic traits. In fact, it was my ability to show her such a behavioral (and transferential) sequence that allowed her to develop enough confidence in me and in the therapy that we were able to start working on her problems, step by step. As far as frequency is concerned, we could start treatment only twice a week in July 2006 – because of the patient's need to find her own way in Munich, because of my need to understand how best to treat her, and because of the time we have to wait in Germany for an application for treatment to be approved. In March 2007 we started working three times a week, and switched to four between June 2007 and December 2008. Once we reached the first 300 sessions paid by the German system in January 2009, we went back to two sessions a week, which Penelope pays, at a reduced fee, out of her own pocket, by giving private Italian lessons.

Had I to cite a first theoretical orientation in my work with this patient at this point, I would mention W.R.D. Fairbairn. I would particularly emphasize one of the most famous among his ideas, that is, how hard it is for patients like Penelope to leave behind and actually separate from their "bad (parental) objects," in as much as they are the only objects to which they feel really connected (see, for example, the chapter on Fairbairn in J.R. Greenberg and S.A. Mitchell, 1983). As I have already stated, this is what most of my patients have in common. Since "a bad object" is better than "no object," migrating from Italy to Germany is not enough for them to leave their "bad objects" behind and/or to bring about inner change. This is what motivates them to start therapy in their native language – their need to deal with their "internal objects." Doubtless, this is also the reason why I have called the patient "Penelope," the wife of Ulysses. Our therapeutic work usually follows Penelope's weaving rhythm: what is weaved during the day is undone during the night, that is, the rhythm is of "two steps forward and one step backward."

Antonino Ferro has captured the nature of such difficult work very well in his book *Mind works* (2009), and the following words were of much comfort to me in my work with Penelope: "With these highly 'deprived' patients there are two main problems. One is the weight of their experiential history, which prevents the acquisition of any trust and must therefore undergo prolonged metabolization; while the other, which is even more serious, is the absence of receptors for positive experiences, these having been destroyed or put out of action, so that it is extremely difficult to find where and how to 'hoop up new positive experiences'. The excess of beta is so great that there is virtually no alphabetization that can withstand it, and in addition there is nowhere to deposit alpha-sequences" (Ferro, 2009, p. 214). Only once I had become "the new object" Penelope had preconsciously been looking for, which took a long time, was she able to develop a new relationship with her parents over the phone (in November 2008), to be really convinced that she wanted to work in order to finish her degree and not just to nourish her neurosis (in March

2009), and to be able eventually to see her parents in person (in May 2009). As we will see later on, this result was contributed to by both the work she did with me and the new identity developed through her integration into German society and culture, in which she had felt so welcome.

Having made clear the direction of my work, I would like to discuss *its phases*. For this purpose, I will use the three phases described by Ilany Kogan: resistance and gradual opening-up of the inner world of the patient, work of mourning, and reconstruction of the self. My first concern was to allow Penelope to experience an atmosphere where she could speak as freely and openly as possible about her traumatic family experience. She gradually did so with increasing detail, and her revelations touched me deeply. It took us rather a long time to understand how such experiences had actually shaped her inner world. It was at this point, when, by gradually overcoming her resistances, she was able to deal with the sense of shame and sorrow connected with giving us the chance to look into her problems, that I proposed switching from two to three sessions a week (March 2007). In the meantime, she had had the chance to feel at home in Munich. She had reached a stability which, along with the confidence she had developed in me and in our work, certainly contributed to her being able to undergo a therapy characterized by a higher frequency and a possibly deeper regression. She had already met the man (about 10 years her senior) who is still her partner. She had found a very good *Studentenwonheim* (dorm) to live in, with a social life that would slowly enrich her. And she had developed such a good relationship with the teaching staff at the Institute for Italian Literature that they had offered her a job as *akademische Hilfskraft* (academic assistant), which was very gratifying to her.

In sum, not only through the work she had been doing with me, but also through the great progress she had made in her integration into her new environment, her depression had in the meantime diminished – as had the variety of symptoms she had been suffering at the beginning of the treatment. Although this first phase – overcoming the patient's resistances and allowing her to open up – has only a preparatory character, Antonino Ferro underlines its fundamental role in the creation of what ego psychologists used to call a good "therapeutic alliance." In describing the "mental operations by which transformation is triggered," Ferro distinguishes three phases, namely, "listening and sharing the manifest meaning of what the patient tells us," "abstraction and description of the prevailing emotions," and "possible contextualization in the transference" (2009, p. 172). He describes the first as follows: "What the patient tells us must pervade us and soak us through; we must 'negotiate' the road through it with him. This then becomes the first step in the process of reception: 'I have understood that you, the analyst, have understood what I am telling you'" (2009, p. 172).

In other words, it was after having taken this path with Penelope that we were able to deal together with the fact that, as a consequence of her experiences with her parents, she had developed the conviction – as Fairbairn's theory foresees – of being "unworthy of her parents' and of anybody's love." Not only did this feeling accompany her constantly, but it also led her to think of herself as "dangerous, poisonous, and malignant." As a consequence, she would try to hide such a view of herself behind a mask that, as our theory predicts, was built on her systematic attempt at guessing and meeting the others' expectations. A "false self" had thus developed to protect her from her intolerable feelings of lack of worth and dignity, and to give her the feeling that, although at very high cost to herself, she could still lead a normal life. Naturally, at this stage of the treatment the transference started to play a decisive role. It had been quite clear to me for some time how the patient unconsciously tried to play the role of my best patient. She would bring to the session a whole series of dreams that she even had tried to interpret herself. Now we could actually talk about it in a way which Penelope could find useful – to learn something new about herself. Working at a transferential level, of course, also made it possible for us to work on the yet-present fear that, like her father and mother, I might disrespect her, manipulate her, and/or seek my own benefit rather than her therapeutic progress.

More or less at this point *she could also begin her work of mourning*. Thanks to the work we had done so far, she could start to relax. She could start to give up her "false self," to come into contact with how weak, confused, and impotent she felt, and to cry during the sessions without fearing, for example, that I might reject her and/or not find her good enough as a patient. It was at this point that, identifying for the first time what she had really lacked, what had really gone wrong, and so on, she could work through what she had passively experienced and slowly come to see how, in one way or another, she had contributed to maintaining her specific way of life; how she had somehow enjoyed being a prisoner of her parents. Doubtlessly, we can only mourn what we feel we have actively done, as opposed to what we have just suffered as a victim. For a patient like Penelope, this meant she had gone a very long way.

One particular issue whose analysis and working-through allowed us to make great progress in this

direction was the way in which she had dealt with her work as "academic assistant." In fact, it was in a particularly peculiar and neurotically gratifying way that she avoided talking about it in the sessions for quite some time. It took a while before she could talk about it openly enough that we could slowly come to the conclusion that her way of interpreting such a role consisted in … working two or three times as many hours as she was paid for just out of the need, which she could not admit to herself, to seek the gratification required by her poor self-esteem. Besides spending hours and hours making photocopies for various professors and helping them to prepare and deliver their *Vorlesungen* (lectures), she had to go so far as to being the first to arrive in the morning and the last to go home in the evening. She was thus able to feel that she was the one who kept the institute going. More specifically, her very first, confused attempt to deal with this problem had been to tell me how tired and stressed she felt, and how her psychosomatic disturbances were once again draining her energy. Through the work we did on this issue, Penelope was eventually able to understand not only how her neurotic way of struggling with her poor self-esteem had made her into a prisoner of her professors and institute, but also how her gradually increasing stress was contributing to her psychosomatic disturbances. Last but not least, the consequent work of mourning became even more important and useful when the director of the institute discovered the amount of extra work she had been doing and, despite his great esteem for her, put an end to their work relationship, told her to give up her role as "academic assistant," and asked her to give him back the keys to the institute. After having enjoyed the narcissistic illusion of being in charge of the institute, Penelope ended up relinquishing it completely.

Only with the help I could give her as her therapist was she able to understand how she had come so close to ruining her chances of a future academic career. In addition, through the work of mourning we carried out, she was able to recover, and she slowly found a new identity. Six months later, in the fall of 2008, she was able to start going to the institute again, and, thanks to her great change of attitude and to the teaching staff's enduring esteem for her, she was readmitted. Having been able to renounce seeing in the director of the institute the gratifying father she had never had, and in his main collaborator, a woman with big breasts, the loving mother she could only dream of, Penelope is now able to get the most out of her contact with both of them.

We have now reached the point where we can discuss *the third phase of our work together*, which Ilany Kogan (2005) has called "reconstruction of the self" and/or "integration and new orientation." In this context, I would like to make reference to the three above-mentioned steps that occurred between November 2008 and May 2009. I propose to see their common denominator, in the light of Fairbairn's theory, in terms of Penelope's slowly but clearly developed awareness that real life does not take place in her head, but in the world outside it. The experience analyzed earlier allowed her to understand how she had transformed a university institute into the family of her childhood. Coming to terms with this insight was crucial in allowing her to eventually understand the difference between external and internal reality, and to start living in her external reality and enjoying it. No wonder that, as a result of the work of mourning conducted so far, *at the end of November 2008* Penelope was able to interact with her parents on the phone without the mask which she had always had to wear in front of them.

For the first time, she told them how she really felt, that is, how angry and disappointed she had been. The exchange that followed was a turning point in their relationship. "I know that you are angry with us, tell me about it!" her mother told her for the first time. "I can't accept that you think that you have been good parents to me!" "I'm really sorry. I was too young and immature, but now I do feel much love for you!" "But what can I do with it now?" "I could still be a good mother to you." "But what do you mean by 'mother love'?" "To be always there for one's daughter!" At this point both of them cried, and this allowed their exchange to undergo a new, important shift: "I myself hated your grandmother so much – said the patient's mother – that it took me many years to understand that such a hate was damaging me very much too, and not only your grandmother. If you want to feel well, you have to leave this hate behind you. I myself understood this only at 46, and now I do feel well. Because of this I also know what it means to be a mother."

Her analyst having listened to her long enough for her to be able to admit him into her inner world, Penelope was now ready not only to listen to her mother, but even to allow her to be the mother Penelope never seemed to have experienced. The therapy had allowed the patient to find a new space for her mother inside herself. It is no wonder that in the week following the session when she had discussed the phone call, she had missed her analyst so much that, given the new relationship with herself she was about to find, she was able to admit to him how much she had missed him. And this was also happening for the first time. This development had also been made possible by the fact that, at variance with the mother, the father had kept his distance from

Penelope, which had allowed her (as we could see in the following sessions) to eventually distance herself from him – from the emotionally distant person he had proved again to be. Last but not least, a further ingredient in this turning point was a dream which the patient had over the weekend where the analyst appeared to her as an "evil seducer." On the basis of the patient's associations, the analyst interpreted this dream, drawing from Fairbairn's theory, in terms of his role in helping her find a new distance from her parents, something she both very much wanted and had always been very frightened of doing.

Another interesting aspect of Fairbairn's theory played an important role in the next group of sessions in this phase of the therapy to be described here. These sessions took place *around March 2009* and centered on Penelope's development of a new attitude regarding her studies. According to Fairbairn, whose main papers came out in German only in 2000 (edited by Hensel and Rehberger), internal objects arise as lines and/or strategies of defense in all those situations in which we have problems and/or are not able to deal with our "important others" in real life. Patients develop a so-called "closed system" where they hide and from which the therapy aims to free them. Here is what Fairbairn wrote in this regard in his important 1958 paper entitled "On the nature and aims of psychoanalytic treatment": "The associative material … reveals the central importance of the relationship between patient and analyst as a means of effecting a breach in the closed system of internal reality in which the patient's symptoms are entrenched. In the light of such evidence it would appear that, however neutral a role the psychoanalyst may assign to himself therapeutically, he cannot escape from the necessity of becoming an interventionist if he is to be therapeutically effective – and it must be recognized that every interpretation is really an intervention. Thus, in a sense psycho-analytical treatment resolves itself into struggle on the part of the patient to press-gang his relationship with the analyst into the closed system of the inner world through the agency of transference, and a determination on the part of the analyst to effect a breach in this closed system and to provide conditions under which … the patient may be induced to accept the open system of outer reality. … In any event … the actual relationship between the patient and the analyst constitutes the decisive factor in psycho-analytical … cure" (Fairbairn, 1958, pp. 384–385). If we now apply Fairbairn's ideas to Penelope's case, we can say the following: her defense allowed her to transform her "terrible monster" of a father into an internal object and feel that she was able to control him, which she could not do in external reality. Such a defense, however, had also many disadvantages, the main one being that she stopped living in external reality – she ceased to share and "consensually validate" (as H.S. Sullivan would say) her experiences.

Consequently, her reading had ceased to be a means to advance in her studies. She had transformed the authors she studied into "internal partners" who would keep her company and give her comfort in her solitary life. Not surprisingly, she was able to start leaving behind such a defensive pattern and her consequent very neurotic use of her university studies (another aspect of which we saw above) at a point in the therapy when she dreamed that her analyst showed his affection for her by coming close to her and putting his arms around her. This is what allowed her to eventually take one of her final exams, instead of repeatedly postponing them so as to nourish her inner neurotic life. She was able to tell me in this regard: "I used to be a slave to my system without realizing it. You could now show this to me very clearly. Fortunately, I don't need this system anymore. You are now on my side, as is my partner, and I really felt helped by you. I was about to fall into a dangerous situation again: I wanted to keep studying for my exam not to be able to take it, but to have the chance to keep talking with authors such as Friedrich Nietzsche and Giovanni Verga, as if they were some sort of life partners. But your help came just in time, and I was able to open my own inner doors and windows and start living again in the reality we all share. I am very thankful to you for this."

And now I can come to the third and last stretch of the third phase of Penelope's therapy: *last May she was able to see her parents for a weekend*. The prelude to this event will allow us to better understand how the whole therapy worked, in terms both of the interplay between the work we did on her old "Italian self" and the emergence of her new "German self," and of the work of mourning as a continuous dimension of the treatment – as in many of the cases described by Ilany Kogan in *The struggle against mourning* (2007a). Before she heard of her parents' invitation to join them in Italy for a weekend, Penelope had already come so far as to see (as she had been able to do as regards the way in which she had behaved as a university assistant) her own contribution to the creation of the prison she had shared with her parents. She had realized how much his father's seeing her as his partner and wanting her to help him take care of her mother had coincided with and gratified her Oedipal phantasies. She also understood to what extent she had let herself be seduced into playing such an important role in the psychic balance of her parents to the extent that intense guilt feelings had developed at the prospect of

leaving them to go about her own life – as had happened also to her own father. In this way, the physical separation she had realized by coming to Germany could eventually be followed by the experience of psychic separation. Among other things, psychic separation allowed her to think that her parents' love-making with the door open might have stemmed in the first place from the neurotic nature of their sexual life – if you use sex as tranquilizer, sex is the only thing that matters. Last but not least, for quite some time she had stopped dreaming that her father tried to make love to her and she enjoyed it, or that she called her own mother "my daughter."

But let me tell you now how Penelope's meeting with her parents came about, and why we can look at it as such an important watershed in the therapy. The first session after Easter, Penelope came to me saying that her parents had invited her to see them in Italy, in the town where her father, an amateur painter, was organizing an exhibition of his work. She could not wait to tell me about it, also because she was both hesitant and perplexed. After I had listened to her very attentively and neutrally, she was able to come to the conclusion, which she reported to me in the next session, that it was now really up to her do decide what to do. Penelope opened the following session saying that she had accepted her parents' invitation, and told me, among other things: "I need a change. I've been in Munich since the summer of 2005 and I haven't gone anywhere. Now I am ready to experience something new. My only concern is that when I see my father eating I may get that same feeling of disgust that had prompted me to stop eating with my parents; a feeling of disgust, but also of sexual excitement. I said this to my mother" – continued the patient – "and she told me that neither she nor my father would force me into doing anything anymore." My reaction to her words was to tell her that she was now ready to meet life's challenges and profit from the opportunities of growth it can offer us – something which, as she told me, she had never really had the chance to do. Not surprisingly, she utilized part of the next session to tell me how much she had enjoyed the last paper she had written – which, incidentally, she had been able to deliver on time. She had written about Hermann Hesse's successful synthesis of an array of contradictions he had struggled with – a successful synthesis which she felt she had also achieved.

I can now come to the last two sessions preceding her trip to Italy. Here is what she told me toward the end of the first one, on May 6, 2009: "I almost forgot to tell you how wonderful my weekend with D. [her partner] was. We went to a Bavarian lake where we spent the whole day, and D. even let me drive his car, something I had also quite forgotten how to do. For the first time I had the feeling I was driving the car, and not the car me! I felt so alive! At that point I also had the feeling that I had spent a great part of my life in a state of half consciousness. And this also makes it easier for me to forgive my parents. Perhaps they were not aware that they were making love with the door open." It was therefore easy for me to tell her: "Whatever the behaviour of your parents, you will be able to drive the car, that is, to keep the relationship going on the right track." And here are some excerpts from the following session: "Yesterday I was again so anxious about my trip that I sent my parents a text message, a very childish one: 'I hope you will treat me well.' And my mother's answer was: 'All you will see is your parents' love.'" Then she made the following comments regarding what was in store for her: "Perhaps I have come so far in my recovery process that I can allow them, for the first time, to be my parents! I accept their invitation, they pay for my trip, and I can allow myself to be their daughter! And I have the feeling that now they can be better parents for me. I thought I would never again experience the joy of being a daughter! I told them that I will be happy to eat with them at a Roman restaurant, that I will be ready to allow them … *mich zu versorgen* [a German word meaning in this context "to nourish me"], and also ready to enjoy their love and protection." At this point I told her that I had the feeling that she could eventually gain a new confidence not only in the therapy, but also in her parents. This is how Penelope reacted to my words: "Through the therapy I could get used to receiving good things, and this experience allows me to be happy with what my parents can give me."

One of the things which particularly struck me of Penelope's attitude in this last session was *her use of the German word* "*versorgen*" instead of an Italian word like "*nutrire*" [to nourish]. Not only did her use of this German word reflect the role played by her new "German self," but she had also chosen a peculiar word. Like the word *Weltanschauung*, *Versorgen* carries various dimensions of meaning. As a matter of fact, my feeling was that such a word allowed Penelope to tell me how change had occurred not only through her therapy, but also through her migration and exposure to German society. The therapy had provided her (this English verb actually represents a very good translation of the German verb "*versorgen*") with the attention, love, and care she had not experienced in her own family, and had allowed her to revisit her relationship with her parents to the point of eventually letting them be her parents and letting herself be their daughter. Yet after all, she had enjoyed a similar experience in

the German society of which she was now a member. Coming to Germany had represented a breath of fresh air and, at the same time, had allowed her to enjoy rights and/ or undergo experiences which had been impossible in her home town and country: free psychoanalysis, a scholarship, and good housing conditions in a German *Studentenheim* (dorm).

Such a point of view on the therapy confirmed what I had already experienced with other patients and coincided with the patient's own viewpoint, as she formulated it in one of the sessions we had after her weekend in Italy with her parents. Here is what I told her on Wednesday May 20, 2009: "The day after tomorrow I will give a paper on my work with Italian patients in Munich, in which I would also like to mention your case, with particular regard to the session before your trip to Italy in which you used the German word '*versorgen*.' Besides requesting your permission, I would like to talk with you about it. What do you think?" Here is what she told me: "I am happy that you can use my case, and I will gladly tell you my associations with the German word I used. My first association is my mother's womb. Everything a child needs to survive and develop; warmth, food, and attention. The German word covers such a wide spectrum as no Italian word can. But I can also think of the quiet I experience in Munich. In Munich I feel well *versorgt*, well *versorgt* through the social security system. I also feel a *Geborgenheit* [a feeling of safety] which I did not know in Italy. Here human rights are respected. The whole system hinges on a great respect for the individual. Today, while coming here, I was thinking about this, after seeing the advertisement of a *Fluchtpunkt für Kinder* [literally, point of escape, a shelter for abused children], something unthinkable in Southern Italy! There everything centers on the primacy of the family. There is no society, only the family! It is so nice that here in Germany there is a *Gesellschaft* [society], a society which grants individuals many rights that they don't have in their own families, for example the right of *Selbstbestimmung* [self-determination] – the right to autonomously look for one's own way in life. My father didn't have it, and this made it hard for me too to find my own way in life! In my family I never felt protected. Neither protected nor free!"

Some final considerations

Of the many possible concluding remarks I can make, allow me to choose the following three. In the first place, the case of Penelope shows very well how (as I have seen with many other Italian patients in Munich) the therapy of migrant patients conducted in their mother tongue can greatly profit from the interaction between the chances for growth offered by the new environment and the removal of the psychological obstacles to that same growth which can take place in therapy. Patients can revisit their old "Italian self," mourn their past and look at it in a different light, and, at the same time, let their new "German self" grow. In this way, the Italian and German selves can give rise to a new identity, an identity which did not exist before.

I also found that Penelope's biography and treatment provided confirmation for a significant theoretical contribution, namely, the relational perspective developed by the late Stephen A. Mitchell (1946–2000), whose work I helped introduce to Italy and Germany. Mitchell contended that the fundamental challenge to both human development and analytic therapy is our struggle to succeed in finding our way between the two poles of autonomy and dependence (see, for example, his 1997 book *Influence and autonomy in psychoanalysis*). Penelope came to Germany and started therapy with me because it was impossible for her to be herself and maintain a relationship with her parents at the same time. One pole excluded the other.

Third, I would like to call attention to the international character of psychoanalysis. Psychoanalysis as a new discipline emerged out of the new synthesis reached by Freud's genius of the medical models developed in Vienna, Berlin, and Paris. Nowadays, we might similarly think of psychoanalysis as a discipline which can allow us to go beyond the stereotypes of our national identities, and thereby produce the new "citizen of the world" we so badly need. I am referring here to the stereotypes described by Erik Erikson by means of his concept of "pseudo-speciation" (see, for example, Lawrence Friedman's 1999 biography). He claimed that national and cultural influences make us human beings, but also Italians, Germans, Americans, and so on. I believe that thanks to her migration and her therapy, Penelope is now neither Italian nor German in the usual sense of the term, but a new "citizen of the world."

References

Akhtar, S. (1999). *Immigration and identity. Turmoil, treatment and transformation*. Northvale, NJ: Aronson. German edition, 2007.

Amati Mehler, J., Argentieri, S., & Canestri, J. (1993). *The Babel of the unconscious. Mother tongue and foreign languages in the psychoanalytic dimension*. Madison, CT: International Universities Press. Original Italian edition, 1990.

Anzieu, D. (1986). The place of Germanic language and culture in Freud's discovery of psychoanalysis between 1895 and 1900. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, *67*, 219–226.

Bauriedl, T., & Brundke, A. (eds.) (2008). *Psychoanalyse in München – Eine Spurensuche* [Psychoanalysis in Munich – retracing its history]. Giessen: Psychosozial-Verlag.

Fairbairn, W.R.D. (1958). On the nature and aims of psychoanalytic treatment. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, *39*, 374–385.

Fairbairn, W.R.D. (2000). *Das Selbst u. die inneren Objektbeziehungen* [The self and internal object relations] (B.F. Hensel and R. Rehbergher, eds.). Giessen: Psychosozial-Verlag.

Ferro, A. (2009). *Mind works. Technique and creativity in psychoanalysis*. London: Routledge. Original Italian edition, 2006.

Friedman, L.J. (1999). *Identity's architect. A biography of Erik Erikson*. London: Free Associations Books.

Greenberg, J.R., & Mitchell, S.A. (1983). *Object relations in psychoanalytic theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Grinberg, L., & Grinberg, R. (1989). *Psychoanalytic perspectives on migration and exile*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Original Spanish edition, 1984.

Haynal, A. (2008). About emigration … . *E.P.F. Bulletin*, (62), 104–109.

Kernberg, O.F. (1989). Foreword. In L. Grinberg and R. Grinberg, *Psychoanalytic perspectives on migration and exile* (pp. 7–8). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Kogan, I. (2005). *Nachwort* [Afterword]. In P. Bründl and I. Kogan (eds.), *Kindheit jenseits von Trauma u. Fremdheit* [Childhood beyond trauma and alienation] (pp. 288–300). Frankfurt am Main: Brandel & Apsel.

Kogan, I. (2007a). *The struggle against mourning*. New York: Aronson.

Kogan, I. (2007b). *Escape from selfhood. Breaking boundaries and craving for oneness*. London: International Psychoanalytical Association.

Mitchell, S.A. (1997). *Autonomy and influence in psychoanalysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press.

Pérez Foster, R.M. (1998). *The power of language in the clinical process. Assessing and treating the bilingual person*. Northvale, NY: Aronson.

Steiner, R. (1989). "It is a new kind of diaspora … ". *International Review of Psychoanalysis*, *16*, 35–72.

Author

Marco Conci, MD, is a psychiatrist (Rome, 1986) and a psychoanalyst (Deutsche Psychoanalytische Gesellschaft, Società Psicoanalitica Italiana, International Psychoanalytical Association) in private practice in Munich. He has been the coeditor-in-chief of this journal since 2007.

International Forum of Psychoanalysis, 2018
Vol. 27, No. 1, 35–39, https://doi.org/10.1080/0803706X.2016.1141234

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

Freud's Utopia revisited: The International Psychoanalytic University Berlin

LILLI GAST

Abstract
The International Psychoanalytic University was founded in 2009. This article provides an outline of its core tasks, study programs, research activities, and infrastructure.

Key words: *psychoanalysis, university*

> If – which may sound fantastic today – one had to found a college of psycho-analysis, much would have to be taught in it which is also taught by the medical faculty: alongside depth-psychology, which would always remain the principal subject, there would be an introduction to biology, as much as possible of the science of sexual life, and familiarity with the symptomatology of psychiatry. On the other hand, analytic instruction would include branches of knowledge which are remote from medicine and which the doctor does not come across in his practice: the history of civilization, mythology, the psychology of religion and the science of literature. Unless he is well at home in these subjects, an analyst can make nothing of a large amount of his material. (Freud, 1926, p 246)

In October 2009, 83 years after Freud penned his utopian vision of a psychoanalytic university, the International Psychoanalytic University (IPU) opened its portals with the commencement of its Master of Arts in Clinical Psychology/Psychoanalysis study course, with 75 students enrolled. Today, five years later, it has some 600 students studying in five study programs.

The IPU is a private university established by means of a legally recognized foundation initiated and financed by Prof. Christa Rohde-Dachser, Professor Emeritus of Psychoanalysis within the psychology department of the Johann Wolfgang Goethe University, Frankfurt, and fellow member of the German Psychoanalytical Society (DPG) and the International Psychoanalytical Association. Together with Prof. Jürgen Körner, founding and now Honorary President of the IPU, she achieved the goal of inaugurating a psychoanalytic university in Germany, which, given the absence of a private education tradition in Germany, undoubtedly has to be considered a unique and bold endeavor.

The idea

As psychoanalysts and professors, Prof. Rohde-Dachser and Prof. Körner were reacting to the ongoing removal of psychoanalysis from German state universities due to the prevailing focus on nomothetic and behavioral approaches in the humanities, including departments of psychology. By establishing the Foundation to Promote University Psychoanalysis, a nonprofit body founded under German law, and, providing financial support for the IPU, the idea was to close this gap that had arisen in the one-sided focus on natural sciences in academic psychology.

The general principal of the IPU, one that underlies its research activities as well as all its study courses, is to convey psychoanalysis as a science that maps the human as a biological, social, and culturally imprinted being, and that seeks to understand the individual against the background of their history and the influence of their unconscious. All the study courses at the IPU are, without exception, research-related and provide close contact with clinical practice from the very beginning in the psychology-based fields of study. Fundamentally, we are dedicated to a multiperspective and multifaceted approach to psychoanalytic thinking in its

Correspondence: Professor Dr. Lilli Gast, International Psychoanalytic University, Stromstrasse 3b, 10555 Berlin, Germany. E-mail: Lilli.Gast@ipu-berlin.de

(*Received 9 March 2015; accepted 8 January 2016*)
© 2016 The International Federation of Psychoanalytic Societies

clinical and theoretical objectives, by linking clinical, cultural, and social expertise. Accordingly, the IPU fosters a (self) reflective attitude in research and teaching, as well as an inter- and transdisciplinary and thus indeed international dialogue.

The IPU is financed solely from the nonprofit foundation's resources and the students' tuition fees, in addition to third-party funding for its research activities. It does not receive any grants or contributions from the public purse, and while the IPU is a private university (a third-level academic institution with university status), all its study courses and degrees are recognized by the state. The IPU as an universitarian institution has been examined thoroughly with a specific focus on its research and teaching capacities, as well as the quality of the infrastructure provided, and since 2014 has been fully accredited by the German Council of Science and Humanities.

The professors of the International Psychoanalytic University

From the very beginning, the IPU benefitted from internationally renowned professors of excellent repute, who in their senior years put their profound experience in the fields of research and teaching at the disposal of this major project. First and foremost to be mentioned are Prof. Dr. Dr. Horst Kaechele and Prof. Dr. Rainer Krause, whose contributions greatly supported the IPU and yielded recognition for the IPU from the very start. Apart from the senior colleagues, a number of highly qualified professors were won over, and since the early days the staff has constantly expanded, reflecting the multiple facets, teaching subjects, and research areas of the IPU – both clinical and nonclinical.

As of spring 2016, the professoral staff consists of 19 full professors, and three more are about to come within the next six months. They represent the broad range of different specific core areas the IPU has managed to establish. Their respective expertise covers psychoanalysis in its clinical and non-clinical discourses as well as psychological topics and cultural issues.

In March 2016, the professorate consists of Prof. Dr. Dr. Michael B. Buchholz, Prof. Dr. Lilli Gast, Prof. Dr. Benigna Gerisch, Prof. Dr. Dorothea von Haebler (Psychosis Therapy), Prof. Dr. Andreas Hamburger, Prof. Dr. Insa Härtel (Cultural Studies), Prof. Dr. Éva Hédervári-Heller, Prof. Dr. Dr. Dorothea Huber, Prof. Dr. Dr. Horst Kächele, Prof. Dr. Christine Kirchhoff (tenure track, Cultural Studies), Prof. Dr. Rainer Krause (emeritus), Prof. Dr. Lars Kuchinke, Prof. Dr. Elfriede Löchel, Prof. Dr. Christiane Ludwig-Körner, Prof. Dr. Konrad Schnabel, Prof. Dr. Christine Stelzel, Prof. Dr. Annette Streeck-Fischer, Prof. Dr. Birigt Stürmer, and Prof. Dr. Lutz Wittmann.

The study programs and degrees of the International Psychoanalytic University

In 2009, we started with an MA in Clinical Psychology advanced degree program, with two separate study routes – either full time for residential students or part-time for nonresidential students and working professionals. The course imparts the content in the field of psychological competencies across a wide spectrum of expertise. In doing so, it presents psychoanalysis as a clinical theory, a theory of human development, a method of counseling and therapeutic treatment, as well as a cultural theory and a theory of the subject in the threshold field of philosophical and ethical discourse. The intention of the MA in Psychology is to enable students to work independently as clinical psychologists, to further their scientific or academic studies, and to pursue a university or higher education career as the case may be. Graduates can apply to train as psychological psychotherapists in accordance with the German Psychotherapy Act.

Only one year later, we launched our Bachelor of Arts in Psychology study program, a basic undergraduate study course intended for young people. It is a Bachelor of *Arts*, and not the more usual Bachelor of Science, because we attach great importance to the idea that psychology is, after all, a social science that maps the human as a social and cultural being. Nevertheless, the syllabus covers the "classic" subjects of psychology, such as general psychology, developmental psychology, social psychology, and empirical research methods, as well as biopsychology and neurocognitive psychology, in addition to organizational psychology. The "clinical" subjects with differential psychology and diagnostics, as well as theories and methods of psychological intervention, form one focus of this study course, because experience has shown that most graduates from psychology courses work in various fields of counseling. To meet this goal even more closely, the Bachelor of Arts program at the IPU also includes specific training in psychological interviewing and conversational skills.

In addition to these two psychology degree programs, the IPU hosts a part-time MA study course entitled Psychoanalytical Cultural Studies, of which we are very proud. What makes this degree program unique is the double approach it takes in that the psychoanalysis/culture interface is studied from both sides. On the one hand, cultural issues are an original element of psychoanalytic theory and thinking, while on the other hand, psychoanalytic approaches are an

essential component of cultural studies. It is a highly innovative MA program, concerned with both classic and current cutting-edge discourses along the transdisciplinary borderline between cultural sciences, philosophy, literature, and psychoanalysis. One emphasis here is on the psychoanalysis of cultural productions, structures and situations – above and beyond the borders between "high culture" and "everyday culture."

A further part-time MA program is dedicated to the topic of Integrated Care of Psychotically Ill Persons (Psychosis Therapy). This was designed as a mutual degree offered jointly by the IPU (primary responsibility, guided by Prof. Dr. Dorothea von Haebler) and three further universities, the Charité University Medical Department in Berlin, the Catholic University for Applied Sciences Berlin, and the UKE Hamburg Eppendorf University Hospital. The cooperative effort of these four universities has allowed the integration in a unique manner of four different professional competencies, all of which are required when working with psychotically ill people: psychodynamic competency, medical and pharmacological competency, social work, and social psychiatric competency.

In spring 2015, a new MA in Organisational Studies program was launched, intended to convey scientific knowledge and skills for leadership and consultation requirements in (profit and nonprofit) organizations and companies. This provides access to a profound understanding of the unconscious dynamics and conflicts that influence organizations and teams beyond rational steering intentions and plans, and fosters change management and corporate culture.

In addition to its study courses, the IPU provides a framework and structure for doctoral dissertations (Postgraduate Study Programme to Accompany Individual Doctoral Dissertations), conducted by Prof. Dr. Dr. Michael B. Buchholz and supported by Prof. Dr. Dr. Horst Kächele. For this purpose, the IPU has concluded a formal cooperative agreement with Humboldt University in order to jointly accompany and support suitable scientists during their doctoral studies in the fields of psychodynamic psychotherapy, clinical psychology, and psychoanalytic theory. This program is run in English as the participants come from several countries.

In summer term 2015, approximately 600 students were enrolled at the IPU, all of whom had undergone an individual selection process. The IPU conducts a personal interview with each applicant who fulfills its formal acceptance requirements. These interviews aim to ensure that the students are able to take and complete the program they apply for in terms of their intellectual, personal, and social capabilities.

As expected, the student-to-staff ratio is above average when compared with state universities. At present, the scientific staff consists of 19 professors and 20 research associates (with some of the latter also teaching), depending on the number of research projects. The number of professorships is constantly increasing. The permanent staff is supported by (international) visiting professors and a varying number of study course lecturers, all of whom are clinical professionals and/or experts in their respective fields.

Psychotherapeutic University Outpatient Service

Parallel to our study courses in the fields outlined, the IPU maintains a Psychotherapeutic University Outpatient Service, authorized with regard to its teaching and research work by the German Association of Statutory Health Insurance Companies and under the direction initiated by Prof. Dr. Heinrich Deserno (emeritus) and now under the direction of Prof. Dr. Lutz Wittmann. The diagnosis and treatment of personality disorders (based on the insurance companies' directive) form one focus of the University Outpatient Service. The service includes initial interviews and case history sessions, as well as psychological testing. When required, psychotherapeutic crisis intervention and further treatment options are provided through counseling.

Research activities

From the very beginning, much effort has been made to establish a research profile and matching infrastructure for the IPU, in order to fulfill the highest university standards of research. To accomplish this, we are reliant on third-party funding in addition to our own more moderate means. Over the last few years, we have succeeded in raising an increasing amount of third-party resources, permitting us to widen the spectrum of research projects even more.

Most of the clinical research projects are in one way or another linked to the IPU's University Outpatient Service. The IPU's research profile is subject to constant differentiation and refinement. The main references and common denominator in all our research work are, of course, the effects of unconscious processes within the subject, the group, organizations, societies, and cultural phenomena of all kinds. Apart from the analysis of unconscious processes in various fields, another common denominator of major importance to us is critical reflection on an epistemological level of the methodology used for psychoanalytic research. We think that ultimately this critical impact may foster the development of

new methods and boost our creativity in terms of our scientific obligations and concerns.

At present, we are conducting more than 20 research projects, including a number of long-term studies, such as the APS Study, which is dedicated to the Effectiveness, Sustainability and Efficiency of the Treatment of Anxiety and Personality Disorders (project heads Prof. Dr. Dr. Dorothea Huber and Prof. Dr. Heinrich Deserno), and the Anxiety Study for Children (ASC; project head Prof. Dr. Annette Streeck-Fischer), in cooperation with the University Medical Center Göttingen and the University Hospital Heidelberg. Also to be mentioned is the interdisciplinary project "Aporias of Perfection in Accelerated Societies," conducted by Prof. Dr. Benigna Gerisch in collaboration with the universities of Hamburg (Prof. Dr. Vera King) and Jena (Prof. Dr. Hartmut Rosa).

The current focus of research at the IPU, in which the various research projects from the scientists at the IPU are arranged and organized, is related to the following: psychotherapy research (process/outcome research) (Prof. Dr. Dr. Dorothea Huber, Prof. Dr. Heinrich Deserno, Dr. Wolfram Keller, Dr. Melanie Ratzek, and others), supervision and training research (Prof. Dr. Andreas Hamburger), parent, infant, and toddler psychotherapy (Prof. Dr. Christiane Ludwig-Körner), emotion research (Prof. Dr. Birigt Stürmer, Prof. Dr. Konrad Schnabel), trauma and violence (Prof. Dr. Andreas Hamburger, Prof. Dr. Lutz Wittmann), critical discourse analysis and concept analysis (Prof. Dr. Lilli Gast, Prof. Insa Härtel, Prof. Christine Kirchhoff), conversational analysis (Prof. Dr. Dr. Michael B. Buchholz, Prof. Dr. Dr. Horst Kächele), virtuality and new media (Prof. Dr. Elfriede Löchel), and cultural theory (Prof. Insa Härtel). The exchange processes between the scientists are fostered by means of overlapping areas of content, as well as through the utilization of similar methodical approaches. The quantitative psychotherapy research methods are applied from a methodical perspective, as indeed are the qualitative methods, especially conversation analysis, grounded theory, and metaphor analysis.

International Office

The IPU maintains an International Office, which serves all our students and scientific staff. It is tasked with arranging international cooperations and coordinating all non-German activities at the IPU. Its main assignment consists of arranging internships abroad or scholarships for our students, as well as for students and visiting scholars from abroad intending to stay at the IPU for study or scientific research. It also provides information on specific third-party funds for our staff. The IPU has been granted access to the Erasmus, Promos, and Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst (DAAD) funding programs, and awarded the Extended Erasmus University Charter (EUC). The receipt of the EUC obliges the IPU Berlin to comply with its internationally set principles on international mobility for students and scientists. Recently, the IPU has become one of only a few German universities to be accorded membership of the Scholars at Risk international network.

Public activities

In addition to these core tasks, such as lecturing, researching and providing outpatient services, the IPU organizes public events related to current issues and topics in the psychoanalytic field. We hold regular public lectures, which compete successfully with all the other academic events that a city like Berlin has to offer. A further, more informal format the IPU provides consists of its Library Talks: in the context of these events, readings are held in the university's library at various times during the year, rounds of discussions are initiated between members of the IPU and external guests, and open debates on subjects currently relevant to society are broached.

Supporters

In all of our efforts to establish a solid basis for future psychoanalysis in an academic world, we have gained valuable support from the national and international psychoanalytic community. In this regard, the IPU's international board, as well as its scientific committee, reads like a "who's who" from today's world of psychoanalysis. Board members are Prof. Massimo Ammaniti, Prof. Stefano Bolognini, Prof. Brigitte Boothe, Prof. Heinz Böker, Prof. Franco Borgogno, Prof. Dieter Bürgin, Prof. Jos de Backer, Prof. Mattias Desmet, Prof. Claudio Eizirik, Prof. Robert Emde, Prof. Peter Fonagy, Prof. Stephan Hau, Prof. Igor Kadyrov, Prof. Gunnar Karlsson, Prof. Otto Kernberg, Prof. Mykhaylo Pustovoyt, Prof. Bent Rosenbaum, Prof. Frances Thomson Salo, Prof. Rolf Sandell, Prof. Daniel Schechter, Prof. Mark Solms, Prof. Mary Target, Prof. David Tuckett, and Prof. Sverre Varvin.

Furthermore, the IPU Sponsors and Fundraisers Association has succeeded in attracting an increasing number of members and is highly active in raising money to support IPU students with small grants and subsidies for their international outreach in terms of internships abroad.

Utopia revisited

Freud's utopian vision seems to have now arrived in the reality of the twenty-first century. At the IPU, a fundamental understanding of psychoanalysis underscores all our teaching and research. Our core task is, in addition to promoting and developing the science of psychoanalysis and its specific insights and epistemological methods, to train, qualify, and foster young scientists and scholars in the field of psychoanalysis. The aim here is that ultimately they will become sufficiently competitive in the academic world to be appointed to professorships at state universities . In pursuing this major objective, the IPU has devoted itself to providing a solid grounding and reliable home for psychoanalysis in terms of all its scientific and scholarly potential.

"If – which may sound fantastic today – one had to found a college of psycho-analysis," it seems as if Freud's vision has became reality and his demand for a psychoanalytic university has been rendered into a state-of-the-art institution of modern psychoanalysis in all its multiple perspectives and facets. That this endeavor was to be accomplished is due to the ongoing commitment and devotion of the foundress and all staff members of the IPU.

Reference

Freud, S. (1926). *The question of lay analysis*. SE 20: 183–250.

Author

Prof. Dr. Lilli Gast is vice-president of the International Psychoanalytic University, Berlin, and professor for theoretical psychoanalysis and subject theory. Her profile can be found at http://www.ipu-berlin.de/en/university/scientists/profile/gast-lilli.html.

International Forum of Psychoanalysis, 2018
Vol. 27, No. 1, 40–53, https://doi.org/10.1080/0803706X.2017.1359665

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

Like a phoenix from the ashes – or "sack cloth and ashes"?:[1] The reconstitution of psychoanalytic institutions in Germany since 1945 and its consequences

ROSS A. LAZAR [†]

Abstract
Here, I attempt to formulate some thoughts about the past, present, and future of psychoanalysis and its institutions in Germany. To do this, I have employed my varied experience as a supervisor and consultant to many such psychoanalytic institutes over the past several years. Themes discussed include the history of psychoanalysis in postwar Germany, the organizational structure of German psychoanalytic institutes, and their cultures in regard to group and organizational dynamics, and political and economic aspects. Finally, I add brief thoughts about the future, taking into account recent developments relating to planned changes in laws governing psychotherapy in Germany. Further, I attempt to analyze and comment on: coming to terms with the past; how to begin after the "Zero Hour"; the form of organization of psychoanalytic institutes in Germany; missing patients and missing candidates; constructive debate and hurting people's feelings; the lack of "detoxification" and "recycling" of the poisonous remains of psychoanalytic processes; and the future of psychoanalytic institutions in Germany. I end with an example of a typical primary task used in conducting large groups in the institutes in which I worked, and include an anonymized table listing individual interventions, their duration, and frequency. These should provide an idea of my way of working, and an overview of the dimensions of the task.

Key words: *psychoanalytic training, psychoanalytic institutions, training analysts*

> *Unsre Leidenschaften sind wahre Phönixe. Wie der alte verbrennt,*
>
> *steigt der neue sogleich wieder aus der Asche hervor*
>
> Our passions are true Phoenixes. As the old one burns, the new one arises
>
> immediately from its ashes. (Goethe, 1809, translated by current author)

In this paper, I would like to present the observations, experiences, and thoughts that I have had the privilege of gathering in various German psychoanalytic institutes over the last 8–10 years. At this point, I would like to thank each and every institute for the material they were willing to share with me, for it is in no way self-evident that an institution would grant access to such sensitive data to an "outsider," a "stranger." In pursuit of my various roles and tasks, I was fortunate to experience much trust and goodwill, which then gave me opportunities to gain largely undisguised, unfiltered insights into the dynamics and organizational processes in those institutions. The fact that in this paper I use this material as the basis of my thoughts about the state of institutionalized psychoanalysis in Germany to date is, however, my idea alone. And I must emphasize that all observations, thoughts, and opinions described here are exclusively mine, for which I take full responsibility.

Due to the fact that much of this "raw material" is, by nature, highly sensitive, and that my intention is to avoid offending or embarrassing any of the individuals or institutions involved, I have decided to

[†]R.A. Lazar died in Munich on July 23, 2017. He could not correct the proofs of this article – M. Conci took care of them.

This article was originally published in German with the title "Phönix aus der Asche – oder Asche auf unser Haupt? Die Rekonstruierung der psychoanalytischen Institutionen in Deutschland und ihre Auswirkungen", in *Forum der Psychoanalyse*, 32, 335–358. © Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2016. We thank Springer-Verlag for kind permission to reprint it. Translated by the Author.

This paper is based on a lecture with the German title *Die Entwicklung des Diskurses in psychoanalytischen Instituten und Institutionen in Deutschland* (The development of the discourse in psychoanalytic institutes and institutions in Germany), given in celebration of the 25th anniversary of the Akademie für Psychotherapie, Psychosomatik und Psychoanalyse Hamburg (APH), on June 20, 2014.

[1]Hesekiel 28:18: "By the multitude of thine iniquities, in the unrighteousness of thy traffic, thou hast profaned thy sanctuaries; therefore, have I brought forth a fire from the midst of thee; it hath devoured thee, and I have turned thee to ashes upon the earth in the sight of all them that behold thee."

(*Received 6 July 2017; accepted 20 July 2017*)

© 2018 The International Federation of Psychoanalytic Societies

"fictionalize" the material by inventing a generic institute, the "N-O-W-S" Institute, where N-O-W-S in German stands for Nord-Ost-West-Süd (North-East-West-South), that is, for no one institute in particular, yet, at the same time, for *all* the institutes with which I have worked and for "now." The essential topics I want to try to cover are:

1 *the history* of psychoanalysis in Germany and its influence on the "reinstitutionalization" of psychoanalytic institutions, particularly since 1945;
2 *the structure* of German psychoanalytic institutions after World War II; and
3 *the culture* of these institutions, whereby group and organizational dynamic aspects, political and economic aspects, as well as some thoughts on future perspectives, including moral and ethical considerations, play an important role.

Therefore, my main focus will be on:

1 coming to terms with the past;
2 how to begin building up an organization after the "Zero Hour" (the so-called "*Stunde Null*") has passed;
3 which organizational form for these newly reconstituted institutions can, should, or must be chosen;
4 the issue of not enough patients, not enough candidates: who is still interested in psychoanalysis as a form of therapy; who wants to train as a psychoanalyst?;
5 dealing with internal conflict and power politics;
6 the need for "detoxification" and "recycling" of the toxic remains of psychoanalytic processes;
7 changing laws in psychotherapy, direct training, and the future of psychoanalytic institutes.

In addition, I deal with the opinions and conclusions of various authors, German and others, who have researched and reflected on institutionalized psychoanalysis in Germany as well as abroad, in particular in the USA. I present their sometimes very critical opinions on the state of training and the forms of organization of these institutions, and discuss them in view of my own experience. Particular attention is given to the question of what comprises a psychoanalytic training – what it should or could be, and, accordingly, how it would then have to be organized. Special attention is given to Otto Kernberg's contribution to this discussion.

I then take the liberty of compiling a fantasy list of three radical changes resulting from my observations and analyses taken all together. Finally, I offer a tabular summary of my supervision activities.

Introduction to the project

The question of the future of psychoanalytic institutes and institutions in Germany, the efforts aimed at integrating psychoanalytic education into the curricula of universities, and thoughts about suitable forms of organization in order to accomplish this give me the opportunity to present some important observations and hypotheses about these developments, which I have gleaned from my longstanding work as supervisor and consultant in many of these similar, yet in many ways diverse, institutions and organizations.

But first of all, I need to say something both about my qualifications for undertaking such a project, and, at the same time, to identify a certain "prejudice" on my part:

1 I am not German. In fact, I do not even have any German forbears. If anything, I come from a family of Austrian Jews on my mother's side and Polish Jews on my father's side.
2 I have neither been professionally trained nor professionally "socialized" in Germany.
3 I maintain memberships in several German professional organizations, but play no active part in them.
4 However, I do live and work in Germany, and have done so for well over 35 years. Thus, I am "a part of the system" as a whole, if not an active member of any of the groups and institutions for whom I have worked.

All this gives me a rather particular perspective on the German psychoanalytic landscape, its institutions and organizations, as well as the people who work and train there. It is a view from both within and without – involved, participant, yet still not completely belonging. It is these factors that have allowed me insight in so many institutions and organizations – and have also allowed me, at least insofar as it was consistent with my role as supervisor/consultant, to have some say in what goes on.

In what follows, I shall not be providing a formal history of institutionalized psychoanalysis in Germany since 1945, nor is this a research report in the narrow sense. But I do like to think of it in terms of an "action research" project in the Tavistock Institute tradition. And, as I have already indicated, what I will not do is to reveal any secrets or give away any identifiable details that stem directly from the work itself. I can only hope that my observations, my formulations and reflections, will be taken in the constructive sense in which they are meant, for I do not want to be labeled a "whistleblower" or as someone who wants to "dirty the nest" (*Nestbeschmutzer*). What I want to achieve is simply to be able to name the most important points in order to

encourage dialog around them, and this, not least, because the fate of psychoanalysis, both in theory and in practice, is so important to me. In order to prevent these negative consequences from happening, I took the following steps

1 I informed all the institutes in which I had worked or was still working, that I was going to write up my observations, first for lecture and then for publication. I was amazed at the amount of support and encouragement I received for this.
2 All the institutes in which I had worked received a copy of the text before it was presented in public.
3 In order to provide for maximum security and anonymity for the persons and institutions concerned, I decided to portray relevant details by disguising them under the camouflage of a fictional institute. Thus, I created the N-O-W-S Institute, where N-O-W-S stands for North-East-(Ost)-West-South, that is for all German institutes and yet for none in particular. Over and above that, my acronym stands for "now," for the state of affairs in the here-and-now.
4 Finally, in order to provide a complete overview of my activities, I have created an anonymized table of the interventions plus an example of a typical primary task for the large group events (see Appendixes 1 and 2 below).

To prepare myself properly to write this paper, I read extensively on the state of affairs in many psychoanalytic institutions worldwide, and discussed the topic with many colleagues, which extended and enriched my view of the psychoanalytic "scene" in Germany today. However, all the observations, claims, arguments, and hypotheses are mine and mine alone.

Nevertheless, there is one colleague in particular, my dear friend and colleague, Matthias Lohmer, whom I need to both mention and thank for his thoughtful and most helpful "brainstorming" in exploring these difficult subjects. Together, we came up with a list of the relevant themes, which I will now sketch for you, despite the fact that I can only touch on each one of them briefly. They are, in short, themes that touch on the *history* of psychoanalysis in postwar Germany, the *structure* of German psychoanalytic institutes, and simultaneously their group and institutional *culture*. At the same time, I pay attention to group and organizational dynamics, political and economic aspects, and, last but not least, some thoughts about the future. The list of themes is as follows:

1 *Coming to terms with the past*: how to revive a psychoanalytic institution after the generation of "parents" has been forced either to flee, to disappear into the underground, to capitulate, or be murdered; where to get "new," surrogate "step"-parents from; need they be imported, in some case reimported, from abroad?
2 *How to begin building a new organization, or bringing an old one back to life after the "Stunde Null,"* certainly not through incest, after all … or … ?
3 *What sort of organizational form should one, must one, choose for these new and/or newly rebuilt institutions?* Which structure is suitable for a *democratic* organization, which one suits "psychoanalysis"?
4 *Lack of patients, lack of candidates*: who is still interested in psychoanalysis as a therapy, and who is interested in training to become a psychoanalyst?
5 *Constructive debate, internal conflicts, and power politics* … or narcissistic wounding, hurts and insults? What to do with all the skeletons in the cupboard?
6 *Lack of detoxification and recycling of the toxic remains of psychoanalytic processes* – "A psychoanalytic training is something from which one needs to recover" (Donald Meltzer, personal communication).
7 *Changes in the laws governing psychotherapeutic training/the so-called* "Direktausbildung" *(university), and the future of psychoanalytic institutes*: the times in which we live are changing ever faster!; whoever does not change along with them is lost.

But before I elucidate these themes any further, I need to mention a number of critical points that have had the effect of giving psychoanalysis a negative image for a very long time. Although what I have to say here is nothing new, still it is important that we pay attention to these critical points in the discussion to follow. Practically all the authors cited, who, for the most part, are themselves psychoanalysts, have criticized the same or similar points, while the same time having to admit that over many years practically nothing has changed, and that none of their comments has had much of a positive effect.

In order to present the image of psychoanalysis in the public sphere succinctly – including at the international level – I have chosen to quote from two non-German experts, one American and one Australian. The American, Ken Eisold, is well known in psychoanalytic circles as an honored colleague, psychoanalyst, organizational consultant, and past president of the International Society for the

Psychoanalytic Study of Organizations (ISPSO). The other, Douglas Kirsner, an Australian, is also well known, as a sociologist, philosopher, and "friend of psychoanalysis."

According to Eisold (1994), psychoanalysts are considered to be "narcissistic, arrogant, full of prejudice, orthodox, rigid and even to an extent fanatic!". He sees them as being against new ideas, and tending to offer both resistance and an inclination towards splitting. He has observed that they are totally convinced of the rightness of their own opinions, and that they are "intolerant, uncompromising, suspicious, anxiety-ridden, and full of self-doubt" (see *ibidem*). They fear being seen as incompetent and, most of all, fear failure. Moreover, they tend to be conservative, conformist, fundamentalistic, "cultic," privileged, and believe themselves to be the "better human beings" (see *ibidem*).

Kirsner, who is not a psychoanalyst, is presumably the only person and scientist who has been allowed to glean such deep insight into psychoanalytic organizations. In his book[2] *Unfree associations – Inside psychoanalytic institutes*, Kirsner reports of extremely unpleasant but all the more revealing facts and events, leading him to the conclusion "they only have themselves to blame!" (2009). With this radical statement, Kirsner felt he needed to emphasize that it was the psychoanalysts themselves who, to a great extent, had led to the longstanding downfall and current crisis in psychoanalysis. The closed nature of the institutes encourages the development of authoritarian cliques, struggles for power, and intrigue. Scientific discussion and exchange, that is, "free inquiry," could not take place. Quoting Robert Knight, Kirsner writes "psychoanalysis must be neither a doctrine nor a party line," that is to say, neither religious dogma nor party platform (p. 3).

As Kirsner found again and again, and as we experience it repeatedly, the main theme and simultaneously the main problem is the issue of *training to become a psychoanalyst*. Who is entitled to carry it out? Who is to say if it is "done right" or not? Does it require an open system or rather a "closed shop"? It is Kirsner's opinion that the atmosphere that he found to be prevalent in the institutes resembled more that of a "private club" in which the training degenerated to become rather more of an *indoctrination* than an activity leading to free, independent thinking and learning from one's own experience. He sees, as do many others, the institution of the training analyst according to the three-part training analyst model proposed and installed by Max Eitingon at the international congress held in Bad Hamburg in 1925 as the main factor leading to this ideological lack of freedom, and accuses the psychoanalytic training enterprise of holding virtually an "anti-scientific" position and developmental stance.

As for the eternal question of the "scientific worth and status" of psychoanalysis, it is Kirsner's opinion that this is a "red herring," that is the *wrong question* to be asking because, in his opinion, the discipline of psychoanalysis belongs clearly in the realm of the "human sciences," not in the realm of the measurable, result-oriented "hard sciences." For further elaboration of this point, see Meltzer's (1971) *Towards an atelier system*, and Otto F. Kernberg's (1986, 1996) four models of psychoanalytic training, as cited below. Kirsner understands psychoanalysis "neither as science, nor as religion, philosophy, medical specialty nor art" (see Kirsner, 2009). In his words, it is rather "unmoored," that is "anchorless." And he goes on to claim that it is for this reason that it is so difficult for psychoanalytic institutes to combine "*practicing and teaching psychoanalysis*" with *organizing and managing a psychoanalytic institute*. For, in fact, these two tasks belong to two different worlds, with two different sets of primary tasks, and equally two different kinds of primary risks. The one is "open, creative and without aim or goal," that is, the investigation of the subject's unconscious, while the other is a reality-based, goal-oriented and, in the end, even measurable activity.

Since the very beginnings of psychoanalysis, psychoanalysts have believed that they must *discuss* and *understand* everything, but that it is not necessary to *clarify or objectify* anything, not to mention *decide something* within a defined time span. Time and time again, it has been emphasized that psychoanalytic institutions and organizations cannot be adequately understood by applying the methodology of psychoanalysis to them. Furthermore, they most certainly cannot not be managed adequately through their application. (see Hermann, 2014). This way of *avoiding* coming to decisions and *preventing decisions being made* is seen by many authors as a highly neurotic, pathological, and therefore extremely dysfunctional form of dealing with anxiety. Instead, those who strive to apply appropriate forms of institutionalization and management by the employment of such nonpsychoanalytic concepts as power, authority, strategy, planning, economic considerations, and vision, are seen

[2]For even though – or perhaps even *because* – he was *not* a psychoanalyst, Kirsner was allowed to examine the four most prominent American psychoanalytic institutes at the time: the New York, Boston, Chicago, and Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Institutes. Through structured interviews, informal conversations, and "site visits," Kirsner was allowed deep insights into the history, structures, and especially the psycho-, group-, and organizational dynamics of each – and this not only in their older, historic forms, but also including their current conflicts and secrets. In other words, *everything* under which they suffer and doubt became "grist for the mill."

with utmost suspicion and are most often deemed to be, and hence are criticized as being, "antianalytic."

But let us now return to my fictional N-O-W-S Institute in order to take a look at the phenomena spoken of here as they manifested themselves in my observations again and again.

How can a psychoanalytic institute redevelop and "resuscitate" a healthy, lively psychoanalytic culture after it has driven so many of its parent generation into prison, flight, and/or exile, or forced them either to conform or be murdered[3]

Our first question deals with coming to terms with the past. During and after the end of World War II, practically all, if not all, psychoanalytic organizations and institutions were guilty of such misdeeds, such inhumane, and despicable treatment of their Jewish and political members. Instead of offering them solidarity, protection, and support, they were neglected, left in the lurch, and either actively banned or just watched (or rather not watched) as one after the other were made to disappear, whether alive or dead. How, after the end of the war, after the end of the Holocaust and all the other horrors perpetrated during the 12 years of Nazi power, how on the ashes in the ovens, the horror of the gas chambers, and the unbelievable tragedy, the mourning, and depression of the survivors of the camps, not to mention those endless numbers of anonymous dead lying in mass graves, how could a significant psychoanalytic tradition be revitalized, how could a meaningful, active, and vital psychoanalytic culture redevelop – and through whom? (For a German attempt to answer this unanswerable question, see Mitscherlich & Mitscherlich, 1967). The answer which our N-O-W-S Institute attempted was one that had also been tried by many other similar institutes and consisted of three parts:

1. Trying to engage the "remnants" of the disaster, that is, those few psychoanalysts who were still around after the time of the Holocaust in an attempt to perform the arduous task of reconstruction.
2. Trying to find their way back to "real" psychoanalysis by searching for what had been "lost," a sort of rediscovery, in fact a sort of "reinvention" of psychoanalysis through the study of classic texts and through lively discussion in the groups and fora that they themselves had created through their own initiative.
3. Through the first very hesitant attempts to reimport impulses from outside, or to a much lesser extent, to dare to venture "outside" in order to seek out such sources of knowledge and experience that were known to exist elsewhere, most of which had been lost and/or actually destroyed in the Nazi period.

Lacking their own "genuine" parents, the only possibility of regaining something of what had been lost and/or destroyed was to go out into the world in search of substitutes. After a while, some went to the USA or to London in search of new/old psychoanalytic roots, and later, much later, a few of the "substitute uncles and aunts" made their way from abroad in order to visit postwar psychoanalytic Germany, albeit with very mixed feelings. The results of these visits were, to a large extent, humiliating and extremely embarrassing, and were therefore either ignored or avoided. But for those who dared to participate and to inform themselves about the developments that had been happening in the world of psychoanalysis outside Nazi Germany, beside it being a cause for humiliation and embarrassment, it became also a catalyst for joy, for insight, and for motivation.

In time, it became more and more common and desirable that such psychoanalytically prominent persons as Otto Kernberg, Anne-Marie Sandler, Herbert Rosenfeld, Donald Meltzer, Ronald Britton, Irma Brenman-Pick, Leon Wurmser, and others came to visit West Germany to do some "remedial" work with their German colleagues. Some, especially Otto Kernberg and Anne-Marie Sandler, have made a special effort in this regard, dedicating themselves to the task of improving the standards and structure of postwar psychoanalysis in Germany and attempting to bring it into line with the standards of the rest of the world.[4]

How to begin building a new organization, or bringing an old one back to life after the "*Stunde Null*" (the "Zero Hour") has passed? *Certainly not through incest …*

Let us turn now to our second key question. This question brings us to a particularly sensitive and "touchy" subject in the institutional history of psychoanalysis in postwar Germany (see Beland, 1986, 1988; Kreuzer-Haustein, 2002). How could it happen that

[3]A very popular and concrete way of remembering and honoring the past in the present is through the naming of institutes after a historically important psychoanalyst like Sigmund Freud, Michael Balint, Donald W. Winnicott, Edith Jacobsen, Lou-Andreas Salome, and many others.

[4]Kirsner, however, believes this to be a fruitless activity, as, according to him, these standards do not exist in reality anywhere.

in the name of psychoanalysis after the horrors of war and Holocaust, and ostensibly in the service of the rebuilding of psychoanalysis, that so many sexually abusive situations in so many and various institutes could take place? Indeed, in the context of postwar German history in general, how is this phenomenon to be understood, not to mention repaired.

In 1990, long before I had even begun thinking about this problem and long before I began my work as a consultant and supervisor in these different institutions, I began to hear tales of relatively widespread sexual and other misconduct between training analysts and candidates, and of incestuous relationships between analysts and colleagues within the various institutes' membership. Naive as I was at the time, I could not – and above all did not *want* to – to believe my ears, until finally an experienced colleague took me aside and explained to me that such inappropriate and in a sense, illegal, activities were, in fact, widespread. Regretfully, this has been more than confirmed by my own research and personal experiences in our N-O-W-S Institute. In fact, it was often those older colleagues, those who were supposed to be the ones serving as "genitors" for the new young rebuilders of psychoanalysis, who proved themselves to be particularly vulnerable to misusing their positions and their power to wrong ends.

Were they themselves so needy, so love-starved, so desperate, and so deprived as to go to such lengths and take such risks? Could there have been feelings of guilt for having allowed the rape of psychoanalysis not only by the Nazis, but also by the German people themselves? Was it an unconscious attack against psychoanalysis itself for making them feel and act so guiltily, while knowing all too well what dangerous, destructive, and harmful things they were acting out? Was their resentment of the younger, unspoilt generation for their relative freedom to found more or less "unspoilt" new institutes, while they were condemned to live burdened with the guilt incurred by their actions during the Nazi period? Did this make them "unworthy," not entitled to bear the title and the rights and responsibilities left to them by the heritage of psychoanalysis?

Or was it a kind of "desert island" phenomenon? Could they have felt that it was up to them to "save" the "species psychoanalyst" through the necessary use of the means by which one tries to save a nearly exterminated species? Perhaps there existed a sort of unconscious, fairytale-like phantasy that they, as the "kings and fathers," could "marry" their own "princesses/daughters?" and save their kingdoms in that way. Or even worse, that they felt themselves "entitled" as "lords of the manor" to claim their privilege or even right to every girl or woman in their "court."

Of course, one can speculate in many directions as to what made (and makes) this dynamic possible, what led to it in the first place, and what enabled it become so widespread … but that is speculation; we will probably never know. However, fact is that in our N-O-W-S Institute, a training analyst had a long affair with a candidate who was married to another candidate; another well-known training analyst who had been married for many years to another long-standing training analyst, and who was at the time even chairman of the training committee, had an affair with a candidate of his; and two other training analysts had several affairs with various candidates and colleagues on their analytic couches. What in the world was (is?) going on here.

My Munich colleague Peter Zagermann (2014) subscribes to the thesis that the group and institutional dynamic structures of psychoanalytic institutions (according to Zagermann not only in Germany, but also worldwide) are to blame for these transgressions. He talks in terms of the "endogamous co-optation mode" behind the selection of the training analysts, a phenomenon which Kirsner much more aptly and simply described as a selection "per anointment" instead of "per appointment". With these designations, both Zagermann and Kirsner mean the same thing, namely the negative effects of the model of training, established by Max Eitingon in 1925. For it is this model which has become the universal form for psychoanalytic training worldwide. Its main point, and as we now know main *fault*, was and is the "co-optive" practice by which members of these groups and their replacements are selected. Both authors consider this method, through which such positions are filled exclusively through the choices made by the group of training analysts and educational committee members as fundamentally "incestuous, anti-generative, delusional and perverse" (see Zagermann, 2014; Kirsner, 2009). According to Zagermann (2014), the roots of this dynamic are to be found in what he calls the psychoanalytic institutions' "unresolved Oedipus complex" right from the onset, and this automatically creates an atmosphere in which, through the ignoring and overstepping of recognized and officially espoused boundaries, a corrupt, power-hungry, and hierarchical situation ensues, creating a "self-proliferating, self-selected and self-perpetuating power elite", which Kernberg claims was and is inevitable.

But even if one accepts such a hard-put argument only in part, or perhaps even not at all, nevertheless it is not difficult to come to a similar conclusion on the basis of a politically derived, democratically, and rationally deduced basis of institutional logic. For wherever intransparent, uncontrolled arbitrariness, exercised by capricious wielders of power and

decision-makers, rules, no reality principle can persist, and as a result no rational – and most importantly – no *justifiable* foundation for decisions taken can come to be. And since, the world over, training analyst groups and training committees are all organized more or less according to this structure, can one rightly claim that the system created by these principles was and is corrupt, uncontrollable, and, in this sense, destructive and counterproductive. It is, therefore, to my mind, self-evident to come to the conclusion that such a system is, by its very nature, unable to produce anything effective in preventing breaches in the rules against incest.

What sort of organizational form should one, must one, choose for these new and/or newly rebuilt institutions? Which structure is suitable for a democratic organization; which one suits "psychoanalysis"?

The history of the institutionalization of psychoanalysis in Germany, where its historical/institutional roots lie, is fascinating, complex, and filled with contradictions. Out of the "circle of friends" who shared a similar way of thinking, out of the "disciples" surrounding Freud, there grew the "*Mittwochsgesellschaft*" (the so-called "Wednesday Society"), a sort of secret society or "Mens' Club" of more or less like-minded young men. In time, this small, private, and rather secretive "club," which reminded many of the structures and laws of a Masonic Lodge, grew and expanded into the modern institutional and societal constructs of the IPA, the APA, the DPV and the DPG, just to name a few of the many psychoanalytic organizations and institutions that exist today. This development took a long time and was (and is) a hard struggle, full of problems and contradictions, which, even to this day, remain to a large extent unsolved.

At this point, those engaged in saving and reconstituting psychoanalysis in Germany were confronted with a unique historical problem, namely, after 12 years of the worst hell, the worst dictatorship the world has ever known, how are we to organize ourselves in order to become a renewed, healthy, and prosperous but, most of all, free, fair, and democratic movement? Which form of organization suits us best in pursuit of that goal? Which come into question? Which are even possible?"

At this point, a historically interesting phenomenon occurred: the German institutes, or what was left of them, turned to an older, more democratic and transparent mode of incorporating themselves, namely that of the "*eingetragener Verein*" or registered society, which had come into existence in Prussia in the revolutionary year of 1848. Whereas in other countries psychoanalytic groups had developed a large variety of different forms of organization (private institutions, university departments and institutes, corporations, foundations, and trusts), most German groups (including the Jungian DGAP and the DGIP, that is those adhering to the teachings of Alfred Adler) structured themselves according to the rules and byelaws of the "*eingetragener Verein*." The crucial question here is, did they ever ask themselves if this was a wise decision? Were/are the structures and rules required by such a form of organization really suited to the requirements of a psychoanalytic institute? And even if it seemed suitable then, what about now? Is it still an organizational structure that suits the modern requirements of a psychoanalytic institute? Will it do so in future? At this point, my answer can only be "yes and no": for some aspects of the tasks and requirements involved it could be viable and functional, for others, not at all.

At first sight, the reasons for choosing the "*e.V.*," as it is commonly abbreviated in German, for our newly founded N-O-W-S Institute – especially after the terror of Nazi rule – probably seemed plausible and self-evident:

1. It picked up on an already existing, well-tested German *democratic* tradition. (The laws governing the founding and required structure of "*Vereine*" came into being in Prussia in 1848.)
2. Such a "*Verein*" automatically creates a legally independent instance (*juristische Person*), that is, an entity not beholden to any one single person or group, therefore forming a bulwark against the dangers of personal cults or even dictatorships.
3. From the very start, it offers a complete concept of a democratically chosen, pluralistic, and "parliament-like" formation, deriving its power and authority, and therefore its "rules," through established democratic voting procedures, and through openness, transparency, and rationality. In other words, all power to the membership! The members are the "people" (*Die Mitglieder sind das Volk!*).

This would have all been very well if it had worked out that way, but, of course, it did not. If it had become such a public, democratic forum for members, that would have meant that, at the organizational level at least, a fair and rationally structured, transparent, and honest system could have evolved. But that is evidently not the way it works in psychoanalysis, not to mention equivalent problems to be found in other such organizations (like the German Automobile Club – the ADAC – or the football clubs who also avail themselves of the very same "*Vereinsstruktur*")*,* and where it has been abused, ignored, and misused for years.

The membership meetings (the "parliament," so to say) of our N-O-W-S Institute has for some time been falling more and more into neglect. It is always the same people, the same handful of hardcore members, for whom the perpetuation of the democratic structures and functions and the way business is conducted is so important, who attend. But what about the rest? Where are they? Why don't they come; why don't they participate?

This is a question asked regularly by those who always do come. The answers range from "have no time" to "after finishing my training, I had had enough of the place. I wanted nothing whatsoever to do with the kind of '*Vereinsmeierei*' [the exaggerated sense of self-importance in one or more societies] characteristic of proceedings in such societies," to "after all the insults and vilifications I have had to endure and have had witness to during my training, not for a minute do I consider contributing to this society!" But a membership so weakened by lack of engagement and participation is in no position to master the complex, manifold and work intensive tasks that it takes to keep such an organization running successfully nowadays, and that only refers to the running of the society, not to everything else that comes with properly conducting a psychoanalytic institute, not to mention a psychoanalytic training. But more of that below.

What I want to discuss briefly now is what I like to call the "*Kirche im Dorf*" (the church in the village) syndrome. By this I mean the phenomenon that, although so many members have no time or energy or enthusiasm to help run the organization and thereby pitch in with their own strength, energy, and dedication to sustain it, they also do not want to see it disappear, not under any circumstances! They allow themselves the position somewhat similar to those "Christmas and Easter churchgoers" who say, "I hardly attend church myself, but I certainly want that church in the village to continue to exist!" In other words, it may well be that choosing the "*eingetragene Verein*" as the best choice under the circumstances available was the right thing to do then – or at least was considered to be the least bad option at the time – but it turns out now that, as time goes by and things change and develop, it is increasingly less and less stable and less suitable, and is proving to be nearly impossible to sustain.

But that, of course, does not answer the question in focus – *what would be the best way to organize psychoanalytic education now and in future, especially considering all the changes that are about to be put into place, at the legal, social, and scientific levels*? But then what's so bad about a "*Vereinsmodell*?," you might ask. It suits everything else from a rabbit-breeding society to Bayern Muenchen football club to the ADAC! However, one must answer the question with the return question, "yes, but what do these organizations and their activities have to do with the spirit and the tasks of psychoanalytic education, and especially what have they to do with its preservation and future development? The only answer I can give to this is "*nothing whatsoever!*" But then, what is the significance of the fact that "*psychoanalysis*" in Germany has to date been organized almost exclusively only in this way?

So which structure is suitable for a *democratic* organization, which one suits "*psychoanalysis*"?

Who on earth ever claimed that psychoanalysts and those wanting to become psychoanalysts should be organized *democratically*? For surely, it was not Freud's idea of how his followers should be organized! His idea was obviously more along the lines of an informal English Mens' Club (the "*Mittwochsgesellschaft*" or "Wednesday Society") only to then switch to a more formal organization, more like a Masonic Lodge, a "secret society" (*Geheimbund*) with signet rings, secret meetings, and so on. That is to say, it was always his idea to form a *closed society of the selected few* and certainly not an open or – God forbid – democratic one with a membership that was in principle open to any and every one! It took the initiative of Ernest Jones, C.G. Jung, and Sandor Ferenczi at the International Congress in Nuremberg in 1910 to call the "*Internationale Psychoanalytische Vereinigung*" (the International Psychoanalytic Association, or IPA) into being.

However, according to the common definition of an organization (see below), its job is to do just exactly that which a psychoanalytic procedure or activity or method is *not meant to do*! Indeed, its job is to do quite the opposite: it must encourage free association, phantasy, meditative reflection, dreaming, experiencing, and the pursuit of heretofore unknown truths – ideally without even having judge or to decide upon anything – not to mention having to evaluate and/or judge the results (see Cremerius, 1987). But then how can one imagine such an organization being in a position to organize itself, given the necessity of doing so in accordance with the demands of reality. How can it, must it, organize itself in order to be in the position of being able to pursue "psychoanalysis" in the widest sense?

Unfortunately, along with most of my colleagues, I must come to the conclusion that we have as yet to find an adequate answer to this question. In the end, this means – and this is something which many authors have espoused for a very long time – that the organization of the psychoanalytic undertaking suffers from a sort of congenital defect, that its

organizational form has never suited the spirit and essence of psychoanalysis, that the necessities and conditions of an adequate interface with the modern world and its realities are incompatible with the realities of psychoanalytic culture and practice, and that organizing psychoanalysis in the form of an "*eingetragener Verein*," a registered society, as its institutional "container" was more or less destined to run into trouble right from the start.

According to Kirsner, this is also true of most of the other forms of organization that he found in the American institutes he examined. Quoting Otto Kernberg, he suggests four models for the organization of *psychoanalytic education*, depending on how its primary task is defined:

1 as an "*academy of fine arts*" that teaches talented craftsmen and women to use their artistic talent and expertise fruitfully;
2 as a kind of "*technical college*" with a focus on teaching students a clearly defined skill or craft with no emphasis on artistic creativity;
3 as a sort of "*theological seminary*" that sees psychoanalysis as a religious system and whose task it is to communicate "right beliefs" to its students;
4 as a kind of "*collegial university institute*" that serves the purpose of transmitting, exploring, and encouraging the pursuit of knowledge as well as methodological tools for creating new knowledge.

Kernberg concludes by saying that psychoanalytic institutes often function as "technical high schools mixed with elements of a theological seminary," when, in his opinion they should be oriented more towards an art academy/university institute model (cited in Kirsner, 2009, p. 4).

But if that is true, what will become of our many German psychoanalytic institutes? More and more, these institutes lack enough "man-" and "woman-" power to fill the necessary posts to do the work required of these offices, nor can they recruit enough "clients," that is, potential candidates for training and people willing to be treated psychoanalytically in order to uphold the training enterprise as it should be. So how and in what form can they survive? This dilemma has occupied greatly us in our N-O-W-S Institute, as it has preoccupied those in other institutes for some time.

Here, as there, the question of the continuation of training in the psychoanalysis of adults has had to be called into question and, indeed, has already ceased to exist in some institutes, while in others it is feared that this step must be taken sooner or later. Does this signify the beginning of the end of training in the psychoanalysis of adults in Germany? Worldwide? Add to this the fact that in our N-O-W-S Institute, as almost everywhere else, the members get older and older, while the so-called "*Mittelbau*," that is, the next generation, is missing. Those who do qualify as psychoanalysts no longer automatically join the society and become voting members. Young people tend to go elsewhere for psychotherapeutic training, and no longer to psychoanalytic institutes as they did in the past. Why is that, and where do they go instead?

Kirsner states that the reasons why psychoanalysis as a discipline is no long attractive, or why its culture appears unacceptable, has nothing to do with its attractiveness as a pursuit in general. According to his research, there are still more than enough people who still find psychoanalysis fascinating as an intellectual pursuit, and who are intensively engaged in it – not only in the context of psychoanalytic institutions or psychoanalytic education per se, but in many and varied other realms of intellectual, artistic, scientific, and social pursuits. His hypothesis that it is through their claims of superiority, their elitist demeanor, their "keeping exclusively to themselves," and their attitudes of omniscience and omnipotence, that they have long ago lost contact with outer reality and no longer have a voice in the general discussion, in which they no longer play much role at all. For after all, why should one commit oneself to a system that costs so much time and so much money, in which there is no guarantee that one will be treated as an adult individual, but one instead binds oneself to an intransparent, willfully managed, even "incestuous" system in which – in Kirsner's terminology – in order to advance, one must succumb to a system of what he calls "*anointment*" rather than being dependent on transparently reached decisions that is, advancing by *appointment*.

But more and more, there are exceptions to this widespread pattern: for one, those institutes which have begun to offer a less frequent, somewhat less intensive training in psychotherapy fare better, as do those who have begun offering a child analytic or child psychotherapeutic training. Even those older, more established institutes who take this route are finding their candidates to be more motivated and more capable. Unfortunately, our N-O-W-S Institute was too hesitant, too late, and too half-heartedly engaged in setting up a training in psychotherapy alongside the psychoanalytic one, and, for lack of competent teachers, has yet to even begin to offer a child psychotherapy training. For this reason, we are now forced to regard our rivals with a mixture of envy, admiration, anger, and resignation.

In this sense, we do not know what is to become of the old institute, particularly if it remains as resistant to change as it has done in the past. The fact that our greatest rival was "born" as the result of a split does not make it any easier to accept. The "joke" that no

psychoanalytic institute can call itself one if it is not the result of a split from a parent institute may sound funny and may have some truth to it, but this, too, does not make it any easier to accept. The theme of splitting among psychoanalytic institutions is in any case a serious one that must be considered in its own right.

In order to understand better what was happening to our potential students in the outside world, the N-O-W-S Institute began an initiative in order to come into better contact with younger people –psychology, medical, and social work students – asking them to explain to us why they had no interest in training at our institute. The answers they gave were as revealing as they were sobering. For some, psychoanalysis was "old-fashioned," no longer contemporary, irrelevant, unscientific, and so on. For others, for whom the approach itself still seemed attractive, we heard this:

> We are neither interested in grass-roots, antiauthoritarian constellations as was the generation of the "'68ers," nor do we want to join an elitist, privileged, authoritarian, or paternalistically structured culture like the one promulgated by Sigmund Freud. We don't want to be bound to any form of membership, nor do we want to be treated as apostles or disciples of a religious movement. For us, it is a matter neither of social democratic, liberal grass-roots participation, nor of a "secret society" made up of the "chosen few." Our position is that of students, of trainees who understand themselves to be "clients," that is to say "customers," and who therefore expect financially sound, reasonably priced, and highly qualified training possibilities for the fees we pay. We are not here to become "members" of anything, do not understand ourselves to be part of a larger "movement." Instead, we simply want adequate service for our money. We understand the economic dimension completely differently from you. We want neither to be organized as a democratically run society, nor trained to become an elite group. We want to be neither disciples nor members, but simply "clients." We are not interested in any kind of co-ownership, nor any "inheritance." All we want is value for money, no strings attached!

These sobering words gave the members of the N-O-W-S Institute a lot to think about. Some became very upset over the "impertinence" of the young people, declaring, "then let them go jump in a lake … we cannot be treated as simple employees who are just here to service our customers … we are psychoanalysts!" Others became very thoughtful but did not know how to react, given the fact that one older, very self-reflective colleague had voiced the observation that, if they were to be perfectly honest, they would have to admit that there was a lot to be said for the young people's position. "Indeed," he went on, "our institute is unable to compete with those who make such offers, unable to fulfil the wishes and needs the young people articulated, even if we wanted to." "We are," he said "in no position whatsoever to do so. We have neither the resources, the equipment, nor the will, nor the ability to do so."

Constructive debate, internal conflicts, and power politics … or narcissistic *wounding, hurts and insults* – but what about all the skeletons in the cupboard?

One hypothesis about this widespread and unfortunate phenomenon claims that a dynamic of this sort is related to a narcissistic family model in which people treat each other very differently from what one would expect of members of a scientific professional society. Does this mean that it is inevitable that sibling rivalries abound in a system that sees itself as a kind of "ideal family"?

The simple fact that we speak of "couch brothers" and "couch sisters" seems to indicate that such an unconscious dynamic is the inevitable result of such transference-induced relationships, and that they must be handled as such. If we were dealing with a kind of church or religious affiliation, calling our colleagues "brothers and sisters" would be construed as a call for brotherly love. Were we talking about a union or a social democratic party, that is those groups who address one another as "comrades," it would be construed as a call for solidarity, and serve the purpose of a kind of inhibition to attack one another (*Beisshemmung*). In psychoanalytic organizations, however, it seems to have the opposite effect, that is, one which seems to strengthen and sharpen the tendency to sibling rivalry, to attack and to hurt one's colleagues. The idea that one has become a member of such a "family" seems to increase feelings of envy, rivalry, and distrust, rather than fostering altruism, caring, and respect for one another.

For instance, in our N-O-W-S Institute, we have a talented, highly articulate, and very emotional member, who at times can also behave rather erratically. Again and again, he comes out with statements accusing both colleagues and the institution itself of things that are hard to swallow and hard to digest. They are often quite personal, hurtful, and sometimes even insulting, even if – or perhaps especially when – they are true! Nevertheless, his style, choice of words, and general way of expressing himself is often so hefty that it makes it difficult for the group to take him seriously. From time to time, his words are so hurtful that his "victim" has difficulty retaining his or her "*contenance*." In fact, one might even get the impression that he is not satisfied until his counterpart has been driven to this point.

In my role as supervisor/consultant, I have again and again tried to interpret these outbreaks less as the aggressive "acting-out" of one individual and

more as the expression of a group phenomenon, a group feeling, a latent, unconscious aggressive attitude of the silent others for which the group has unconsciously "chosen" its most suitable member to act out. That is to say that, because of his personal "valences," as Bion calls them, this group member is particularly suited to act as spokesman for this unconscious group dynamic. But the sentiments he expresses are equally relevant to the group-as-a-whole, not just to the person being addressed.

At this point, someone in the group always cries out, "What's going on here? How are we talking to one another? After all, we are all psychoanalysts!" For sure, the public image of psychoanalysts is that they, of all people, must know better than most how one is meant to deal with one another in a civilized way, particularly in situations of conflict. The person voicing these sentiments then claims that "surely we must be able to manage ourselves so that such uncontrollable, unacceptable expressions and behavior are prevented before they even happen!" Regrettably, one can only reply, "if only that were true!"

Even if we grant the individuals involved the fact that they, of course, do know how to behave and to express themselves properly, then we must conclude, if my hypothesis is correct, that more often than not it is the expression of a latently present group feeling, a perhaps even totally unconscious group dynamic, that it is bound to find a way to express itself, whether loudly or quietly, sooner or later. That is to say, it is useless to try to appeal to the "psychoanalyst" part of the members' personality in an attempt to prevent such things from happening. Quite the opposite, psychoanalysts should actually be the first to recognize that unconscious expressions at the group level cannot be stopped, cannot be suppressed. Perhaps it is even the case that they feel themselves to be unconsciously bound to find expression for what is going on in the group unconscious at the time. But it also has to do with the lack of boundaries and rules of behavior and procedure, which, unfortunately, are typical of psychoanalytic organizations. In any case, it is my subjective impression that this kind of hurtful, injurious behavior and attitude to one another is more prevalent and more damaging than in many other kinds of professional organizations – and this, indeed, may have to do with the following problematic point.

Inner conflict and personal insecurity: lack of detoxification, constructive debate and recycling of the toxic remains of psychoanalytic processes – "*A psychoanalytic training is something from which one needs to recover*!"

It is unfortunately typical for our N-O-W-S Institute that the most bitter controversies and differences of opinion are dealt with at a personal level rather than being discussed and debated on a more objective, factual level, leading to more constructive argument and exchange. Why is that? Are psychoanalysts innately more likely to squabble with one another in this injurious, personalized way than other professional groups? Are we so full of aggression, both our own and that of others, that it constantly threatens to break out at any moment? Why do these differences of opinion so often lead to such hurtful verbal battles, to splits, and to the complete collapse of constructive exchange rather than to constructive compromise, or at least constructive dispute?

It is most likely that we all know the feeling of insecurity when confronted with other ways of seeing things or a different approach that does not coincide with our own, and which therefore puts our position in question. However, as psychoanalysts, we seem to be very bad at defending our point of view vigorously but in a businesslike, matter-of-fact manner, without offending one another so much that the very cohesive fabric of the group and the institution is threatened with being torn apart.

Kirsner claims that that which we understand under the concept of "psychoanalysis" is so amorphous, so complex, and so manifold that no one can claim with total conviction that he or she *is a psychoanalyst* and therefore knows for certain *what psychoanalysis is*, *and what it is not!* This, according to Kirsner, leads to the tendency by many to disqualify everyone whose opinion differs from their own, via negative definition. For if I can claim that whatever the other does or represents or believes *is not psychoanalysis*, it follows that he or she *is* therefore *not a psychoanalyst*. Then, by simply reversing the perspective, I can claim that *I* am the true psychoanalyst, because *I do know what psychoanalysis is and what it is not!*

When controversy is treated so subjectively, therefore precluding the possibility of establishing the kind of factuality that would enable a fair, open, and controversial debate, then capriciousness, injustice, and the unfair misuse of power is the result. Kirsner, as well as many other critical psychoanalytic authors, are insistent in their claim that the so-called "Eitingon" training analyst model is at root responsible for this desolate state of affairs. In our discussions in the N-O-W-S Institute over the last few years, we have explored this point extensively but, unfortunately, have not been able to decide to change it. It is for this reason that the problem remains, presumably until we muster up the courage to change it, or we wait so long that we no longer have a say in how things should be modified in future. For as long as we try to avoid or get rid of the problem by means of "analyzing it away" rather than attempting to ground it in facts and seeking concrete solutions to

it, as long as we do not work at the solution in a role- and task-oriented manner, but continue to argue about it and act it in a "conflict-" or, worse still, "symptom-oriented," even "diagnosis-oriented," manner, our institutions are threatened with being pulled into a maelstrom of political pressure and competitive interests that will drag them under, while others divide the future among themselves.

But the very worst that psychoanalysts do to themselves, at least in our institute, is to *misuse* psychoanalysis as a weapon in order to attack, and presumably "destroy," their competitors within the institution itself. Whenever mud-slinging with psychoanalytic jargon starts, hurtfulness and injury becomes inevitable. This is one of the main reasons, if not the only one, why it is so difficult to find willing volunteers to fill those much-needed main positions of responsibility, as the mere idea that one might become the target for such attacks is reason enough not to put oneself forward for a position of leadership.

With his "*container–contained*" theory (Bion, 1962), we have received from Wilfred Bion an impressive and most useful model for the psychic detoxification of those poisons which are inevitably produced in the course of psychic processes (see Lazar, 2000). This model demonstrates how these "poisons" (for instance, anxiety, insecurity, and/or ignorance) can be "detoxified" and "recycled" through what he calls the "emotional thinking" of the mother/therapist or supervisor/consultant. A Munich colleague, Andreas Hermann, even espouses the view that such "poisons" as those which we "inhale" during the course of many analytic sessions make it difficult for us the work cooperatively with one another in our psychoanalytic institutions. If even more "psychotoxic" waste is produced as a by-product of psychoanalytic training, the training analysis, and the group dynamics in general, then we have a situation which, if we are not careful, is totally poisoned and therefore unable to serve as a fruitful atmosphere for work, psychoanalytic or otherwise. For in such an atmosphere, one "can't catch one's breath" or keep one's head clear in order to apply oneself to the problems at hand.

In other words, psychoanalytic institutes are in dire need of such a "detoxification and recycling" system, which affords the opportunity for psycho-hygiene for both individual and group. This should provide the chance to transform these toxic remains of therapy, training, and even possibly psychotic group processes into useful, flourishing workgroup-oriented actions rather than those which further a basic assumption dynamic. The healthy "oxygen" and energy thus produced should allow the tasks at hand the possibility of being executed in a meaningful, transparent, and fair way and of giving rise to those constructive structures that the group must have in order to function properly.

Changes in the laws governing psychotherapeutic training and the so-called "*Direktausbildung*" (university-based training) – the future of psychoanalytic institutes in Germany: fears, dangers and possibilities

The times in which we live are changing rapidly. Whoever doesn't change with them is lost. Does psychoanalysis in Germany have a future? And what about the rest of the world? If the answer is "yes," then what could it, what must it, look like? A fantasy list of what must, could, and/or would be some of the desirable changes might look like the following:

1. We should no longer speak of psychoanalysis as if it were a specific "thing." "Psychoanalysis" has never had a singular, unique identity, never will have, and never should have. Psychoanalysis exists in all different forms and colors – one variant has no more claim to "be" psychoanalysis than another. Nevertheless, it is still necessary to define what counts as psychoanalytic and what does not.[5]
2. We must dissolve psychoanalytic training institutes in their present form and replace them with something more along the lines of Meltzer's "atelier model" in combination with Kernberg's academic or "university model." The aim should be to produce something more along the lines of a creative "think-tank" as well as a place where theory and technique may be learned and practiced, while the management of the new organization needs to be placed in the hands of external, professional managers – *not* psychoanalysts!
3. We must replace psychoanalytic training as we know it, that is, according to the "Eitingon" model: we must dissolve the status and position of the training analyst and training analyst committees in favor replacing it with the free choice of analyst for every person wanting to train in psychoanalysis.
4. The qualification to offer and carry out psychoanalyses for people wanting to become psychoanalysts themselves should be determined through *public, transparent appointments* that

[5]There seems to be considerable consensus around the idea that, to be considered "psychoanalytic," two elements must be present: an acknowledgement of a "dynamic unconscious" and a notion of "transference" as formulated and developed by Sigmund Freud.

> should be as objectively based as possible, not via the route of "anointment" (as Kirsner put it), as is for the most part the case to date. Clearly defined criteria based on publications, open, objective discussions, and consensus must replace the present arbitrary, unfair, and antiquated way in which training analysts have been selected up until now.

These, according to my experience and the experience of many internationally acknowledged experts, whose publications I have studied and in part cited, are the kinds of radical changes necessary if psychoanalysis is to survive and prosper in future. Steps like these are absolutely necessary to create a healthy and viable psychoanalytic climate not only in Germany, but worldwide.

How much of such radical reforms, if any, are realizable? And when, if ever, might this happen? According to Kirsner, it is already too late. Might not the universities and the more modern institutes either eliminate, claim for themselves, or, through the offering of plausible alternatives, make psychoanalysis as we know it today finally and completely obsolete? Of course, I do not know the answers to these question, but I have heard of late that a new group is forming that intends to split itself off from the present N-O-W-S Institute. Their plan is to make their mark in cooperation with the university and a marketing/PR firm. Their intention is to make what they offer in terms of psychoanalytic training cheaper, fairer, more modern, and more up to date than what the old institute had to offer. They have even modified their name, now calling themselves the "N-E-W-S" institute, which sounds more progressive – although this again stands for North-East-West-South, it also stands for "**N**EW-**E**XPERIMENTAL-**W**ORTHWHILE-**S**CIENTIFIC."

Is this the answer? Will this be the model for psychoanalytic institutes in future? Will this guarantee their survival in the modern, globalized, and media-led world? Is this movement to become the new "phoenix ascending from the ashes" of all that has gone before, or is it merely yet another of the many splits that have characterized the history of psychoanalytic institutions from the very beginning, and which is damned to do no more than offer "old wine in new skins"?

ORCID

Ross A. Lazar http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7669-6396

References

Beland, H. (1986). *Psychoanalyse unter Hitler – Psychoanalyse heute* [Psychoanalysis under Hitler – Psychoanalysis today]. Podium discussion. *Psyche*, *40*, 425–426.

Beland, H. (1988). How they know themselves: Confronting the past – A contribution to the history of the German Psychoanalytic Association. *Psychoanalysis and Contemporary Thought*, *11*, 267–283.

Bion, W.R. (1962). The psycho-analytic study of thinking. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, *43*, 306–310.

Cremerius, J. (1987). *Wenn wir als Psychoanalytiker die psychoanalytische Ausbildung organisieren, müssen wir sie psychoanalytisch organisieren* [When we as psychoanalysts organize analytic training, we must do it in an analytic way]. *Psyche*, *12*, 1067–1096.

Eisold, K. (1994). The intolerance of diversity in psychoanalytic institutes. International *Journal of Psychoanalysis*, *75*, 785–800.

Hermann, A.P. (2014). *Warum es so schwierig ist, in psychoanalytischen Institut(ion)en gedeihlich zusammenzuarbeiten* [Why is it so hard to collaborate in a satisfactory way in analytic institutions?]. *Psyche*, *68*, 97–121.

Hesekiel 28:18. Retrieved from http://www.transcripture.com/deutsch-amerikanische-hesekiel-28.html

Kernberg, O. F. (1986). Institutional problems of psychoanalytic education. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, *34*, 799–834.

Kernberg, O. F. (1996). Thirty methods to destroy the creativity of psychoanalytic candidates. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, *77*, 1031–1040.

Kirsner, D. (2009). *Unfree associations: Inside psychoanalytic institutes*. New York: Jason Aronson.

Kreuzer-Haustein, U. (2002). Psychoanalyse und Psychoanalytiker in Deutschland nach der Shoa. Thesen fuer das Panel [Psychoanalysis and psychoanalysts in Germany after the Shoa. Theses for the panel]. *EPF Bulletin*, *56*, 127–133.

Goethe, J.W. (1809). *Die Wahlverwandtschaften. Aus Ottiliens Tagebuche* [The elective affinities. From Ottilien's diary].

Lazar, R.A. (2000). Container–contained. In W. Mertens and B. Waldvogel (eds.), *Handbuch psychoanalytischer Grundbegriffe* [Handbook of basic psychoanalytic concepts] (pp. 114–118). Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.

Meltzer, D. (1971). Towards an atelier system. In A. Hahn (ed.), *Sincerity and other works* (pp. 285–289). London: Karnac, 1994.

Mitscherlich, A., & Mitscherlich, M. (1967). *Die Unfähigkeit zu trauern. Grundlagen kollektiven Verhaltens*. Munich: R. Piper. English edition: (1975) *The inability to mourn – Principles of collective behavior*. New York: Grove Press.

Zagermann, P. (2014). Theses on the heart of darkness. The unresolved Oedipus complex of psychoanalytic institution formation. In P. Zagermann, *The future of psychoanalysis: The debate about the training analyst system* (pp. 311–337). London: Karnac, 2017.

Author

Ross A. Lazar holds a BA (Hons) in the history of art from the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, and a Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) in early childhood and special education from the Harvard University Graduate School of Education. He trained as a psychoanalytic child and adolescent psychotherapist at the Tavistock Clinic and Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, and was a founder

member and chairman of the Wilfred R. Bion Forum for the Advancement of Psycho-Analysis, as well as a founder member and member of the executive of MundO (sponsoring group relations activities in German-speaking Europe). He was also central in the development of infant observation according to the Tavistock–Bick model, and of initiating its use in the psychoanalytic observation of organizations. He is a member of the International Society for the Psychoanalytic Study of Organizations (ISPSO), the Association of Child Psychotherapists – UK (ACP), the Organization for the Promotion of Understanding in Society (OPUS), and the Infant Observation Study Group, Vienna, and has been a visiting professor at the University of Vienna and the Alpen-Adria University in Klagenfurt, Vienna and Graz. He has also served as a supervisor and coach on the INSEAD Executive Master's program in consulting and coaching for change, Fontainebleau, France.

Appendix 1

In order to be able to work in a large group setting in these institutions,
I formulated a definition of the primary task as follows:

The primary task of this large group is:
To *exchange and explore anything and everything* to do with *your membership* in this institute as it occurs to you *in the here and now*, in order *to learn* from it.

Appendix 2 An anonymized table of the institutions consulted to and the themes of interventions made

Type of Institute	Time span and/or number of meetings	Setting	Number of participants	Themes
1. AFFIL. – I S	2009–1 appointment	Away-day with the board, the training committee, and candidates' representatives	9–11	The future of the institute
2. AFFIL. – II S	2010–1 appointment	Interested members – LG	27–29	Membership of the DPV–IPA; psychotherapy training; finances, lack of candidates, splitting tendencies, competition, standards of training analyses
3. AFFIL. – III S	2013–1 appointment	Interested members – institutional consultation/supervision	12–15	Closing of the adult department?
4. AFFIL. – IV L	2014–2 appointments	Members of the "work group" – institutional consultation/ supervision	33	Identity of the institute; position in the field; not enough new "offspring"; conflicts with the IPA training committee; too much like "school"; too little "heart"
5. AFFIL. – V S	2015–1 appointment	Extended board	5	Future of training (not enough candidates); members' lack of interest; no successors for offices
6. AFFIL. – I L	2009–10 5 sessions	Extended board – institutional consultation/supervision	9–10	New board
7. AFFIL. – II L	2010–2013 3–4 sessions	Members of the "work group" – LG	17–27	Circle of active members; generativity; finances; "paranoid fantasies"
8. AFFIL. – III L	2011–2016 7–8 sessions	Members of the "work group" – LG	8–30	Power/powerlessness; rivalry; envy; murderous tension
9. AFFIL. – IV L	2012–2015/16 5–6 sessions	Members of the "work group" – consultation/supervision	10–20	Confusion of roles, tasks, and boundaries; "It's over!," shut-down; burial
10. IND. – I S	2012–13 3 sessions	Members of the extended board– consultation/supervision	5–6	Succession of leadership
11. IND. – I L	2013–2016 6–8 sessions	Members of the institute – LG	10–15	Democratic understanding of offices versus domination by training analysts; structures; ethics; splitting; misuse of power
12. IND. – II L	2014–2015/16 2 sessions	Members of the institute – LG	20–25	Different societies under one roof

AFFIL, affiliated; IND, independent; L, long; LG, large group; S, short.

International Forum of Psychoanalysis, 2018
Vol. 27, No. 1, 54–69, https://doi.org/10.1080/0803706X.2015.1125018

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

Wilhelm Reich in Soviet Russia: Psychoanalysis, Marxism, and the Stalinist reaction

GALINA HRISTEVA AND PHILIP W. BENNETT

Abstract
In 1929, Wilhelm Reich lectured on "Psychoanalysis as a natural science" before the Communist Academy in Moscow; he was the only Freudian-trained Central European psychoanalyst to do so. That same year, his article "Dialectical materialism and psychoanalysis" was published in the Academy's journal, *Under the Banner of Marxism*, in both Moscow and Berlin. By this time, Reich's involvement with political activism aligned with the Austrian Communist Party was increasing, while simultaneously psychoanalysis in the Soviet Union was in decline. Our paper places these events in their proper historical context and includes a discussion of the various attempts to determine the compatibility of psychoanalysis and Marxism. We offer analyses of both the article, "Dialectical materialism and psychoanalysis," and the lecture, "Psychoanalysis as a natural science," and the reactions to both by Reich's Russian critics. We show the ways in which responses to his lecture foreshadow what becomes the standard Soviet assessment of psychoanalysis. As an appendix to this paper, we provide the first English translation of the Russian account of his lecture, as published in the *Herald of the Communist Academy*.

Key words: *Wilhelm Reich, Soviet Union, psychoanalysis, dialectical materialism*

Wilhelm Reich (1897–1957) was the only Freudian-trained Austrian psychoanalyst to lecture at the Communist Academy in Moscow. By the time he arrived in the late summer of 1929, his own career had taken a decided turn toward political activism aligned with the Austrian Communist Party (hereafter, KPÖ). At the same time, psychoanalysis in the Soviet Union was in decline, having reached its high point around 1924, before Stalin solidified his control of the country. Reich's reception was not particularly comradely, as seen in the Russian commentary on his lecture (Communist Academy, 1929), here published in English for the first time.

We begin with a brief description of psychoanalysis in Russia; we then turn our attention to Reich's life, limiting ourselves to his political thought and activities, and put in context his attempts to incorporate Marxist thought into his psychoanalytic writings. In order to understand his reception when he spoke in Moscow, we consider the changes in attitudes toward psychoanalysis in Russia, following Lenin's death and Stalin's ascendency to power. We provide a critical exposition of Reich's justly famous article, "*Dialektischer Materialismus und Psychoanalyse*" (Dialectical materialism and psychoanalysis; Reich, 1929a, 1929b), which appeared while he was in Moscow, and consider Sapir's criticisms of it (Sapir, 1929, 1930). We conclude with Reich's lecture and the recorded rejoinders to it, and indicate the ways in which responses to his lecture foreshadow what would become the standard Soviet assessment of psychoanalysis.

Psychoanalysis in Russia prior to the rise of Stalin

Before the revolution, indeed before World War I, a few Russians studied psychoanalysis, but did so in Berlin, Zurich, and Vienna: Moshe Wulff spent time in Berlin and worked with Karl Abraham; Sabina Spielrein, Carl Jung's patient and protégée, studied medicine in Zurich, as did Tatiana Rosenthal. But inside Imperial Russia, psychoanalysis was due to Nikolai Osipov, who discovered Freud's writings in 1907. In 1908, Osipov published a review article in Russian of all of Freud's writings up to that point. In 1910, he visited Freud; he was the first Russian psychoanalyst to do so. That same year, Osipov, together with Nikolai Vyrubov, began a journal, *Psychotherapia*, and soon the overwhelming

Correspondence: Galina Hristeva, Schleifbrueckenstr. 11/1, 73430 Aalen/Germany. E-mail: galina.hristeva@gmx.de

(*Received 30 July 2015; accepted 22 November 2015*)
© 2016 The International Federation of Psychoanalytic Societies

majority of articles in it were on psychoanalysis. Osipov also played a role in having all of Freud's work translated into Russian, a first for any language. In 1911, the same year the New York Psychoanalytic Society was founded by A.A. Brill, the Russian Psychoanalytic Society in Moscow was founded and led by Osipov. In 1912, Freud, in a letter to Jung, wrote of a "local epidemic of psychoanalysis" in Russia (Freud & Jung, 1974, p. 548).[1]

Following the Bolshevik takeover, Soviet Russia became a site of revolution in the arts (Guggenheim Museum, 1992) and society,[2] despite the devastation of World War I and the horrors of the postrevolution civil war. Those interested in radical sexual/social reforms much admired such policies as the legal equality of genders, guaranteed in 1917; new laws permitting the easy dissolution of a marriage; the elimination of the legal category of a child born out of wedlock; the decriminalization of homosexuality (at least in Russia, if not all the Soviet Republics); and the legalization of abortion under all circumstances in 1920, a global first. All these reforms compared quite favorably with the Marxist Social Democratic "Red Vienna" where Reich lived, beginning in June 1918, or the Weimar Republic in Germany where Reich moved late in 1930. Once politicized, Reich would often refer to these reforms as exemplars. Later, as many of them were modified or ended by Stalin, Reich offered a trenchant condemnatory analysis of the reversal in the second half of his famous *The sexual revolution*, originally published in 1936 as *Die Sexualität im Kulturkampf. Zur sozialistischen Umstrukturierung des Menschen* (Sexuality in the cultural struggle: On the socialist restructuring of man; Reich, 1936), and then in English in 1945 as *The sexual revolution: Toward a self-governing character structure* (Reich, 1945).

As for psychoanalysis under Bolshevism, things started off quite positively. In 1920, Tatiana Rosenthal established a separate school in Petrograd for children with neurotic problems and learning disabilities, where psychoanalytic psychotherapy was the primary mode of treatment. The following year, inspired perhaps by Rosenthal's school in Petrograd, Vera Schmidt opened *Detski Dom*, the Children's Home.[3] The school was a unique experiment, an attempt to raise and educate young children from a psychoanalytic perspective, or, as Reich points out in his *Sexual revolution*, "the first attempt in the history of education to give practical content to the theory of infantile sexuality" (Reich, 1945; English edition, 1974, p. 260; for his general discussion, see 1974, pp. 254–261).[4]

The Children's Home was one of five branches of the Psychoanalytic Institute, headed by Otto Schmidt,[5] Vera Schmidt's husband; another branch was an outpatient clinic run by Sabina Spielrein, who had returned to Moscow in 1923 and also worked at the school.

In April 1923, the school received an unfavorable inspection. Soon thereafter, in September, Otto and Vera Schmidt went to Vienna, met with Freud and others, including Reich, and spoke about the school. By July 1924, it became apparent that continuing was not possible, and the school was closed early in 1925 (Etkind, 1997; Miller, 1998).

Wilhelm Reich: Psychoanalysis, and Marxism, in theory and practice

Early in his career, Reich showed little interest in politics (Higgins, 1994, p. xiii), but by the time he completed the manuscript for *Die Funktion des Orgasmus* in 1926, he had clearly read Marxist literature and had begun to incorporate it into his writings. He was not the first in Freud's circle to do so. Alfred Adler gave a paper to the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society entitled "The psychology of Marxism" in March 1909 (Nunberg & Federn, 1976–1981, II, pp. 155–156). And Adler's bringing together Freud and Marx was probably predated, at least in her thinking, by Tatiana Rosenthal, who discovered Freud during her medical training in Zurich (*circa* 1907), and declared, "What harmony results when

[1]This brief summary of Osipov's role in establishing psychoanalysis in Russia is derived from Etkind, 1997; Miller, 1998; and Van der Veer, 2011. For more on Osipov's relation with Freud, see Hristeva (2013).

[2]There are numerous sources describing the early social changes following the Revolution, especially with reference to sexuality and the family, which, naturally, were of greatest interest to Reich; here we recommend Max Hodann's *History of modern morals*, since Reich was very familiar with Hodann's work (Hodann, 1937). In Reich's *Sexual excitation and sexual satisfaction*, he himself lists Batkis's *Die Sexualrevolution in Russland* (1928) and three books by Hodann as suggested "Further Reading." See also Stern (1980).

[3]The official leaders of the school were Ermakov and Wulff, but the school was actually run by Vera Schmidt, who was not formally acknowledged because she lacked a medical degree (Miller, 1998, p. 64).

[4]For a much fuller analysis see Schmidt's (1924) *Psychoanalytische Erziehung in Sowjetrussland: Bericht über das Kinderheim-Laboratorium in Moskau* (Psychoanalytic education in Soviet Russia: A report about the Lab-school in Moscow), published by Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag. It was later issued in French, but never in Russian.

[5]Otto Schmidt was a mathematician and explorer who was vice-president of the Academy of Science; headed the State Publishing House (1921–1924); was chief editor of the *Great Soviet encyclopedia* (1924–1941); ran the Russian Psychoanalytic Institute, which opened in 1922; was the publisher of the Psychological and Psychoanalytic Library series – profits from the sale of its books went to fund his wife's school; and eventually became a hero of the USSR discussed in school textbooks (Etkind, 1997, p. 193 and *passim*; Miller, 1998, pp. 87–88).

one brings together the ideas of Freud and Marx!" (Neiditsch, 1921, pp. 384–385). In addition, Siegfried Bernfeld, inspired by discussions with Paul Federn on psychoanalysis and Austro-Marxism (Dudek, 2012, p. 112), published his *Sisyphos oder Die Grenzen der Erziehung* (Sisyphus or the limits of education) in 1925, in which he made explicit his commitment to both Marx and Freud: "Both Marx and Freud are right, but not the Marxists or the Freudians" (Bernfeld, 1925; English edition, 1973, p. 64).

Reich's new found interest in Marxism is most evident in the final chapter of *Funktion*, "The social significance of genital strivings." With reference to this chapter, Robert Corrington observes that it marks

> a clear transition between his classical (but renegade) psychoanalysis and his emerging left-wing thought, in which he sees social structures as shaping and damaging genital libido in ways that the Vienna analysts failed to recognize. In his view, patients could not be cured without a reconstruction of the entire social order; healing was not a matter of adjustment but would require a revolution of sexual attitudes. (Corrington, 2003, p. 83)

Reich contracted tuberculosis in 1926 and returned to Vienna from treatment at the "Magic Mountain" at Davos only a few weeks before July 15, 1927, the day Reich became politicized (Rabinbach, 1973, p. 91).

On July 14, 1927, three reactionaries, in what was clearly a politically disgraceful trial,[6] were acquitted of killing a war veteran and a young boy, and wounding four others; the victims were all associated with the Social Democratic Workers Party (SDAP), the ruling party of "Red Vienna."[7] The next day, workers left their jobs and marched on the Palace of Justice, eventually setting it ablaze. The police responded by firing into the crowd, killing around 90 people, and wounding nearly a thousand. Reich was an eye-witness to these events (Reich, 1953a; English edition, 1976, pp. 22–47), and that very day secretly joined the Communist Party, while publically remaining a member of the Social Democrats. In October 1928, Reich was part of a Communist contingent that sought to prevent open conflict between right-wing Christian Socials and the Austro-Marxist Social Democrats in Wiener Neustadt (Gulick, 1948, pp. 790–797; Rabinbach, 1983, pp. 55–57; Reich, 1953a; English edition, 1976, pp. 81–90). In December 1928, together with the Communist physician Marie Frischauf, he founded the *Sozialistische Gesellschaft für Sexualberatung und Sexualforschung* (Socialist Society for Sex Counseling and Research, hereafter the SgSS; Fallend, 1988, p. 67); this led the following year to Reich's first public speeches on sexual matters from both a Marxist and a psychoanalytic perspective (Mesner, 2007, p. 48; McEwen, 2012, p. 133). In addition to sponsoring public lectures and free sexual counseling and legal advice, the SgSS published literature; their first publication was Reich's *Sexualerregung und Sexualbefriedigung* (Sexual excitation and sexual satisfaction; Reich, 1929c), a unique pamphlet written in an accessible style, offering psychoanalytic insights in a Marxist context. The following year, the SgSS published *Ist Abtreibung schädlich?* (Is abortion harmful?), written by Reich's first wife, Annie Pink Reich, and Marie Frischauf (Frischauf & Reich, 1930); that year they also published Reich's lain *Geschlechtsreife, Enthaltsamkeit, Ehemoral. Eine Kritik der bürgerlichen Sexualreform* (Adolescence, abstinence, marital morality: A criticism of bourgeois sex-reform; Reich, 1930).

The decline of psychoanalysis: From Bolshevism to Stalinism

Reich's increasing political engagement, his impatience with liberal reformists and compromising Austro-Marxist Social Democrats, and his admiration for the social and sexual changes in Soviet Russia all contributed to his desire to see for himself and travel to Moscow. At the same time, however, psychoanalysis became a contested site within the wider conflict of the power struggle between Trotsky and Stalin, between Bolshevism and Stalinism.

Whatever enthusiasm greeted the revolution, by 1921 many prominent intellectuals and artists fled to the West. Within the psychoanalytic community, there were two major losses: Rosenthal tragically committed suicide (Neiditsch, 1921), and Osipov fled to Prague (Hristeva, 2013). Osipov, a liberal bourgeois, felt a deep "aversion" toward "all socialist movements" and found Bolshevism, with its disregard for the individual, thoroughly "unacceptable." His attitude toward Bolshevism remained "unshakably negative" over the years (Freud & Osipov 2009, p. 176). His essay "Revolution and dream" (1931) is a rigorous attack on the October revolution and Bolshevism (Hristeva, 2013).

After the death of Lenin in 1924, there was a major shift in the realization of progressive social ideas

[6]Later, Reich described the judges as monarchist reactionaries (Reich, 1953a; English edition, 1976, p. 23).
[7]The country as a whole was run by the right-wing Christian Socials, led by an antisemitic Jesuit priest, Ignaz Seipel (Rabinbach, 1983).

generally and psychoanalysis in particular. According to Martin Miller, Lenin showed a genuine interest in psychoanalysis (Miller, 1998, pp. 85–87; see also Tögel, 1988). But Lenin's rule ended in effect following his third stroke in 1923; he died early in 1924. After his death, a power struggle ensued between Stalin, general secretary of the Party since 1922, and Trotsky, leader of the Red Army during the civil war. Prior to this, Trotsky had exerted important influence concerning the positive reception to psychoanalysis. Miller quotes from a letter Trotsky wrote to Pavlov in 1923: "During my years in Vienna, I came in rather close contact with the Freudians, read their work and even attended their meetings" (Miller, 1998, p. 87; see also Etkind, 2003, pp. 81–83). In his 1924 *Literature and revolution*, Trotsky suggested that Freud's psychoanalysis can be seen as compatible with dialectical materialism (Miller, 1998, p. 87), precisely the argument Reich would make five years later.[8]

Trotsky's support of psychoanalysis was a blessing as long as he had influence, but with Stalin's ascendency to power, the identification with Trotsky soon turned to a curse. Trotsky was expelled from the Communist Party in 1927, expelled from the Communist Academy in 1928, and exiled from the Soviet Union in 1929. With Stalin's solidification of his control came a major shift in the attitudes toward psychoanalysis (Kadyrov, 2010, p. 222).

Either in reaction to or despite Trotsky's comment about the compatibility of Freud and Marx, beginning in 1924, debate began on this topic in Russian scholarly journals. There appeared a series of articles with the same title, "Freudism and Marxism," the first by a major supporter of psychoanalysis, at least at that time, Aron Zalkind. But it was soon followed by Jurinetz's "Freudism and Marxism," published in the fall of 1924, where the author claimed, directly contradicting Trotsky, that "Freudian theory was utterly incompatible with Marxist philosophy … " (Miller, 1998, p. 78). Sapir, who would be one of Reich's major critics, published his own "Freudism and Marxism" in 1926; he argued that "'sexualism as a universal doctrine of the human psyche' was exaggerated and empirically unfounded in Freud's work" (Miller, 1998, p. 84).

Although some within the Russian psychoanalytic community rose to Freud's defense – Wulff and Friedmann to name two (Luria, 1926) – the attacks continued, with Voloshinov's book *Freudianism*, published in 1927, the most important. He too objected to the "overestimation of the sexual." In a chapter entitled, "A critique of Marxist apologies of Freudianism," Voloshinov directly criticized Zalkind, Alexander Luria, and others. Luria, anticipating the possible political implications of this critique, resigned as secretary of the Russian Psychoanalytic Society and the following year published an article entitled "Psychology in Russia," without once mentioning psychoanalysis (Luria, 1928).[9] Zalkind too began retreating and, along with Sapir, offered very critical comments in response to Reich's lecture, which we discuss below. At this time, Freud reported to Osipov that the situation of Russian psychoanalysts was "pretty bad" (letter dated February 23, 1927, Freud & Osipov, 2009, p. 71).

Reich's "*Dialektischer Materialismus und Psychoanalyse*"

It was during this period of increasing attacks on psychoanalysis that Reich wrote "Dialectical materialism and psychoanalysis." Written in German, a Russian translation appeared in *Pod Znamenem Marksizma* (*Under the Banner of Marxism*), in Moscow (Reich 1929a), and soon thereafter in the Berlin-based German version of the journal, *Unter dem Banner des Marxismus* (Reich, 1929b), both in the fall of 1929. It is significant that *Under the Banner of Marxism* was one of two official journals published in association with the Communist Academy (Krementsov, 2010, p. 222); the other, *Vestnik Kommunisticheskoi Akademii* (*Herald of the Communist Academy*), is where the synopsis of Reich's lecture and the responses to it appeared, and is here published for the first time in English.

It has often been remarked that Reich's work marks a *synthesis* of Freud and Marx (Etkind, 1997; Gordon, 1980; Poster, 1985; Robinson, 1969). This is not the case: rather than a synthesis, in "Dialectical materialism and psychoanalysis" Reich is determined to show that there is no incompatibility between psychoanalysis, properly understood, and Marxist dialectical materialism.[10] Further, he maintains that at one point in Marxist theory, the way in which the economic base actually shapes the ideology of a given society, psychoanalysis can play the important role of explaining the details of the movement from materialist economics to "ideas in the head" (Reich, 1929b).

Reich begins by agreeing with those critics who take psychoanalysis to task for extending it outside its

[8]Beginning in 1933, Trotsky and Reich exchanged a number of letters, and in 1936 secretly met while both were in exile in Oslo. See Bennett (2014, pp. 100–101).
[9]For more on Luria's reversal, see Wortis (1950, p. 74).
[10]Anson Rabinbach is one of the few scholars correctly to describe Reich's viewpoint (Rabinbach, 1983, p. 67).

proper limits and recasting it as a "*Weltanschauung*," in which case it comes into direct conflict with Marxist world philosophy. For Reich, psychoanalysis, properly understood, is "nothing more than a psychological method using the means of natural science for describing and explaining man's inner life as a specific part of nature" (Reich, 1929b; English translation, 1966, p. 6). The second justified criticism is that while psychoanalysis correctly studies humans who are socially and historically situated, social phenomena are beyond its reach and properly belong to Marxist sociology: "the phenomenon of class consciousness is not accessible to psychoanalysis, nor can problems which belong to sociology[11] – such as mass movements, politics, strikes – be taken as objects of the psychoanalytic method" (p. 7). Psychoanalysis can serve as an adjunct to Marxist sociology, but cannot replace it. "As a science, psychoanalysis is on equal footing with Marxian sociological doctrine: the former treats of psychological phenomena and the latter of social phenomena" (p. 7).

But Marxism is more than a science of society; it is also a philosophy of science, "dialectical materialism." So, if we accept the psychological/social divide, psychoanalysis may still be in conflict with Marxism if it is not dialectical. Reich then sets out to prove "that psychoanalysis – if only unconsciously, like so many natural sciences – has actually stumbled upon a materialist dialectic in its own sphere and developed certain theories accordingly" (pp. 8–9).

Following an explanation of dialectical materialism, Reich shows that the psychological processes uncovered by psychoanalysis can be understood within its framework. In the course of this discussion, for the first time, he refers to something being both identical and antithetical. (His example is the relationship between sexuality and anxiety, but the pair love and hate are also used.) This notion of simultaneous identity and antithesis, and its part in the dialectical process, was later applied by Reich to his biological studies of microorganisms (Strick, 2015, pp. 46–57, pp. 330–331).

At one point in this section he applies an economic analysis to the origins of neuroses: "Reduced to the most simple formula, the economic structure of society … enters into a reciprocal relation with the instincts, or ego, of the new-born." A contradiction arises between the instinctual needs of the child and the repressive social order within which she lives, but since the social order is firmly established, the contradiction leads to change in the child's psychological structure, that is, the development of neurosis (Reich, 1929b; English edition, 1966, p. 31).

The section concludes with the crucial passage as to how psychoanalysis can add to Marxist sociology:

> Between the two terminal points – the economic structure of society at the one end, the ideological superstructure at the other, … the psychoanalyst sees a number of stages. Psychoanalysis proves that the economic structure of society does not directly transform itself into ideologies "inside the head." Instead it shows that the instinct for nourishment (self-preservation instinct), the manifestations of which are dependent upon given economic conditions, affects and changes the workings of the sexual instinct, which is far more plastic (i.e., malleable). … This means that psychoanalysis has its proper place within the materialist view of history at a very specific point: at that point where psychological questions arise as a result of the Marxian thesis that material existence transforms itself into "ideas inside the head." (pp. 36–37)

In the final section of the article, Reich raises the following question: is neurosis a modern phenomenon connected with capitalism? His answer:

> Just as Marxism was sociologically the expression of man *becoming conscious* of the laws of economics and the exploitation of a majority by a minority, so psychoanalysis is the expression of man becoming conscious of the social repression of sex. Such is the principal social meaning of Freudian psychoanalysis. But whereas one class exploits and another is exploited, sexual repression extends over all classes. Seen from the viewpoint of the history of man, sexual repression is even older than the exploitation of one class by another. But it is not quantitatively equal in all classes. (p. 41)

Given the obvious conflict between bourgeois sexual morality and psychoanalysis, what is likely in time to unfold? Either society will change or psychoanalysis will get watered down; but the latter has already happened, given the increasing denial of the centrality of sexual repression in the origin of neuroses. In the hands of some, "we hardly recognize it as the work of Freud" (p. 42). "The work done becomes milder, gentler, more inclined to compromise" (p. 44).

> the capitalist mode of existence of our time is strangling psychoanalysis from the outside and the inside. Freud is right: his science is being destroyed; but we add: in bourgeois society.

[11]It should be noted that here and elsewhere "sociology" and "scientific sociology" are used by Reich as synonyms for "Marxism."

> If psychoanalysis refuses to adapt itself to that society, it will be destroyed for certain; if it does adapt itself, it will suffer the same fate as Marxism suffers at the hands of reformist socialists[12] … Because psychoanalysis, unless it is watered down, undermines bourgeois ideology, and because, furthermore, only a socialist economy can provide a basis for the free development of intellect and sexuality alike, psychoanalysis has a future only under socialism. (p. 45)

Sapir's rejoinder: "*Freudismus, Soziologie, Psychologie*"

The first part of I.D. Sapir's "Freudism, sociology and psychology" appeared directly after Reich's "Dialectical materialism and psychoanalysis" in the same issue of *Under the Banner of Marxism*; the second part appeared in the very next issue.[13] That it appeared directly after Reich's article is an indication that Reich's ideas did not sit well with the relevant Party intellectuals.[14] Indeed, Reich's article was accompanied by an explicit disavowal of its theoretical content: "The editorial board considers it necessary to point out that it does not share the exposition and evaluation of Freudian theory given by the author. A detailed criticism of this paper follows in the next issue of our journal" (Reich, 1929b, fn. 1, p. 736; Sandkühler, 1970, fn. 1, p. 137).[15]

Sapir's article is an extensive discussion of psychoanalysis and "Freudism," their scientific content, and their compatibility or lack thereof with Marxism and historical materialism; it is only partially devoted to a response to Reich's article. Here we will focus solely on Sapir's criticism of Reich.

One of Sapir's major responses to Reich is an accusation of inconsistency. As we saw, Reich insists that psychoanalysis is devoted to the study and treatment of the *individual*, while Marxism provides the scientific sociology needed to understand *society*; and, also noted above, Reich argues that psychoanalysis can provide the needed analysis of the missing steps between the economic base and the ideology associated with it. Reich's analysis begins with the following passage:

> These considerations can lead us to realize that psychoanalysis, by virtue of its method, can reveal the instinctual roots of the individual's social activity, and by virtue of its dialectical theory of instincts can clarify, in detail, the psychological effects of production conditions upon the individual: can clarify, that is to say, the way that ideologies are formed "inside the head." (Reich, 1929b; English edition, 1966, p. 36)[16]

Reich wrote his article in German, and it was then translated into Russian; we assume that Sapir read the Russian version of Reich's text and wrote his response to it in Russian as well. Later his response was translated into German, and published in *Unter dem Banner des Marxismus* (Sapir, 1929, 1930). Sapir's charge of inconsistency rests in part on the passage just quoted, but where Reich refers to "*Produktionsverhältnisse im Individuum*," production conditions upon the *individual*, whereas when Sapir quotes this passage, this phrase has been changed to "*Produktivkräfte in der Gesellschaft*," the productive forces in *society* (Sandkühler, 1970, p. 194; Sapir 1929, p. 940). This does not appear to be an intentional misquotation on Sapir's part, as the Russian text, which we assume came first, also has changed Reich's reference to the individual to a reference to society (Reich, 1929a, p. 201). While we have no way of knowing if this change, made by the translator or the editor, was intended to put Reich's position into obvious conflict with Marxism and thereby easier to dismiss, it is certainly *not* a typographical error. To the degree that Sapir's charge of inconsistency rests upon this misquoted passage, to that degree it has no legitimate force.

A second area of contention is Reich's (and Freud's and others') reference to *Triebe*, *drives*, though the term is generally translated into English as *instincts* (Young-Bruehl, 2011, fn. 2, p. 182). Sapir seems to assume that references to biological drives are on par with referencing the instinctual

---

[12]Here Reich is clearly alluding to the Austro-Marxists of Red Vienna.

[13]In our discussion, we rely on the German version of both parts, as they appeared in *Unter dem Banner des Marxismus* (Sapir, 1929, 1930). They are also reprinted in Sandkühler (1970, pp. 189–246). Given the wider accessibility of the Sandkühler collection, we reference it as well.

[14]In his "The position of psychoanalysis in the Soviet Union," published after his visit to Moscow, Reich refers to Sapir as an official representative of the Communist Academy (Reich, 1929d, p. 81). For a detailed account of Sapir's criticisms and how Reich might meet them, see Sinelnikov (1972). According to Sinelnikov, Sapir's critique became the basis for the later entry on Freudianism in the *Great Soviet encyclopedia* and represented the official response to Reich's ideas.

[15]This disclaimer is not included in any of the English translations of Reich's article; quoted here is a translation from the German version.

[16]In the original German, the passage reads as follows:

> *Diese Erwägungen gestatten aber die Annahme, dass die Psychoanalyse kraft ihrer Methode, die triebhaften Wurzeln der gesellschaftlichen Tätigkeit des Individuums aufzudecken, und kraft ihrer dialektischen Trieblehre berufen ist, die psychische Auswirkung der* ***Produktionsverhältnisse im Individuum****, das heißt die Bildung der Ideologien "im Menschenkopfe" im Detail zu klären* (Reich, 1929b, p. 762; Sandkühler, 1970, p. 176, emphasis added).

The reason for emphasizing the "production conditions upon the individual" will become apparent.

lives of animals, which are not mediated by consciousness. How can one speak of class consciousness, Sapir asks, if we are governed by instincts (Sandkühler, 1970, pp. 222–223; Sapir, 1930, pp. 130–131)? While Sapir is correct in seeing in Reich an adherence to a biological basis for his ideas in his reference to the "instinctual roots of the individual's social activity," drawn from the passage quoted directly above (just one of his many references to *Triebe* in the essay), Sapir chooses to ignore or at least downplay Reich's understanding of the social moment, and the way that the biological and social are intertwined. Nowhere does Reich suggest that the biologically grounded drives stand alone, uninfluenced by the social context in which they are expressed. Instead of claiming that individuals are "creatures that blindly succumb to the play of the instinctive forces governing them," as interpreted by Sapir (1930, p. 131; Sandkühler, 1970, pp. 222–223), Reich – like the early Freud – always stressed the complex interplay between the drives and society by insisting that the drives are shaped and sometimes even obstructed by the individual's social life. In contrast, Sapir firmly believes that drives are considered by Reich (and psychoanalysis) as the crucial and most "powerful determining factor" in the individual's development (Sandkühler, 1970, p. 236; Sapir, 1930, p. 140) and are given an undeserved priority, to the disadvantage of the social factor (Sandkühler 1970, p. 234; Sapir, 1930, p. 139). Sapir's rejection of psychoanalysis's "biologism" seems to be based at least in part on a misunderstanding.[17]

Finally, Sapir reiterated his earlier criticism, claiming that sexuality is overemphasized in Reich's article (Sandkühler, 1970, p. 236; Sapir, 1930, pp. 139–140).

Reich in Moscow

Reich traveled to Moscow with his wife, Annie Pink Reich, in September 1929. They spent six weeks in Moscow and the nearby countryside, lived with Otto and Vera Schmidt, and visited kindergartens, pioneer camps, factories, and a variety of social institutions, including the famous showcase rehabilitation prison camp, Bolshevo.[18]

Reich lectured at least twice, once at the Moscow Neuropsychological Institute, headed by a Professor Rosenstein, and at the Communist Academy. As previously noted, the Communist Academy had two official publications, *Under the Banner of Marxism* and the *Herald of the Communist Academy* (Krementsov, 1997, 2010, 2011). That Reich's "Dialectical materialism and psychoanalysis" appeared in one and that his lecture before the Academy was described in detail in the other, is no small matter. The very fact that Reich was invited to speak before the Academy is in itself quite remarkable: the Communist Academy, along with the Sverdlov Communist University, and the Institute of Red Professors were "the most prominent centers of Bolshevik training and thought in the 1920s" (David-Fox, 1997, p. 1). The Academy is claimed to have "produced some of the best Marxist scholarship in Soviet history" (Graham, 1993, p. 86), and the *Herald* was considered "the major Marxist social science journal" (Beirne & Sharlet, 1990, p. 27).[19]

The Communist Academy began as the Socialist Academy of the Social Sciences in 1918. Its founders envisioned it as a revolutionary alternative to the Russian Academy of Sciences, which they considered a bourgeois institution.[20] Initially, the Socialist Academy welcomed those of various shades of "Red" – Mensheviks, non-Communist socialists – but with time, and its name change to the Communist Academy in 1924, came a greater sense of orthodoxy: "socialist unity was … replaced by Bolshevik primacy" (David-Fox, 1997, p. 198). Increasingly, "the autonomy of the Communist Academy began to shrink. In January, 1927, Stalin, Molotov and Rykov were elected to membership, apparently as a gesture of the Academy's political orthodoxy" (Joravsky, 1961, p. 88). The following year, Trotsky was expelled and soon thereafter forced to leave the country. Given Trotsky's dismissal from the Academy and his strong identification with psychoanalysis, the highly critical reception Reich received when he spoke there in September 1929 is no surprise.

A synopsis of Reich's lecture "Psychoanalysis as a natural science," and the responses to it, are published below. It is worth noting that in the responses to Reich's lecture we see the seeds of what would become the standard Soviet narrative of psychoanalysis beginning around 1930, the year of the final report about the activities of the Russian Psychoanalytic Society to the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*.

[17]In his "The position of psychoanalysis in the Soviet Union," Reich reaches much the same conclusion: "Sapir's attacks are directed in part against theses which psychoanalysis has never advanced … " (Reich, 1929d, p. 84).
[18]Fenichel visited the camp a year later, and wrote glowingly about it (Fenichel, 1931).
[19]As David-Fox states in his book, *Revolution of the mind: Higher learning among the Bolsheviks*, the leadership of the Communist Academy wanted to maintain a "hierarchy of publications": while it considered *Vestnik* [*Herald*] a journal for scientific research, *Pod znamenem marksizma* [*Under the Banner of Marxism*] was viewed as a "fighting Marxist polemical organ" (David-Fox, 1997, p. 226).
[20]Prior to 1929, no member of the Academy of Sciences belonged to the Communist Party (David-Fox, 1997, p. 204).

For the English translation of the full text, please see the Appendix.

Here are a few of the "seeds" planted in the responses to Reich:

- According to Wortis, an important feature of Marxism as applied to any psychological theory is that theory cannot be divorced from practice (see Zalmanson's reply to Reich). Wortis attributes this to Lenin's *theory of reflection*, and at least one of Reich's critics seems to refer to this theory (see Sapir's response).
- Tatiana Zarubina has argued that an important reason for the Soviets' turn against psychoanalysis, following their early enthusiasm, was an increasing emphasis on the totality of the subject, over and against psychoanalysis' perceived trifurcation of the subject, into either id, ego, superego or conscious, preconscious, unconscious (Zarubina, 2008, p. 268). This resistance to the divided self can be found in Zalkind's response to Reich.
- In his response to Reich, Sapir repeats his attack on *biologism*; it fits well with and partially explains the "desexualized" Freud in Russia: "If the unconscious and the sphere of desire take the central or even a significant place, the Subject loses its status of autonomous authority that controls everything" (Zarubina, 2008, p. 278).

These seeds took root, and by the time of the 1935 edition of the *Great Soviet encyclopedia*, the entry on Freudianism included the claims that "Freudianism has nothing in common with Marxism," and that "extreme individualism, pleasure drives, eroticism – all these are characteristic features of the ideology of the decaying bourgeoisie" (as quoted by Wortis, 1950, p. 78).

Conclusion: The aftermath of Reich's visit to Moscow

Upon his return, Reich spoke about his visit to the Vienna Psychoanalytic Association in early November (Jokl, 1930, p. 281). Soon thereafter, his remarks were published as, "*Die Stellung der Psychoanalyse in der Sowjetunion. Notizen einer Studienreise in Rußland*" (The position of psychoanalysis in the Soviet Union: Notes from a study tour in Russia; Reich, 1929d) in *Die Psychoanalytische Bewegung* (*The Psychoanalytic Movement*). This article, and his activities to follow it, show a Reich who is a dedicated Communist, one willing to ignore Stalin's increasingly authoritarian control, one willing to justify the party line and forfeit, at least publically, whatever doubts or reservations he had about Soviet machinations.

One example: this article includes a section devoted to the "political and economic situation of the Soviet Union today," upholding the "the success of the great cause" (Reich 1929d, p. 80), without a single reference to the conflict represented by Trotsky's Left Opposition to Stalin; Stalin's victory in the power struggle; Trotsky's expatriation; and the increasing authoritarianism in all aspects of life, science included. He does acknowledge the Soviet suspicion of theories from the West – specifically psychoanalysis – but then provides a justification for their suspicion: "it is understandable that proletarian leaders today want to preserve it [Marxism] from any contamination by other theories and doctrines. They want to keep Marxism pure" (p. 78).

One more example: Reich writes as if the acceptance of psychoanalysis by "the true Marxist" is a foregone conclusion. He says that psychoanalysis is "bound to achieve recognition," that it "will eventually be accepted," will inevitably "come into its own" (Reich, 1929d, pp. 85, 87, 88). But we know now – could one have not seen the signs then? – that official psychoanalysis would come to an end the following year.

In his authoritative biography of Reich in Vienna, Karl Fallend sees this article as an indication that Reich had adopted the Stalinist personality cult (Fallend, 1988, p. 155). Although understandable, we do not share this conviction: we leave for another occasion the detailed discussion which would have to include Reich's relationship with Willi Schlamm and Schlamm's expulsion from the Central Committee of the KPÖ in 1929. Fallend also asserts that Reich embraced the "Social Fascism" theory (p. 173),[21] but nowhere in Reich's writings do we find him using this phrase, and later, in his addendum to the second edition of *Mass psychology of Fascism* (Reich, 1934), he denounces the German Communist Party precisely for acting as if the real enemy were the Social Democrats, instead of making common cause with them against the Nazis.

Still, Reich's article is quite disturbing.[22] In the following issue of *Die Psychoanalytische Bewegung*, it was strongly denounced by Moshe Wulff (1930), who had fled the Soviet Union in 1927.[23] It also provided

[21]This view, propagated beginning in 1924, and soon endorsed by Stalin, was that Social Democrats and National Socialists were "twin brothers" (Hildebrand, 1986, p. 106).

[22]Here, we note that Reich does not include this article in his official bibliography published in 1953, although he does mention his lectures in Moscow (Reich, 1953b, p. 35).

[23]In 1933, Wulff emigrated to Israel and, together with Max Eitingon, founded the Psychoanalytic Society of Israel. For more on Wulff, see Kloocke (2002).

fodder (if more were needed) for Bernfeld's attack on Reich in his 1932 rejoinder to Reich's article on masochism and the death instinct (Bernfeld, 1932; Reich, 1932). We think it is safe to say that this article of Reich's was the first step along the path that eventually led to Reich's expulsion from the International Psychoanalytic Association in 1934 (Lothane, 2001, 2003; Nitzschke, 2002, 2003; Peglau, 2013; Reich Rubin, 2003; Steiner, 2011).

In early December 1929, Reich took on the leadership of the left opposition to the SDAP and, together with Comrades Schurk and Hrach, formed the Revolutionary Social Democrats (Fallend, 1988, p. 179). This splinter group held its first and only public meeting on December 13, 1929, at which time Reich gave a completely political speech, without a single reference to psychoanalysis; the meeting ended in a riot (Fallend, 1988, p. 184; Fallend, 2008, pp. 53–55; Rabinbach, 1983, pp. 69–70; Reich, 1953a, English edition, 1976, pp. 116–117). The following month, Reich was tried by the Social Democratic Party and expelled from the Party. That spring, Reich gave a number of speeches encouraging Social Democrats to abandon their party for the Revolutionary Social Democrats, which was assumed to be a Communist front. Eventually, the Revolutionary Social Democrats dissolved, and their membership went over to the KPÖ. That November (1930), Reich ran for Parliament on the Communist Party ticket; soon thereafter, he left for Berlin, to a Germany with a much better organized and effective Communist Party.

As for Reich's impact on psychoanalysis in the Soviet Union, in 1939 Elias Perepel, a psychoanalyst living in Leningrad, wrote an article on the Soviet psychoanalytic movement for the "Notes and News" section of the US-based *Psychoanalytic Review* (Perepel, 1939). Perepel sketched out the history of the movement, noting that "about the year 1930 [it] came to a standstill. From this date it officially ceased to exist, and all publications of its work ceased likewise" (Perepel, 1939, p. 299). Perepel reported on the various articles attempting a rapprochement between "Freudian and Marxian" thought, and then those insisting on the incompatibility of the two. He summarized the objections to psychoanalysis enumerated above, and then said that "such a critique has not been met with any rebuttal nor even elucidation … Isolated attempts to clarify the question have been without success" (p. 300). And what of Reich's attempts to do just that, to show that there is no incompatibility, to elucidate strategies for future development? There is not a single reference to Reich in Perepel's communication.

References

Beirne, P., & Sharlet, R. (1990). Toward a general theory of law and Marxism: E.B. Pashukanis. In P. Beirne (ed.), *Revolution in law: Contributions to the legal development of Soviet legal theory, 1917–38* (pp. 17–44). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Bennett, P. (2014). Wilhelm Reich, the FBI, and the Norwegian Communist Party: The consequences of an unsubstantiated rumor. *Psychoanalysis and History*, *16*, 95–114.

Bernfeld, S. (1925). *Sisyphus: Or, the limits of education*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, 1973.

Bernfeld, S. (1932). *Die kommunistische Diskussion um die Psychoanalyse und Reichs "Widerlegung der Todestriebhypothese"* [The Communist discussion about psychoanalysis and Reich's "refutation of the death instinct hypothesis"]. *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, *18*, 352–385.

Communist Academy. (1929). *Psikhoanaliz kak estestvennonauchnaia distsiplina* [Psychoanalysis as a natural science]. *Vestnik Kommunisticheskoi Akademii*, *35–36*, 345–350.

Corrington, R. (2003). *Wilhelm Reich: Psychoanalyst and radical naturalist*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

David-Fox, M. (1997). *Revolution of the mind: Higher learning among the Bolsheviks, 1918–1929*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Dudek, P. (2012). *"Er war halt genialer als die anderen." Biografische Annäherungen an Siegfried Bernfeld* ["He was more brilliant than the others." Biographical approaches to Siegfried Bernfeld]. Gießen: Psychosozial-Verlag.

Etkind, A. (1997). *Eros of the impossible: The history of psychoanalysis in Russia*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Etkind, A. (2003). To the East of Freud's Vienna in the previous turn of the century. In C. Tögel and J. Frommer (eds.), *Psychotherapie und Psychoanalyse in Osteuropa* [Psychotherapy and psychoanalysis in Eastern Europe] (pp. 71–85). Uchtspringe: Sigmund-Freud-Zentrum.

Fallend, K. (1988). *Wilhelm Reich in Wien: Psychoanalyse und Politik* [Wilhelm Reich in Vienna: Psychoanalysis and politics]. Vienna: Geyer-Edition.

Fallend, K. (2008). *Bereit zum Kampf mit allen Mitteln, auch mit denen der Gewalt! Wilhelm Reich auf der Bühne der Parteipolitik* [Ready for struggle with all means, including violence! Wilhelm Reich on the stage of party politics]. In B. Johler (ed.), *Wilhelm Reich revisited* (pp. 47–68). Vienna: Turia & Kant.

Fenichel, O. (1931). *Die offene Arbeitskolonie Bolschewo* [The open labor colony, Bolschewo]. *Imago*, *17*, 526–530.

Freud, S., & Jung, C.G. (1974). *Briefwechsel*. [Correspondence] (W. McGuire and W. Sauerländer, eds.) Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer. (Published in English as *The Freud/Jung letters: The correspondence between Sigmund Freud and C.G. Jung*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1974).

Freud, S., & Osipov, N. (2009). *Briefwechsel 1921–1929*. [Correspondence 1921–1929] (E. Fischer, R. Fischer, H.H. Otto, and H.J. Rothe, eds.) Frankfurt am Main: Brandes & Apsel.

Frischauf, M., & Reich, A. (1930). *Ist Abtreibung schädlich?* [Is abortion harmful?] Vienna: Münster Verlag.

Gordon, A. (1980). *An American dreamer: A psychoanalytic study of the fiction of Norman Mailer*. Teaneck, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.

Graham, L. (1993). *Science in Russia and the Soviet Union: A short history*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Guggenheim Museum. (1992). *The great utopia: The Russian and Soviet avant-garde, 1915–1932*. New York, NY: Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum.

Gulick (1948). *Austria from Habsburg to Hitler*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Higgins, M.B. (1994), Introduction: Reich's development, 1922–1934. In W. Reich, *Beyond psychology: Letters and journals, 1934–1939* (pp. vii–xxiii) New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Hildebrand, K. (1986). *The Third Reich*. London, UK: Routledge.

Hodann, M. (1937). *History of modern morals*. London, UK: William Heinemann.

Hristeva, G. (2013). A dream of freedom: The correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Nikolay Y. Ossipov 1921–1929. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, *61*, 511–525.

Jokl, R.H. (1930). *Wiener Psychoanalytische Vereinigung (Sitzungsbericht)*. [Vienna psychoanalytic society (meeting report)]. *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, *16*, 281.

Joravsky, D. (1961). *Soviet Marxism and natural science, 1917–1932*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Kadyrov, I. (2010). *Psychoanalyse in der UdSSR und in Russland nach dem Ende der Sowjetunion* [Psychoanalysis in U.S.S.R and in Russia after the end of the Soviet Union]. In M. Ash (ed.), *Psychoanalyse in totalitären und autoritären Regimen* [Psychoanalysis in totalitarian and authoritarian regimes] (pp. 211–234). Frankfurt am Main: Brandes & Apsel.

Kloocke, R. (2002). *Mosche Wulff. Zur Geschichte der Psychoanalyse in Rußland und Israel* [Moshe Wulff. On the history of psychoanalysis in Russia and Israel]. Tübingen: Edition Diskord.

Krementsov, N. (1997). *Stalinist science*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Krementsov, N. (2010). Darwinism, Marxism, and genetics in the Soviet Union. In D.R. Alexander and R.L. Numbers (eds.), *Biology and ideology from Descartes to Dawkins* (pp. 215–246). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Krementsov, N. (2011). *A Martian stranded on Earth: Alexander Bogdanov, blood transfusions, and proletarian science*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lothane, Z. (2001). The deal with the devil to "save" psychoanalysis in Nazi Germany. *Psychoanalytic Review*, *88*, 195–224.

Lothane, Z. (2003). Power politics and psychoanalysis – an introduction. (Special Issue: Psychoanalysis and the Third Reich). *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, *12*, 85–97.

Luria, A. (1926). *Russische Psychoanalytische Vereinigung (Sitzungsbericht)* [Russian Psychoanalytical Society, Minutes of proceedings]. *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, *12*, 227–229.

Luria, A. (1928). Psychology in Russia. *Pedagogical Seminary and Journal of Genetic Psychology*, *35*, 347–355.

McEwen, B. (2012). *Sexual knowledge: Feeling, fact, and social reform in Vienna, 1900–1934*. New York, NY: Berghahn Books.

Mesner, M. (2007). Educating reasonable lovers: Sex counseling in Austria in the first half of the twentieth century. In G. Bischof, A. Pelinka, and D. Herzog (eds.), *Sexuality in Austria: Contemporary Austrian studies, volume 15* (pp. 48–64). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Miller, M. (1998). *Freud and the Bolsheviks: Psychoanalysis in imperial Russia and the Soviet Union*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Neiditsch, S. (1921). Dr. Tatiana Rosenthal, Petersburg. *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, *7*(3), 384–385.

Nitzschke, B. (2002). *"Ich muß mich dagegen wehren, still kaltgestellt zu werden." Voraussetzungen, Begleitumstände und Folgen des Ausschlusses Wilhelm Reichs aus der DPG/IPV in den Jahren 1933/1934.* ["I must defend myself against being sidelined." Conditions, circumstances, and consequences of Wilhelm Reich's expulsion from the German Psychoanalytic Society/ International Psychoanalytic Association] in 1933/1934.] In K. Fallend and B. Nitzschke (eds.), *Der "Fall" Wilhelm Reich. Beiträge zum Verhältnis von Psychoanalyse und Politik* [The "Case" of Wilhelm Reich. Contributions about the relationship of psychoanalysis and politics] (pp. 83–139). Gießen: Psychosozial-Verlag.

Nitzschke, B. (2003). Psychoanalysis and National Socialism: Banned or brought into conformity? Break or continuity? *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, *12*, 98–108.

Nunberg, H., & Federn, E. (1976–1981). *Protokolle der Wiener Psychoanalytischen Vereinigung* [Minutes of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society] (Vols. 1–4). Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer.

Peglau, A. (2013). *Unpolitische Wissenschaft? Wilhelm Reich und die Psychoanalyse im Nationalsozialismus* [An unpolitical science? Wilhelm Reich and psychoanalysis during National Socialism]. Gießen: Psychosozial Verlag.

Perepel, E. (1939). The Psychoanalytic Movement in U.S.S.R. *Psychoanalytic Review*, *26*, 299–300.

Poster, M. (1985). *Foucault, Marxism, and history: Mode of production versus mode of information*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Rabinbach, A. (1973). The politicization of Wilhelm Reich: An introduction to "The sexual misery of the working masses and the difficulties of sexual reform". *New German Critique*, *1*, 90–97.

Rabinbach, A. (1983). *The crisis of Austrian socialism: From Red Vienna to civil war: 1927–1934*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Reich, W. (1929a). *Dialekticheskii materializm i psikhoanaliz* [Dialectical materialism and psychoanalysis]. *Pod znamenem marksizma, 7–8*, 180–206.

Reich, W. (1929b). Dialectical materialism and psychoanalysis (A. Bostock, trans.) *Studies on the Left*, *6*, 1966, 5–46. Original: *Dialektischer Materialismus und Psychoanalyse. Unter dem Banner des Marxismus*, *3*, 736–771. (Both are cited in the text.)

Reich, W. (1929c). *Sexualerregung und Sexualbefriedigung* [Sexual excitation and sexual satisfaction]. Vienna: Münster Verlag.

Reich, W. (1929d). *Die Stellung der Psychoanalyse in der Sowjetunion. Notizen einer Studienreise in Rußland* [The position of psychoanalysis in the Soviet Union: Notes from a study tour to Russia]. *Die Psychoanalytische Bewegung*, *1*, 358–368.

Reich, W. (1930). *Geschlechtsreife, Enthaltsamkeit, Ehemoral. Eine Kritik der bürgerlichen Sexualreform* [Adolescence, abstinence, marital morality: A criticism of bourgeois sex-reform]. Vienna: Münster Verlag.

Reich, W. (1932). *Der masochistische Charakter – Eine sexualökonomische Widerlegung des Todestriebes und des Wiederholungszwanges* [The masochistic character. A sex-economic refutation of the death instinct and of the repetition-compulsion]. *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, *18*, 303–351.

Reich, W. (1934). *Massenpsychologie des Faschismus. Zur Sexualökonomie der politischen Reaktion und zur proletarischen Sexualpolitik* [Mass psychology of fascism. Concerning the sex-economics of the political reaction and concerning proletarian sex-politics]. Copenhagen: Verlag für Sexualpolitik.

Reich, W. (1936). *Die Sexualität im Kulturkampf. Zur sozialistischen Umstrukturierung des Menschen* [Sexuality in the cultural struggle. On the socialist restructuring of man]. Copenhagen: Sexpol Verlag.

Reich, W. (1945). *The sexual revolution: Toward a self-governing character structure*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1974.

Reich, W. (1953a). *People in trouble*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1976.

Reich, W. (1953b). *Bibliography on orgonomy*. Rangeley, ME: Orgone Institute Press.

Reich Rubin, L. (2003). Wilhelm Reich and Anna Freud: His expulsion from psychoanalysis. *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, *12*, 109–117.
Robinson, P. (1969). *The Freudian left: Wilhelm Reich, Geza Roheim, Herbert Marcuse*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
Sandkühler, H.J. (ed.). (1970). *Psychoanalyse und Marxismus. Dokumentation einer Kontroverse* [Psychoanalysis and Marxism. Documents of a controversy]. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.
Sapir, I. (1929). *Freudismus, Soziologie, Psychologie. (Zu dem Aufsatz von Wilhelm Reich "Dialektischer Materialismus und Psychoanalyse")* [Freudism, sociology, psychology. (On Wilhelm Reich's paper "Dialectical materialism and psychoanalysis")]. *Unter dem Banner des Marxismus*, *3*, 937–952.
Sapir, I. (1930). *Freudismus, Soziologie, Psychologie* [Freudism, sociology, psychology]. *Unter dem Banner des Marxismus*, *4*, 123–147.
Schmidt, V. (1924). *Psychoanalytische Erziehung in Sowjetrussland: Bericht über das Kinderheim-Laboratorium in Moskau* [Psychoanalytic education in the Soviet Russia: A report about the Lab-school in Moscow]. Vienna: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag.
Sinelnikov, C. (1972). Early "Marxist" critiques of Reich. *Telos*, *13*, 131–137.
Steiner, R. (2011). In all questions, my interest is not in the individual people but in the analytic movement as a whole. It would be hard enough here in Europe in the times to come to keep it going. After all, we are just a handful of people who really have that in mind … *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, *92*, 505–591.
Stern, M. (1980). *Sex in the USSR*. New York, NY: New York Times.
Strick, J. (2015). *Wilhelm Reich, biologist*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Tögel, Ch. (1988). *Lenin und Freud: Zur Frühgeschichte der Psychoanalyse in der Sowjetunion* [Lenin and Freud: On the early history of psychoanalysis in the Soviet Union]. *Luzifer-Amor*, *2*, 34–40.
Van der Veer, R. (2011). Tatyana on the couch: The vicissitudes of psychoanalysis in Russia. In S. Salvatore and T. Zittoun (eds.), *Cultural psychology and psychoanalysis: Pathways to synthesis* (pp. 49–65). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
Wortis, J. (1950). *Soviet psychiatry*. Baltimore, MD: Williams and Wilkins.
Wulff, M. (1930). *Zur Stellung der Psychoanalyse in der Sowjetunion. Bemerkungen zu dem Artikel von W. Reich* [On the position of psychoanalysis in the Soviet Union. Notes on Wilhelm Reich's article]. *Psychoanalytische Bewegung*, *2*, 70–75.
Young-Bruehl, E. (2011). Psychoanalysis and social democracy: A tale of two developments. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*, *47*, 179–203.
Zarubina, T. (2008). *La psychoanalyse en Russie dans les années 1920 et la notion de sujet* [Psychoanalysis in Russia in the 1920s and the concept of the subject]. *Cahiers de l'ILSL*, *24*, 267–280.

Authors

Galina Hristeva, PhD, is the author of a book about Georg Groddeck, followed by further publications on the history of psychoanalysis. She is a research associate of the American Psychoanalytical Association and the winner of the 2011 Sacerdoti Prize of the IPA.

Philip W. Bennett, PhD, a retired university professor, has published a number of articles about Reich's life and work, including, "The persecution of Dr. Wilhelm Reich by the government of the United States," *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, 2010.

Appendix

Summary of a lecture by Doctor W. Reich: "Psikhoanaliz kak estestvenno-nauchnaia distsiplina" (Psychoanalysis as a natural science) *Vestnik Kommunisticheskoi Akademii* (Herald of the Communist Academy), 1929, #35-36, pp. 345-350. Translated from the Russian by Galina Hristeva.[i]

Reich's Lecture:

Comrade Reich began his presentation with an analysis of the term "Freudo-Marxist"; he then discussed the term *perekluchenie* (conversion) which is commonly used in Russian psychological literature. He believes that "conversion" is the perfect equivalent of the psychoanalytic term "sublimation," which stands for the transformation of sexual energy into work energy. As for "Freudo-Marxist," in Comrade Reich's view it obviously implies more than just a Marxist who is also a follower of Freud or vice versa. Rather, it reflects that complex and contradictory standpoint which a Marxist psychoanalyst has to take, forced, on the one hand, to respond to Marxists' attacks on psychoanalysis and, on the other hand, to criticize certain currents in psychoanalysis – both from the perspective of Marxism *and* psychoanalysis.

Comrade Reich concluded his introduction by asking us to have confidence in him when it comes to the fundamental facts of psychic life upon which psychoanalysis is built, as he is someone who has been applying the psychoanalytic method in practice for years and is able to judge whether these facts really exist.

As to the question of whether psychoanalysis is a natural science, Comrade Reich first examined the view that even though psychoanalysis is a science, it is a bourgeois and not a proletarian one, a science that does not serve the class struggle. Comrade

[i]This presentation was delivered on September 28, 1929 and is given here in an abridged form [footnote in the original text, which included a typographical error with reference to the date; subsequent footnotes are by the translator.]

Reich believes that other natural sciences are in the same situation as well, and that the scientific or non-scientific character of theories should not be judged solely by reference to the class struggle. In order to decide if psychoanalysis is a natural science it is necessary to clarify the following points:

1) what is the object of psychoanalysis; 2) what is its method and approach; and 3) what conclusions does it come to.

With reference to the first point, Comrade Reich started by rejecting Comrade Sapir's understanding of the viewpoint that psychoanalysis is a psychology of the individual. It is true that psychoanalysis explores the psychic life of the individual who lives in a given society. But this life is the only object of both psychology and psychoanalysis: since there is no mass psyche there can be no mass psychology. Phenomena such as class consciousness do not belong to psychology but to sociology, like all other ideological issues. Mass phenomena cannot be explained with the help of psychoanalysis; psychoanalysis is only capable of establishing the mechanisms by which a certain social phenomenon is reflected in the individual psyche. Furthermore, psychoanalysis can explain those phenomena in a person's life which seem contradictory or inexplicable from the point of view of the person's class situation. Dreams, neurotic symptoms, the neurotic character and parapraxes all belong to the phenomena of psychic life that cannot be explained in a rational way, phenomena that seem absurd and senseless. It is to these phenomena that psychoanalysis is properly applied. All psychic mechanisms and the process of formation of human individuality belong to this area, too.

When confronted with phenomena that defy easy rational explanation, psychoanalysis assumes that they have a hidden meaning and exist for specific reasons. In these cases it seeks to clarify the reasons for the formation of the symptom and to outline the underlying process. This is how psychoanalysis *approaches* phenomena. Psychoanalysis has the task of disclosing the true psychic reality beneath the surface, the way Marx explored social phenomena in order to reveal their meaning and motives.

As to *method*, psychoanalysis—like physics and chemistry—has its own method of inquiry. This is the "*free flow of thoughts*," the method of "*free association*." With the aid of this method psychoanalysis discovers facts that amaze those who are only familiar with the contents of the conscious mind. When people allow their thoughts to flow freely, they detect in themselves sensations and perceptions they were completely unaware of and which contradict their conscious sense of self. This method is neither Marxist nor non-Marxist—this is a specifically psychological method. Marxists can only debate whether or not the conclusions of psychoanalysis comply with dialectical materialism; Comrade Reich believes that they do. Even though Freud did not consciously use the dialectical method in formulating psychoanalysis, he nonetheless provided us with a whole array of dialectical formulations. The dialectical nature of key psychoanalytic theorems is just like the dialectical processes revealed in many other natural sciences, where the scientists themselves were not consciously employing the method but it is evident in their results.

Psychoanalysis should be viewed neither as a *system* nor as a worldview (*Weltanschauung*). Freud has repeatedly protested against both viewpoints. It is true that psychoanalysis is sometimes presented as a over-arching system; however this is done by bourgeois psychoanalysts, especially those who come to psychoanalysis from the humanities.

Moving on to the *conclusions* drawn by psychoanalysis, Comrade Reich pointed out that the major and most fundamental assumption of psychoanalysis suggests the hypothesis that consciousness is the smallest and by no means the most important part of psychic life. Psychoanalysis attributes the function of sensations and perceptions to consciousness. In addition, there is *subconscious* or *preconscious* material, i.e., items of psychic life that can be made conscious at any time even though they are not currently in the conscious mind. But psychoanalysis also distinguishes the actual *unconscious* which includes everything that cannot be made conscious by a direct act of will. We call the psychic mechanism preventing the unconscious from becoming conscious *repression*. The psychic *censor* blocks all the elements that have been in conflict with our conscious ego and have been repressed. This repression can happen directly, in response to a particular incident, or more generally in early childhood. The existence of censorship can be easily proven when the patient attempts to free associate. In this case, the subject feels the desire to admit some of these thoughts to his or her consciousness and to reject others. Something inside the patient inhibits this process and criticizes it. This "something" is called by psychoanalysis "censorship."

The *technique* of psychoanalysis aims exactly at the conscious elimination of this authority, in order to articulate and think all the things that cross one's mind through to the end, no matter how bizarre these thoughts might be. In this way psychoanalysis gets to the depths of the forgotten memories, or to be more precise, to the sensations and feelings repressed in early childhood, and in some cases is able to restore the unbroken chain of experiences from the past to the present.

Does psychoanalysis pay enough attention to the social and historical context when examining the individual person? This question can be answered as follows: everything described by psychoanalysis, all the theories it has developed so far, are nothing else but the representation of the process of formation of the fundamental biological needs under the influence of the environment in which the individual is developing. Like the other sciences in bourgeois countries, psychoanalysis has not yet studied the effects of the class identity of the individual person and of the class structure of society as a whole. However, psychoanalysis demonstrates in great detail the conflict between the biophysical needs on the one hand with the socially imposed demands on the other. One of the results of this collision is the so-called "Oedipus complex." Children direct their first feelings—both feelings of love and hostility—at their parents who are not only the first objects of love and hate, but also the first representatives of social authority confronting the child with the demands of the present social order. The fact that the present social order has a class structure, and that the demands directed at children, along with their education, reflect that class structure, has not thus far been examined by psychoanalysis.

Some Marxists claim that psychoanalysis is a subjective method; this characterization springs from a misunderstanding. Many people are convinced that the psychoanalyst or the patient make up the Oedipus complex themselves. They do not know that the material produced by the analysand has been unknown even to him until the moment it emerges from the amorphous mass of reminiscences. Both patient and doctor act as objective observers, and therefore the psychoanalytic method itself is also objective.

It is assumed that psychoanalysis views the libidinal phenomena as the first cause of any development. Some psychoanalysts hold to this view. To make sense of this, it is necessary to review the main assertions of psychoanalytic drive theory. It can be summed up like this: all drives can be subsumed under the two basic needs, hunger and sexual desire. The first need must be met directly, since failing to do so results in death. The second one can be converted into psychic energy; therefore it plays an important role in psychic life. Though psychoanalytic theory is not yet complete, its propositions about the restrictions imposed by society on the libidinal drives, about the repression of sexual energy and its re-emergence in the form of neurotic symptoms, or its transformation into a social interest or a social activity, are definite and empirically proven. On the basis of these propositions it can be concluded with perfect clarity that the libidinous forces per se cannot be a motivating force. Only the conflict between the libidinous drives and society can play such a role. The energy of this movement is supplied by the drives, but the content of psychic life is determined by the outside world.

Seen from this perspective, the Oedipus complex, i.e. the fact that the sexual experiences of the child take place within the family, namely in a certain situation shaped by society, is a social and not a biological phenomenon.

Further, Comrade Reich characterized some idealistic views within psychoanalysis. In connection with the fact that the intrapsychic moral authority of the child evolves on the basis of the relations of the child within the family, many people are inclined to conclude that social morality is also grounded in the relationship between parents and children. In reality, the economic relations determine the social morality which in its turn determines the relationship between parents and their children. Also, it is believed that social morality appears as the individual's moral code, again on the basis of family relations. Psychoanalysis has yet sufficiently to explore these complicated relations and the wider social structures of society.

Freud's effort to trace back the emergence of organized society to the hypothetical primordial patricide gives rise to the conclusion that there might be a causal connection between the individual attitude towards the father and the emergence of morality and the formation of social order in the primitive society. Cautious as Freud was in stressing the hypothetical character of his assumptions, others who built their social theories on this hypothesis did not show such caution. And yet, according to Comrade Reich, all these idealistic deviations can be dismissed, without having to change anything in the overall structure of psychoanalysis. It is also necessary to note that many of these idealistic theories meet with resistance from empirically oriented psychoanalysts who have no idea of Marxism. Comrade Reich believes that psychoanalysis has the same importance as any other natural science for the proletarian society. Psychoanalysis can be of great use when it comes to mental health, the prophylaxis of neuroses, the best conditions for the development of the productivity of the individual, and finally, the question of sexual behavior.

The presenter resolutely dismissed as untruthful the idea that psychoanalysis is a theory which sets out to save mankind. In his opinion, psychoanalysis cannot contribute any improvements to the Marxist theory of social process. Yet, in one area of sociology, psychoanalysis can be used successfully. It is capable of showing how the economic base determines

consciousness, how the individual's social situation is reflected in her or his personality, and what psychic mechanisms are at work during this process.

Finally, Comrade Reich said that in the West psychoanalysis is subjected to flattening out, to dilution, and he voiced the hope that in Soviet Russia psychoanalysts will be given the opportunity to explore psychoanalysis and discuss whatever theoretical errors they uncover, because it is exactly here in the Soviet Union that we find suitable conditions to cleanse psychoanalysis of its bourgeois excesses.

The Respondents:

I. Comrade *Sapir* deemed it necessary to start his objections to Reich's presentation with a description of the essential features of psychoanalysis. According to Comrade Sapir, psychoanalysis is a totalizing psychological theory, that tries to go beyond the confines of individual psychology. This is detailed in Comrade Sapir's article in the journal *Under the Banner of Marxism*. There Comrade Sapir made a distinction between two terms: *Freudism*, the application of Freudian concepts to all manner of issues outside the therapeutic, and *psychoanalysis*, more narrowly understood as a therapeutic practice. Although Comrade Reich distanced himself from those who attempt to use psychoanalysis to solve sociological problems, in Comrade Sapir's opinion Comrade Reich still views psychoanalysis both in his article in the journal *Under the Banner of Marxism* and in the present talk as capable of solving certain social problems.

Turning to the classification of psychoanalysis as a teaching in individual psychology, Comrade Sapir believes Comrade Reich's definition of psychology as a science about the mental life of the socialized individual is incorrect. Comrade Sapir rather thinks that it is more correct to define psychology as a science about the personality, comprising all the laws capable of affecting and determining the subject's behavior. Besides, Comrade Sapir does not believe that psychoanalysis meets the criteria of a sound psychology. With regard to the control over the behavior of the individual, Comrade Sapir believes that the teachings about character, temperament, and constitution are indispensable, as are the teachings of Jaensch, Pavlov, and others. With regard to the higher layers of the personality, it is impossible to do without the theory of the laws of intellect[ii] which discusses the question of the impact of the external environment on the individual organism more fully than psychoanalysis. From this vantage point it must be said that if psychoanalysis takes on tasks which by virtue of its properties and method it cannot solve, if it desires to change all of psychology, it will inevitably fail.

Moving on to the core of some fundamental aspects of psychoanalysis, Comrade Sapir admitted that psychoanalysis has done a great deal for psychology. First of all, a major contribution of psychoanalysis is the development of the theory of the unconscious, the discovery of its laws, the mental formations in the unconscious, and the dynamics of the transformation of experience. An important achievement was also that Freud emphasized the necessity for psychology to look below the surface of phenomena, to explore their depths. Nevertheless, Comrade Sapir does not think that all this is unique to psychoanalysis, because each science—depending on the stage of its development—has to make the transition from the phenomenological description to the analysis of laws and regularities.

Comrade Sapir also raised the question of the dialectical character of psychoanalysis as a whole, since granting the dialectical character of some individual claims as shown by Comrade Reich both in his article and in his report does not guarantee the dialectical character of the whole theory.

Comrade Reich's assertion that psychoanalysis is a method of exploration rather than a system of ideas is radically false according to Comrade Sapir. Neither the history nor the theory of science knows a situation in which either the mere method or the mere system is correct. In his report Comrade Reich mentioned the conditions under which psychoanalysis approaches the healthy and the sick person. Psychoanalysis fuses these conditions into a system that also determines its method. Of course, psychoanalysis is not a complete system, but it doubtlessly has to combine its method with a whole system of theoretical presuppositions.

What does the psychoanalytic theory of the personality look like? From a Marxist point of view, the individual personality is a synthesis of biologically and socially determined elements. Psychoanalysis meets these conditions, but only formally. If we approach the relationship of the biological and the sociological moment from the perspective of their separate significance and structural relationship, the *biologism* of psychoanalysis becomes perfectly evident. Even if the energy that determines the sexual feeling was the starting point of all further development, according to Comrade Sapir the formation of new drives, called by him "secondary drives," also plays a role in the process of life. These secondary drives

[ii]This is probably a reference to Lenin's *theory of reflection.*

doubtlessly act as an autonomous force when it comes to the formation of the personality: psychoanalysis still sees in them only the original sexual drive, though in a different form. Comrade Reich declared that the development of the individual results from the contradictions between the sexual drive and the social environment, rejecting or ignoring these secondary drives. In the dialectical conflict outlined by Comrade Reich the environment plays only the role of an external obstacle which human beings have to overcome, while in reality the environment plays a much more complex role, by acting directly on the individual but also as the source for the formation of the secondary drives. Even if the sexual drive was dominant at the beginning of development, this does not mean that it continues to be active at all future stages. The main sin of psychoanalysis is that it overestimates the idea of historical determinants and, accordingly, views the old unconscious traces as the sole motivator of present behavior. Psychoanalysis shortens the long and complex path of development and ignores the various forms and types of influence of the social environment on people which do not only or always originate in childhood. In addition, psychoanalysts do not sufficiently take into account the influence of social class on the person's unconscious. This underestimation of class structure can also be found in Freud's theory of the relationship between the ego and the id.

Finally, Comrade Sapir drew the following conclusions: when psychoanalysis tries to transcend the issues to which it is entitled by virtue of its method and starting point, it is unable to achieve results characteristic of natural sciences, i.e. which are correct from the perspective of materialism. Freud succeeded, however, in presenting a number of propositions that have enriched psychology, so these grains of truth should be included in the system of Marxist psychology which is now being constructed, while it is out of the question to retain psychoanalysis as a separate, isolated theory on its own.

II. Comrade *Zalkind* stated that Reich's lecture comes at this time in Soviet Russia when we are seeking ideological clarity, when we are determining our *own* ideology, and we do not want to associate ourselves with mechanistic or other tendencies. Freudism raises many questions that conflict with dialectical materialism, such as our commitment to psychophysical monism and dialectical monism in the theory of personality,[iii] and how the environment affects personality, and how personality changes.

Comrade Zalkind pointed to the major stages in the development of the discussion on Freudism in the Soviet Union and noted that currently there is tolerance towards many aspects of Freudism in contrast with recent times, when some suggested that Freudism should be branded with a hot iron and banned from all the places it had managed to infiltrate. Comrade Zalkind thinks that Comrade Reich has not succeeded in narrowing the focus of his topic in his present talk and has failed to establish that psychoanalysis is one of the scientific methods for the exploration of the individual psyche. Both in his present talk and in his article, Comrade Reich defended the whole Freudian system, not only with reference to the individual, but also as it applies to social psychology and sociology. It is Comrade Zalkind's view that psychoanalysis, as understood by Comrade Reich, is not just one of a number of methods, but a comprehensive method for the exploration of the psyche, a complete dialectical materialist psychology.

On the basis of Comrade Deborin's[iv] remark that Freudism can very frequently be found accompanying reformist programs, Comrade Zalkind drew a picture of the political history of psychoanalysis in the Soviet Union. He emphasized that in the field of literary criticism Voronsky,[v] the leader of the right-wing stream, claimed that creativity cannot be regulated by education, because he accepted the Freudian conception of the unconscious, and saw it as the bedrock of the creative process. In addition, Comrade Zalkind believes that in educational matters more generally, the Freudian teachings about childhood sexuality divert the attention of the educator away from the social emotions of the child, from work exercise, and the education of the will. According to Comrade Zalkind, psychoanalysis plays the same reactionary role in reasonable programs of mental health, because, from the psychoanalytic point of view, the intellect and rational thought are powerless in the face of the unconscious. Psychoanalysis approaches group psychotherapy in a similar fashion.

Comrade Zalkind concluded his presentation by stating the fundamental differences between Marxism and Freudism as to the character of the collective. While Marxists view society as a special formation

[iii]That the person is whole and not divided up into parts, like id, ego, superego, not mentioned by Reich, or Reich's use of the terms conscious, pre-conscious and unconscious.

[iv]Deborin was the editor of *Under the Banner of Marxism* during this period; in this capacity he was likely responsible for the disclaimer attached to Reich's article when it appeared in the journal.

[v]Zalkind is referring to Aleksandr Voronsky, who, by this time, due to his earlier alliance with Trotsky, had been thrown out of the Communist Party and had been arrested in January 1929.

and a crucial factor dictating the socio-psychic phenomena, as shaped by the social environment, Freudians see it as a mere mechanistic aggregate of isolated individuals whose social structures emerge from those individuals, and not from the reality of the social environment.

Comrade Zalkind ended his remarks with the promise to discuss in a separate talk the progressive significance of a number of Freudian assumptions, his own efforts to reform some aspects of psychoanalysis, and the possibility of using this purified form of Freudism.

III. Comrade *Rohr* recalled that the term "Freudo-marxist" emerged mainly in connection with an article by Comrade Variash, with whom Comrade Reich and the orthodox Marxists do not have anything in common. Furthermore, Comrade Rohr noted that psychoanalysis indeed has not always sufficiently taken into account the role of the intellect, because psychoanalysis is by no means qualified to explain scientifically *all* phenomena of psychic life, but rather only those of the unconscious part of the mind. Nevertheless, in his *The interpretation of dreams*, Freud gives very valuable instructions as to how to approach the problem of consciousness.

In addition, Comrade Rohr finds that the felicitous term "secondary drives" proposed by Comrade Sapir, i.e., the structural changes of personality caused by the influence of the social environment, completely corresponds with the Freudian term "ego ideal." As to the cardinal question of psychology, "biology or sociology?", Comrade Rohr pointed out that according to psychoanalytic theory the physical characteristics of the individual which lie at the core of life experiences do not determine these experiences in later life, and that society is also an important principle of formation.

IV. Comrade *Friedmann* noted, in response to Comrade Sapir's presentation, that according to Freud's *An outline of psychoanalysis*, psychoanalysis does not purport to explain psychic life in its totality. Yet psychoanalysis substantially differs from the other psychological approaches mentioned by Comrade Sapir, since it gives us the fundamental principles of human psychic activity, by capturing the essence of the psychic process as a whole; in contrast, the other methods and teachings play only a limited role in the science of humanity.

Comrade Friedmann thinks that in the future psychoanalysis should play a central role in Marxist psychology, because no other branch of psychology can provide the elements needed for the construction of Marxist psychology to such extent: an example is the principle of the determination of consciousness by the social being which has been put to the fore by psychoanalysis so resolutely. In order to become the center of Marxist psychology, psychoanalysis will have to use its method to examine still many unexplored aspects of the mind, or psychic phenomena which have been explored with other methods and merely from a limited point of view.

V. Comrade *Zalmanson* assumes that we should evaluate a science by reference to its practical application. He stated that psychoanalytic practice is often as harmful as psychoanalytic ideology. In addition, Comrade Zalmanson believes that no communist or Marxist who uses psychoanalysis would dare to recommend it as the main method of Soviet education. Therefore he thinks that psychoanalysis has to be fundamentally restructured.

In his rejoinder to his critics, Comrade Reich first addressed his position concerning the intermediate steps from the material base to ideology, by insisting that ideology is not plucked out of the air. He feels that he has sufficiently demonstrated that according to psychoanalysis, in agreement with dialectical materialism, ideology—and thus science and art as well—is determined by the socio-economic context. Comrade Reich repeated once again that he does not consider psychoanalysis to be a world-view, and added that there was no need to be "diplomatic"[vi] in holding this position. He maintains that psychoanalysis deserves an objective and sober evaluation. The reactionary interpretation of psychoanalysis as well as its reactionary application cannot alone be a reason for rejecting it, since this is the fate of many scientific theories in the bourgeois countries. Here, in the Soviet Union, by contrast, psychoanalysis can be given a *revolutionary* application.

Comrade Reich concluded his remarks by asking that psychoanalysis be given the opportunity to widely introduce the dialectical method into psychology.

[vi]The reference is to a comment made by Zalkind not in the synopsis, that in making a distinction between psychoanalysis as a natural science and Freudism, Reich was taking a diplomatic line: See Reich's "The position of psychoanalysis in the Soviet Union: Notes from a study tour in Russia."

International Forum of Psychoanalysis, 2018
Vol. 27, No. 1, 70–72, https://doi.org/10.1080/0803706X.2016.1254351

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

BOOK REVIEW

Sigmund Freuds widerständiges Erbe—Bernd Nitzschke zum 70. Geburtstag [Freud's oppositional heirs—Bernd Nitzschke on his 70th birthday]. *Psychoanalyse. Texte zur Sozialforschung* 19 (2/2015). Guest editors André Karger and Bertram von der Stein.

This issue is a *Festschrift* celebrating the 70th birthday of Bernd Nitzschke, one among Freud's oppositional heirs. Freud himself was, however, a rebel with revolutionary theories about sexuality. In 1998, I first saw Nitzschke's name in *Die Zeit* citing Freud (1911) on Paul Schreber: "*The delusional formations, which we take to be the pathological product, are in reality an attempt at recovery, a process of reconstruction*" (p. 71, Freud's italics). I wrote to him, we met in 1998, became friends, and collaborated on a number of psychoanalytic projects. This review is my tribute to Bernd's lifetime achievement as a psychoanalyst and prolific historian of psychoanalysis.

The wide-ranging interview with Nitzschke by André Karger covers major events in his life and evolution from being a student with a passionate interest in philosophy, committed to anti-authoritarianism, freedom, and independence of thought, a participant in *Aktion-Sühnezeichen* (action reparation), and staying on a kibbutz in Israel, to his being awarded a PhD in psychology and philosophy, and becoming a psychoanalyst. He became interested in Sigmund Freud and other revolutionaries – Wilhelm Reich, Otto Gross, Sabina Spielrein, and Erich Fromm – and authored numerous articles, books, and scholarly reviews about Freud and these followers.

Bertram von der Stein devotes his article to "*Grenzgänger,*" or borders-crossers, "people who shuttle between two or more disciplines," and the practices, norms, and rules of different psychoanalytic organizations that developed during decades of dissents and splits between the DPG and DPV in Germany, pleading for building bridges and new relationships in the twenty-first century. He cites Nitzschke's (2006) essay on the magical triangle of Spielrein, Jung, and Gross.

Albrecht Götz von Olenhusen's approach to the problem of the revolutionary as rebel against the patriarchs is to examine the life of Otto Gross: psychiatrist, psychoanalyst, and *enfant terrible* between Freud and Jung, Nitzschke's great interest, too. At the Burghölzli, therapist Jung and patient Gross were switching roles when the Jung–Spielrein drama reached a peak (Lothane, 2012, 2016). Gross (1904) was important to me as the first psychiatrist who analyzed Schreber's book and who, like Schreber, became entangled in battles with German institutional psychiatrists (Lothane, 2010a).

A more notorious rebel was Wilhelm Reich, discussed by Andreas Peglau, citing six publications by Nitzschke. Over the years, Reich's books and the reactions to them filled libraries and gave rise to two historiographies: the orthodox and the revisionist. Fallend and Nitzschke (1997) documented the drama, history, and politics of Reich's expulsion from the IPA and the DPG (Lothane, 2001), followed by Nitzschke (2003) and Lothane (2003). I discussed Reich and Peglau in 2015 (Lothane, 2015).

In her scholarly paper, Galina Hristeva presents a very different kind of *Grenzgänger*, Georg Groddeck, who adored Freud but disagreed with him too. She correctly concludes that whereas Groddeck began as an *enfant terrible.* he was later neither rebel nor martyr – on the contrary, he originated psychoanalytic psychosomatics and was credited by Freud for giving the unconscious a new name, *das Es* or the id. Groddeck's ideas were in fact a continuation of the Romantic tradition in German medicine and psychiatry as declared in 1846 by Carl Gustav Carus: "The key to knowing the conscious life of the soul lies in the region of the unconscious" (p. 1); "The organism is a totality, … is never this or that structure sick but the whole person is sick" (p. 89); "the wonderful inner and secret action of unconscious life resides in the so-called healing power of nature" (p. 91). As cited by Hristeva, Groddeck was correct in telling Freud that he "needed people of his breed, like a little pepper," people of the heart, not "systematic heads" like Freud and his intellectualist ego psychology.

Thomas Anz reflects on the relationship between psychoanalysis and modern literature, affirming that the twentieth- and twenty-first-century history of literature and the reception history of psychoanalysis

© 2016 Henri Zvi Lothane

go hand in hand, citing Arthur Schnitzler, Karl Kraus, Adolf Döblin, and Thomas Mann. In his 1997 publication, Anz cited the Swiss literature historian Walter Muschg and emphasized "the striking parallels between Mann's *Death in Venice* and Jensen's *Gradiva*," a wonderful meeting of two inspired minds, Jensen's and Freud's (Lothane, 2010b).

Helmut Dahmer posits that psychoanalysis is "a sister of Marx's critique of political economy," but does so without citing Wilhelm Reich, the father of this idea. Curiously, "economic" in Freud refers to sex; in Marx, to money. Activist Marx roused the workers of the world to lose their chains, which created Soviet Russia, China, and North Korea. Interpreter and armchair revolutionary Freud only talked about sex but did not create the LGBT revolution. Dahmer dismisses free association as a "psychoanalytic shibboleth" but misses its meaning as free speech in analytic therapy. Free speech does not exist in a dictatorship and also has its limits in a democracy. Fascinatingly, Freud's (1933) "hope for the future … [was] that intellect—the scientific spirit, reason—may establish a dictatorship in the mental life of man" (p. 171). Freud acted dictatorially toward some followers and opponents, and all engaged in furious wars of theories and other wars of words.

Interestingly, Paul Schreber (1903; English edition 1955), an ancestor of Freud's theories, is omitted from this *Festschrift* even though he qualifies for two reasons. First, as a "person who wishes to pave a way for a new conception of religion … [using] flaming speech (*Flammenworte*) as Christ used towards the Pharisees or Luther towards the Pope and the mighty of the world" (p. 309), he was rebel and revolutionary, imagining being a woman and prophesying the transgender revolution. The second reason is because Nitzschke discussed Schreber (1985, 1998, 2000, 2003, 2010, 2011) and endorsed my Schreber work. In his "closing words," Nitzschke cites his 2012 review of Cronenberg's film *A dangerous method*, characterizing it as deceptive kitsch. In 2012 (Lothane, 2012), I concurred.

Henri Zvi Lothane
Clinical Professor of Psychiatry, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, USA
henry.lothane@mssm.edu

Check for updates

References

Anz, T. (1997). *Psychoanalyse in der literarischen Moderne* [Psychoanalysis in literary moderns]. In K. Richter, Schönert and Titzmann (eds.), *Die Literatur und die Wissenschaften 1770–1930* [Literature and sciences 1770–1930] (pp. 377–413). Stuttgart: Metzler.

Carus, C.G. (1846). *Psyche. Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der Seele* [Psyche. Evolution of soul]. Leipzig: Kröner.

Fallend, K., & Nitzschke, B. (1997). *Der "Fall" Wilhelm Reich* [The "case" of Wilhelm Reich.]. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Freud, S. (1911). *Psycho-analytic notes on an autobiographical account of a case of paranoia (dementia paranoides)*. SE 12: 9–82.

Freud, S. (1933). *New introductory lectures on psycho-analysis*. SE 22.

Gross, O. (1904). *Ueber Bewusstseinzerfall* [On splitting of consciousness]. *Monatschrift für Psychiatrie und Neurologie*, *15*, 46–51.

Lothane, Z. (2001). The deal with the devil to "save" psychoanalysis in Nazi Germany. *Psychoanalytic Review* , *88*, 195–224.

Lothane, Z. (2003). Power politics and psychoanalysis—an introduction. *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, *12*, 85–97.

Lothane, Z. (2010a). Romancing psychiatry: Paul Schreber, Otto Gross, Oskar Panizza – personal, social, and forensic aspects. In W. Felber, G. Heuer, A.G. Olenhusen and B. Nitzschke (eds.), *Expressionismus und Psychoanalyse. 7 Internationaler Otto-Gross-Kongress, Dresden* [Expressionism and psychoanalysis. 7th International Otto Gross Congress, Dresden] (pp. 461–493). Marburg: LiteraturWissenschaft.

Lothane, Z. (2010b). The lessons of a classic revisited: Freud on Jensen's *Gradiva*. *Psychoanalytic Review*, *97*(5), 790–817.

Lothane, Z. (2012). Sabina Spielrein between Carl Gustav Jung and Sigmund Freud: The naked truth vs. salacious scandals. *Off the Couch, an Ezine of Psychoanalysis and Culture*, 2(1), 8–15.

Lothane, H.Z. (2015). Wilhelm Reich revisited: *Die Rolle der Ideologie in der Charakteranalyse des Individuums versus in der Charakteranalyse der Massen* [The role of ideology in character-analysis of the individual vs. that of the masses]. *texte psychoanalyse, ästhetik, kulturkritik*, *15*(3), 8–29.

Lothane, H.Z. (2016). Sabina Spielrein's Siegfried and other myths: facts versus fictions. *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, 25, 40–49.

Nitzschke, B. (1985). *Der eigene und fremde Körper Bruchstücke einer psychoanalytischen Gefühls- und Beziehungstheorie* [One's own and the other's body: Fragments of a psychoanalytic theory of emotional and interpersonal relations]. Tübingen: Konkursbuchverlag.

Nitzschke, B. (1998). *Aufbruch nach Inner-Afrika. Essays über Sigmund Freud und die Wurzeln der Psychoanalyse* [Departure for inner Afrika. Essays on Sigmund Freud and the roots of psychoanalysis]. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Nitzschke, B. (2000). *Das Ich als Experiment Essays über Sigmund Freud und die Psychoanalyse im 20. Jahrhundert* [The ego as experiment essays on Sigmund Freud and 20th century psychoanalysis]. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Nitzschke, B. (2003). Psychoanalysis and national socialism: Banned or brought into conformity? Break or continuity? *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, *12*, 98–108.

Nitzschke, B. (2010 [2012]). Solution and salvation: Daniel Paul Schreber "cultivation of femininity". *Eur J Psychoanal*, *31*, 121–140.

Nitzschke, B. (2006). Das magische Dreieck – Otto Gross, C.G. Jung, Sabina Spielrein. Ein Bericht aus der Frühgeschichte der Psychoanalyse [the magic triangle- Report on the early history of psychoanalysis]. In A. Karger, C. Weismüller (eds.), *Ich hieß Sabina Spielrein. Von einer, die auszog, Heilung zu suchen* [my name was A woman who sought healing] (pp. 33–49). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Nitzschke, B. (2011). *Die Psychoanalyse Sigmund Freuds – Konzepte und Begriffe* [The psychoanalysis of Sigmund Freud – Concepts and technical terms]. Wiesbaden: Springer.

Nitzschke, B. (2012). *Vorwärts die Rosse traben, lustvoll schaukelt das Boot: Cronenbergs Film „Eine dunkle Begierde"* [Forward trot the horses, sensuously rocks the boat: Cronenberg's film "The dangerous method"). München: Literaturkritik.de

Schreber, D.P. (1903). *Denkwürdigkeiten eines Nervenkranken*. [Memoirs of my nervous illness]. Leipzig: Mutze