Int J Psychoanal 2005;**86**:1–16

Analytical space and work in Russia:

Some remarks on past and present[1]

IGOR M. KADYROV
Fadeev ul., 6-170, Moscow, 125047, Russia — imkadyrov@comtv.ru
(Final version accepted 23 November 2004)

In this paper, the author outlines the historical-cultural picture in the former USSR and post-Soviet Russia. He looks at some facets of psychoanalysis in Russia in the years immediately before and after the October Revolution as well as in its recent history, exploring the implicit question of how the wider social context, and specifically totalitarian and post-totalitarian reality, has influenced psychoanalytic work and analytic space in this country. With the help of Sebek's concept of the totalitarian object and Britton's formulations about the triangular space, the author attempts to understand the interaction of external and internal space and to give an introduction to the problem of establishing the analytic setting as well as finding some new possibilities of enlarging the space for new psychoanalysts in Russia.

Keywords: analytical space, Russia, USSR, Eastern Europe, totalitarian object, history

The purpose of this paper is to offer an overview of the historico-cultural and clinical picture in the former USSR and post-Soviet Russia. The article addresses the implicit question of how the wider social context has influenced psychoanalytic work and analytic space in this country. It is not an attempt at a comprehensive study, but rather presents some personal considerations of certain aspects of the whole picture. These considerations are limited and selective due to lack of space. They are also inevitably subjective, as they are shaped by (a) my individual idiosyncratic understanding of the question, (b) my personal experience of living and practising in Moscow, and (c) my belonging to a local psychoanalytic culture, one I share with those of my colleagues who are members of the local Moscow Psychoanalytic Society and who, like a number of other Russian and East European colleagues, have been privileged to be trained by the IPA and who are now IPA members or candidates of the Han Groen-Prakken Psychoanalytic Institute for Eastern Europe.

It is a common belief that psychoanalysis, as a discipline based on practice, cannot survive for long in countries whose political systems are authoritarian and that, in turn, for its own development it 'needs a certain liberal-mindedness' in the community (Freud, 1923, unpublished letter to Ossipow, in Miller, 1998). And yet even during totalitarian periods it existed in Eastern Europe in an underground

[1]Paper presented at 'The psychoanalyst at work' (IJP conference), Moscow, Russia, 8–9 May 2004.

form. Attempts recently made by nearly all East European groups to define the 'lost family' of the local pioneers of psychoanalysis or to name and describe their underground analytic 'parents' have become an important element in their search for some basis for the present psychoanalytic identity (Pocius and Augis, 1989; Klain, 1995; Klein, 1995; Szonyi, 1998; Sebek, 1998). In spite of Russia's historically long adherence to authoritarian, oppressive and terror-ridden political systems, with only brief periods of liberalism, psychoanalysis also existed here in some form in the years immediately before and after the October Revolution. It became very popular again in the 1980s, especially after the fall of the Iron Curtain.

Whereas in some countries of the former Eastern bloc, such as Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, the link with 'Fenichels' (Sebek, 1999)—that is, with analysts of the first pre-war generation, who became the symbol of the invention and transmission of psychoanalysis in these countries—was broken, there were always individual analysts (or even just one analyst) who continued to practise analysis. In the USSR, the psychoanalytic tradition was subjected to a longer-lasting and more fundamental distortion and destruction.

The early history of psychoanalysis in Russia is relatively well documented (see, for example, *IJP*, 1922; Luria, 1923, 1925, 1926; Ermakoff, 1924, Jones and Abraham, 1924; Luria and Schmidt, 1927). Recently, as students of psychoanalysis and a wider audience in Russia became acquainted with this material and publications by Etkind (1993, 1995), Fisher and Fisher (1995), Miller (1998) and Ovtcharenko and Leibin (1999), to mention just the best known, they were proud to learn of the intensity and scope of Russians' involvement in the early psychoanalytic movement.

Freud's mother, Amalia Nathanson, was born in eastern Galicia (now part of the Ukraine) and lived for a time in Odessa at her elder brother's home. It is well known that Freud was fascinated by Dostoevsky, that he borrowed the concept of censorship from the political structure of tsarist Russia (Laplanche and Pontalis, 1996 [1973]) and that some of Freud's disciples, such as Lou Andreas-Salome, Max Eitingon and Sabina Spielrein hailed from Russia, as did Sergey Pankeev, one of Freud's classic cases, 'The Wolf Man'. According to Etkind (1993, 1995), who refers to Freud's correspondence with A. Zweig**,** Freud thought that even those Russians who were not neurotics were deeply ambivalent and that Russians seemed 'closer to the Unconscious than Western people' (Etkind, 1995, pp. 333–4). Etkind suggests that, if Freud was right, then this might partially explain the relatively quick acceptance of psychoanalysis in pre-revolutionary Russia and also its recent blossoming. Of course, other reasons, too, could be found. For example, psychoanalysis then and now—in the context of Russia's long history of autocratic and totalitarian evolution—could represent a container for liberal fantasies, a 'romantic vision' of pleasures of the unlimited freely associating mind (Sebek, 1999). It was intended to serve and, indeed, did serve as part of social restoration.

I will sketch very briefly the history of the development of psychoanalysis in Russia[2] and outline some thoughts on the current situation.

[2]For a fuller discussion see Etkind (1993, 1995), Fisher and Fisher (1995), Miller (1998), Ovtcharenko and Leibin (1999). The present account relies on these and some other works.

'A local epidemic of psychoanalysis'—Then and now

If as a measure of the popularity of psychoanalysis in Russia we take the amount of translated material published here, psychoanalysis enjoyed extraordinary popularity at the beginning of the 20th century, as it does again now. By 1914, 22 of Freud's works had been published in Russian (Miller, 1998). For a time after the Revolution Freud's writings were no less popular. A report on the psychoanalytic movement published in 1923, in the *Bulletin of the International Psycho-Analytical Association*, says, 'The spread of psychoanalysis in Russia is testified to by the fact that, within a month, 2,000 copies of the first volume of Freud's *Introductory lectures* were sold' (IPA, 1923, p. 524). After the final demolition of psychoanalysis in the 1930s, psychoanalytic literature was not published at all. During the *perestroika* years interest revived. An edition of 40,000 copies of Freud's *Introductory lectures on psycho-analysis* published in 1989 sold out instantly. The same year, three parallel editions of Freud's principal theoretical writings appeared in Moscow in a total of more than 500,000 copies (Fisher and Fisher, 1995). According to Reshetnikov (1998), during the following 10 years the works of founders of psychoanalysis and translations of contemporary psychoanalytic works were published in more than 50 million copies.

In a 1912 letter to Jung, Freud notes, 'There seems to be a local epidemic of psychoanalysis' in Russia (McGuire, 1974, p. 495). In 1914, he says: 'In Russia, psychoanalysis is very generally known and widespread; almost all my writings as well as those of other advocates of analysis have been translated into Russian' (p. 26). However, in the next sentence he remarks: 'But a deeper grasp of the analytic teaching has not yet shown itself in Russia' and adds that so far the work of Russian doctors has not been noteworthy, and that, apart from Moshe Wulff, there were no trained psychoanalysts there.

Although in those early years it was not yet compulsory for a person conducting analyses to be analysed himself, nevertheless by that time Freud had already published his essay on '"Wild" psycho-analysis' (1910b), his 'The future prospects of psycho-analytic therapy' (1910a), 'The dynamics of transference' (1912), as well as the majority of his papers on technique (1911–5). In these works, he said many important things highly relevant to the subject of 'the analyst at work', among which he stated that the analyst's unconscious should function like a 'receptive organ' (a telephone receiver), that no analyst could go 'further than his own complexities and internal resistances permitted' and that he needed a training analysis. This reflected the growing expectation that subsequent analysts would gain some training and a personal analytic experience.

While among the significant figures in this first blossoming of Russian psychoanalysis there were those who visited Freud or his followers and who even attended scientific meetings in Vienna, Berlin or Zurich (like N. Ossipow, M. Wulff, S. Spielrein, T. Rosenthal, M. Asatiani, V. Schmidt), those who published their work in the psychoanalytic journals and exchanged letters with Freud (like A. Luria and W. Schmidt) and those whose contribution to psychoanalysis and

science in general later proved to be highly important,[3] only Wullf and Spielrein seem to have undergone personal analysis.

In the 1920s and early 1930s, psychoanalysis in the West developed into a profession and Eitingon's model of training became the prime prerequisite for all branch societies and institutes of the IPA (see Schroter, 2002). In Russia, the Russian Psychoanalytic Society (1922–30s), was set up under the Soviet Ministry of Education and the famous State Psychoanalytic Institute (1923–5), the state-run psychoanalytic children's home/laboratory called **'**International Solidarity', 1921–5) and an out-patient department (1923) were opened in Moscow, but the lack of trained analysts remained a major handicap for Russian psychoanalysis.

At the end of the 1970s, the psychoanalytic tradition began to revive. A few enthusiasts, such as Sergey Agrachev in Moscow, were able to start their analytically oriented practices—in secret and without proper training, of course. At the time, some self-appointed analysts read and discussed Freud's work and tried to 'analyse' others for therapeutic and 'didactic' purposes. Describing the position of these colleagues, Agrachev (1998) notes that their professional identity and work was seriously marked by at least three significant preoccupations: (1) the uncomfortable feeling that they were starting from scratch, without any roots or tradition behind them; (2) fear of the surrounding social reality—from this their secret practice was a refuge. Reality constantly threatened to break into the consulting room and this was prevented only by the patients' tacit consent in keeping the very fact of these sessions secret. Discussion of this was as a rule avoided by the analysts, since it would have threatened their narcissistic omnipotence; (3) highly ambivalent feelings towards 'real' Western analysts, contacts with whom could come into being only in a dim, but

[3]In 1933, Wulff, together with Eitingon, founded the Palestine Psychoanalytical Society (four of the six founding members were originally from Russia and came via Berlin). Ossipow and Dosuzkov played an important role in the development of psychoanalysis in Prague. Spielrein, directly and indirectly, made a fundamental contribution to the formation of transference and countertransference theory (Van Waning, 1992). She contributed to psychoanalytic conceptualisations of the destructive instinct and of the importance of the child's experience at the mother's breast (anticipating some of Klein's formulations); to the understanding development of thought, language and concepts of space, causality and time in children, as well as to child observation and analysis. Spielrein also developed some interesting ideas on similarities between aphasic thinking and infantile thinking (Luria, 1924) and, according to Etkind, she may have acted as an *intermediary* between two trends in world psychology—the Piaget school and Vygotsky–Luria school.

Alexander Luria, under external pressure, dissociated himself from psychoanalysis in the early 1930s, publicly admitting his 'ideological mistakes'. In his post-psychoanalytic period he became the founder of neuropsychology. Without mentioning Freud by name or openly criticising him (in his 1940 article in the *Great Soviet encyclopaedia* he **even** called psychoanalysis 'a false theory'), he developed a science which was not only compatible with Freud's assumptions, but also became a breakthrough in the study of the problem posed by Freud in his 'Project for a scientific psychology' (1895). In the context of the recent development of neuro-psychoanalysis, Luria's works on 'dynamic localisation' have evoked great interest among analysts working in this field (see Kaplan-Solms and Solms, 2000). Among the very important achievements of the early Russian and Soviet analysts, above all Wulff, Ermakoff and Ossipow, were the translation and publication in Russian of the very large Psychoanalytic Library. These books were the basic reading of nearly all who attempted to carry on psychotherapeutic work in the USSR. Among their major contributions was the creation of Russian psychoanalytic terminology, widely used up to the present.

nonetheless inescapable future. On the one hand, Russian analysts dreamed of the disappearance of the Iron Curtain and free intercourse with foreign colleagues, but, on the other, because of the inevitable feeling of shock and professional humiliation, they feared it. As a defence against this, these colleagues tended to devalue what had been discovered in psychoanalysis since Freud's time.[4]

Naturally, these colleagues and those who joined them later never saw a real Western psychoanalyst in the flesh until the end of the 1980s. Nonetheless, it was these colleagues and their groups that established the first contacts with the Western psychoanalytic community following the fall of the Iron Curtain. They organisåd the first seminars with teachers from the West, including long-term programmes. Space does not permit me to mention here all the regular programmes (including theoretical seminars and clinical supervisions) that have been organised by Western psychoanalysts during the last 15 years for different psychoanalytic groups in Moscow, St Petersburg and some other regions of Russia. Among the most important, to name just a few, there were regular and functioning curricula stretching over several years offered by members of the American Psychoanalytic Association in Moscow and later also in St Petersburg; by members of the German Psychoanalytical Association (DPV) in Moscow; by Cheryl Fitzgerald in Moscow; by the Early Intervention Group (under the auspices of the Anna Freud Centre) in St Petersburg; by Division 39 of the American Psychological Association; and by the Paris Psychoanalytical Society in Moscow. Although some of these simultaneous efforts might appear as not sufficiently interconnected and sometimes even as in competition with each other, they were very helpful and precious in allowing many Russian colleagues to develop professionally.

In the 1990s, a few people managed to travel to the West (the USA, France, Britain) for psychoanalytical training. This was also the time when the first shuttle analyses began, first in Germany and the Czech Republic, and then also in France, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Finland and Yugoslavia. However, despite the explosive outburst of interest and the establishment of numerous psychoanalytic associations and institutes throughout Russia, until the very end of the 1990s the lack of trained analysts continued to be a problem. A prominent American analyst who visited Russia after the fall of Iron Curtain said with surprise, 'There are psychoanalytic associations, but no psychoanalysts!'

In this period, many therapists were treating their patients by using psychoanalytic techniques, sometimes even copying the external features such as the couch and frequent sessions, but without the internal changes brought about by training analysis and without sufficient contact with their own unconscious. In 1998, at the 7th East European Seminar of the EPF in Moscow, my colleague Lola Komarova described some painful aspects of this experience in her 1988 paper.

The situation only altered towards the end of the 1990s and the first years of the new century, when the 10 years of help from the IPA (through its East European

[4]Although Freud's works had been removed from general circulation in public libraries, it was not impossible for these colleagues to read some of them. At the library of the psychology department of Moscow University, for example, in the 1970s and 1980s, interested students could obtain photocopies of Freud's works published in the 1920s without any difficulty.

Committee co-chaired by Han Groen-Prakken and John Kafka) and the IPA's Branch Societies, from the EPF and its East European Committee as well as from individual enthusiasts (such as Hans-Volker and Annelore Werthmanns, Horst Kächele, Ursula Volz in Germany, Alain Gibeault in France and some others), who arranged shuttle and other forms of training for Russian candidates, produced its first results. Since 2002, training has been conducted through the Han Groen-Prakken Psychoanalytic Institute for Eastern Europe. Today Russia has more than 10 IPA members, several dozen candidates and applicants in training, and a large number of psychoanalytic psychotherapists whose qualification is now much higher than formerly.

State psychoanalysis, and jolly and holy psychoanalysis

Some scholars speak of the unprecedented achievements of Russian state psychoanalysis in the first half of the 1920s (Miller, 1998; Curtis, 2001). They stress that, thanks to Freud's blessing on the one hand and support from the Bolshevik state on the other, Moscow became the third training centre, after Vienna and Berlin. The latter statement is difficult to accept, however. Freud did support the Russian analysts and in 1922, at the Congress in Berlin, he proposed that the Moscow group should be admitted to the IPA.[5]

He also followed the Bolsheviks' experiment attentively, though not without scepticism. For some time, post-war Vienna was 'Red'. In 1918, in his speech in Budapest and other speeches and writings, Freud himself took a 'politically liberal step' by sanctioning the development of free psychoanalytic out-patient clinics (Danto, 1998, p. 287), namely the Berlin Poliklinik (opened in 1920) and the Vienna Ambulatorium (opened in 1922). He attached great social value to this project of 'widening the scope of psychoanalysis' and making psychoanalysis available to those who needed but could not afford it. He also supported it financially. Once Jones even jokingly called him 'a Bolshevist' (Danto, 1998, p. 295).[6] In this context, the Muscovites' experience and their out-patient department were bound to attract his attention.

Nonetheless, Freud does not seem to have had any illusions about political parties in general and about the actions of the Bolshevist authorities in Russian in particular. This is confirmed by many well-known statements he made between 1919 and 1939 (see Freud, 1927, 1929, 1939; Jones, 1953–7; Miller, 1998).[7] For example, as noted by Jones, in 1919 Freud surprised him

[5]Because of 'administrative reasons', this proposal was opposed and the Russian Society was admitted to the IPA only two years later, in 1924, at the Salzburg congress. Yet, according to Curtis (2001), the Russian Society was never fully integrated into the IPA even though their formal members accounted for 13 per cent of the total membership of the IPA.

[6]In 1926 Jones wrote to Freud: 'In your private political opinion you might be a Bolshevist, but you would not help to spread Ψ to announce it' (quoted by Danto, 1998, p. 295).

[7]Miller cites another statement by Freud from an unpublished letter of 23 February 1927, to Ossipow in Prague: 'Things are going poorly for the [psycho]analysts in Soviet Russia, by the way. From somewhere the Bolsheviks have gotten it into their heads that psychoanalysis is hostile to their system. You know the truth, that our science cannot be placed at the service of any party, but that it needs a certain liberal-mindedness in turn for its own development' (1998, p. 97).

> by saying he had recently had an interview with an ardent Communist and had been half converted to Bolshevism … He had been informed that the advent of Bolshevism would result in some years of misery and chaos and that these would be followed by universal peace, prosperity and happiness. Freud added: 'I told him I believed the first half' (Jones, 1953–7, vol. 3, p. 16).

As we know, subsequent events tragically confirmed Freud's bitter scepticism.

Alas, the 'third Rome' was not destined to become 'the third training centre' either. In any case, it is difficult to find in the available material evidence that, for all their efforts, Wulff and Spielrein succeeded in organising in the State Psychoanalytic Institute or the state-controlled Russian Psychoanalytical Society a training that would go beyond the traditional academic lectures and seminars; these lectures covered the variety of subjects related to psychoanalysis and Marxism.[8]

Despite the initial hopes of the pioneers of Russian psychoanalysis, and the attempts of some of them to make use of their proximity to state and Party officials (Trotsky, Lunacharsky and others) in the interest of psychoanalysis, the flirting and partial identification with the authorities only confirmed Lord Acton's remark: 'Power tends to corrupt. Absolute power corrupts absolutely'. The perverted state for a while treated psychoanalysis as just an acceptable decoration for its own political ambitions, at the cost of grave mimicry and distortions in psychoanalysis that stripped it of its basic truth (Wulff, 1930; Etkind, 1993), and finally made it a *scientia non grata* in the Soviet Union. The outcome is well known. The psychoanalysts were dispersed. Only a few managed to emigrate and survive. The rest were subjected to persecution or made to stop all psychoanalytic activity, publicly admitting their 'ideological mistakes'.

Strange as it may seem, in the recent resurgence of psychoanalytic institutions in Russia, the idea of state-run psychoanalysis has been reborn and has become quite popular again. In recent years, Russian colleagues as well as colleagues in Eastern Europe have inevitably found it necessary to scrutinise the specific features of their practice amid post-communist social instability. At East European seminars, summer schools and conferences organised by the EPF there has been much discussion of how the totalitarian past influences the inner reality of patients, the analytic work, the formation of the professional identity and the professional community as a whole (Sebek, 1998, 1999; Kadyrov, 2000, 2001; Timofeeva, 2000; Uskov, 2000; Vuco, 2000; Orasanu, 2001; Rotmann, 2001).

---

[8]As far back as 1920, when, at the first National Congress of Russian Care Committees for Backward Children, Tatiana Rosenthal moved a resolution calling for psychoanalytic training for doctors and teachers, for 'unknown reasons this was not put to the vote' (*Int J Psychoanal* 1922;**3**:515). In 1922 there was still a hope (see a report by Ossipow in IJP, 1922) that such training, including personal analysis, would be organised for doctors and teachers, but judging from later reports from Russia in the *Zeitschrift*, and from archive material studied by Etkind, all that was organised was lectures. In 1927, at the meeting of the International Training Commission in Innsbruck, Max Eitingon reported: 'Our Russian colleagues, with Dr. Wulff at their head, are making valiant efforts to disseminate psycho-analytical knowledge, though so far, on account of their difficult situation, they have not been able systematically to take in hand the question of training in psycho-analysis' (in A. Freud, 1928, p. 136). In the same year, Wulff resigned the office of president of the Society and fled to Berlin.

Developing Rosenfeld's (1971, 1987) theory of destructive narcissism and his idea of a Mafia gang, Michael Sebek suggested the concept of the totalitarian object.[9] I think that the latter enables us to understand at least some features of our local clinical and professional reality. Phenomena related to the totalitarian object can easily be found in present-day life, in our consulting rooms and in the psychoanalytic institutions. They are detectable in practically all our professional groups, including those that try to follow IPA recommendations.

For example, representatives of the pro-state orientation in Russian psychoanalysis, in their partial *identification* with administrative power, can show a split attitude towards Western analysis. On the one hand, there is an apparent acceptance of psychoanalytic theory, ethical principles and interest in visits by Western lecturers and supervisors, but, on the other, at least in my view, there is a kind of grandiose contempt for and criticism of the 'Western' psychoanalytical setting. One may find in the press and at conferences statements that the Western psychoanalytic setting is inapplicable or unacceptable in Russia, that the Western technique 'should not be copied', that 'our own technique must proceed from Russian patterns of social intercourse' and that 'Russian spirituality has always been different' (Reshetnikov, 1999, p. 220).[10] As a result, the object is split from its function: 'the breast is bad, but the milk is good'.

In an apparent opposition to state psychoanalysis there are in Russia the widespread variations of 'jolly' (Sebek, 1998) psychoanalysis, that is, 'as if' psychoanalysis, which is characterised by a flippant or even perverse attitude towards psychoanalytic boundaries and professional ethics. 'Jolly' psychoanalysis can be seen in this context as a kind of *reaction formation* against the 'totalitarian object' or as a specific product of it. Michael Sebek has described it as a specifically Czech phenomenon. He has demonstrated that in his country, where external power is seen as having a strong negative flavour and internal totalitarian objects tend to evoke strong resistance along with an ironic and sadistic attitude towards authority and its rules, there may be a tendency among some colleagues and groups not to take psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic rules seriously. These colleagues tend to treat those rules, much as the *Good Solder Svejk* in Jaroslav Hasek's book treated the orders of his superiors. There is a tendency to keep a certain distance between themselves and professional requirements: they proudly call themselves psychoanalysts but feel they should not study 'too much' or take the professional ethical code 'too literally'. For example, a planned professional meeting of therapists/analysts can be easily turned into a drinking party. In Russia, where according to the well-known

[9]The totalitarian object, as defined by Sebek (1998), is a primitive pre-genital (mostly anal-sadistic) object whose total power is intrusive and presupposes a total compliance and identification. Although destructive and sadistic by its nature, the totalitarian object presents itself to the libidinal self as a helper. Almighty and omniscient it functions as an umbrella and a prison for immature identity and ego. The totalitarian object can be understood as an introjection of or an identification with totalitarian external power. As an introject into ego, superego and ideal-ego structures it is infectious and can survive in subsequent generations (Rotmann, 2001).

[10]There is also a group of psychotherapists whose leaders claim, 'We cannot copy the West. We are different. We need to develop a purely Russian psychoanalysis to understand ourselves' (see, for example, Karush, 1998).

expression '*the severity of our laws is always compensated for by the non-necessity of observing them*', jolly psychoanalysis is also a well-known feature. During a popular night-time talk-show a couple of years ago on the subject of professional boundaries, a 'psychoanalytic' psychotherapist said that, although all the textbooks forbid sexual affairs between therapist and patient, that rule should not be treated too literally. In his view, such relations could be harmful only in severe psychotic cases; in work with mild neurotics or healthy patients, they could even be helpful. Even the masseur and the sex-magazine photographer who were participants in the talk-show looked rather embarrassed by this statement.

Idealisation of Western training can be another way of preserving the 'totalitarian object' in the form of a Western psychoanalytic idol. After all, at some scientific meetings, we ourselves—I mean those who have had their training in the West—may ironically refer to people not yet trained, but trying to practise as '*those who found themselves in a cabbage patch*'. And some of us would like to represent ourselves as an elite caste of psychoanalysts '*who brought the Word*' [this is *holy*, as opposite to jolly, analysis]. However, the latter form of idolisation, provided that we ourselves can detect and contain it, can be compared to some benign and transient forms of idolatry in adolescence, where the identification with the idol helps the adolescent on his way to individuation and to both dis-identifying with his parents and towards group-identifying with his peers (Rotmann, 2001).

Rotmann (2001) has found Sebek's concept of a 'totalitarian object' clinically useful in his supervision of quite a few Russian and East European colleagues. According to him, traces of the totalitarian objects (which may hinder the analyst's listening and work) can be detected in the clinical attitudes of these colleagues. For example, in a direct identification with the 'totalitarian object' the therapist-analyst tends to be authoritarian and critical with the patient, or, as a result of a reaction formation against the controlling 'totalitarian introject', he becomes passive and is not firm enough in insisting on the setting.

Some remarks on analytic space and work then and now

Psychoanalysis, or as Freud used to call his creation '*our science*', has developed essentially as a discipline of the consulting room, building upon the 'state of mind' of individual analysts vis-à-vis their patients, and upon the working through of their complex experience in the analytic setting (Green, 2000). As far as the Russian context (past and present) of *the psychoanalyst at work* is concerned, in spite of the well-documented history of the early Soviet institutions, very little is known about the actual clinical work of those first analysts under Soviet rule.

The material available today contains no evidence of their 'inner experiences' in the analytic setting and almost no information about their technique, their actual conduct at the sessions and about the kinds of patients they saw. What is especially astonishing is that we know practically nothing about the very *setting* they offered to their patients. Did they see their patients in private or only at the out-patient clinic? Did they see them five or six times a week, as Freud did, or did they meet them less frequently? Did they use the couch? Was the treatment free or did they charge a fee?

All we know is roughly as follows. Before her mysterious suicide in 1921, Tatiana Rosenthal did analytical work with neurotic patients and children at the Brain Institute in Petrograd. Rosenthal called her method psychogenetic. Although she connected it with Freud, she did not share his views on the role of sexuality. According to Etkind's information, Spielrein was disappointed that in Moscow she was not allowed to work with children or to analyse teachers. During an interview with Etkind, one of Spielrein's relatives recalled that, in the former stables where Spielrein lived in Rostov, she occupied one room, which was empty apart from something like a primitive couch (a trench-bed). Was this her consulting room, and did she analyse patients there? We do not know. In Moscow, evidently only Wulff, Ermakoff and Kannabich had an analytic practice (Etkind, 1993). Possibly some others practised too. For a time there was the psychoanalytic out-patient clinic in Moscow, which, according to Miller, 'guaranteed the practice of psychoanalysis to anyone in the population who volunteered or was referred for the treatment of a disorder' (1998, p. 60). What was this practice like? What were the disorders and treatments? We still do not know. While the analytic work conducted at the free out-patient clinics in Weimer Berlin (the Berlin *Poliklinik*) and 'Red Vienna' (the *Ambulatorium*) have been investigated in great detail (see, for example, Rado et al., 1930; Danto, 1998), the work of Russian free clinics has so far not been studied at all. Strange as it may seem, more information about the atmosphere and 'work' in Soviet out-patient clinics can be gathered from Soviet satirical writing of those years.

For example, characters in the satirical stories of Michail Zoshchenko (1986), written in the late 1920s and early 1930s, often come to doctors who use psychoanalytic approaches. In a story called 'Doctoring and the psyche' (1933)[11] the hero comes to an out-patient clinic to see a 'nerve doctor' who, instead of prescribing pills, 'analyses' the causes of his patients' troubles. There is a long queue to see this doctor—some 30 people. The patients talk to each other about their complaints and problems, but, as soon as their free-floating discussion takes on politically suspect overtones, one of those present threatens that unless they stop letting their tongues 'run away with them' he will inform 'the proper authorities'. The doctor sees patients not in a separate room, but in a screened-off corner, so everyone can hear perfectly what the doctor and his patient are talking about. The patient complains of insomnia and the doctor asks him to remember the cause of it. The patient tries distrustfully to recollect. He recalls how, on returning home after the Civil War, he found his wife in the arms of his nephew. The doctor brightens, tries to give interpretations, but the patient doesn't agree that this is the cause of his problem. He has stopped sleeping since his sister's whole family moved into his room; the room gives access into another; the children run around pulling his nose. A neighbour passes by, spilling hot coals on his blanket; the blanket smoulders, burning his feet, and somebody is playing a mandolin nearby. In despair, the doctor prescribes him pills. The final note of the story is that these patients could hardly be helped by such treatment. Alas,

[11]Freud's teaching undoubtedly had an influence on Zoshchenko, who even engaged in self-analysis to get rid himself of neurotic problems. The title of his 1933 story precisely repeats that of *Doctoring and the psyche*, by Stefan Zweig, which appeared in Russian in the 1920s, and a large section of which was devoted to Freud and psychoanalysis.

the space these characters find themselves in is so disordered, both internally and externally, that it could hardly be called 'analytic'.

By giving an example from my analytic work and through the interpretation of literary works by Bulgakov and Zoshchenko in a previous paper (Kadyrov, 2000), I attempted to focus on the extremely limited analytic space that many of my colleagues had to deal with in both Soviet and post-Soviet Russia. I refer here to a quite broad definition of analytic space, which includes extrinsic aspects: the physical space of the consulting room and setting, the ground rules, confidentiality, the boundaries of the analytic relationship. I also include such intrinsic concepts as the psychic space within which the analyst and the patient can think, feel and live in their own private areas, as well as the area available for 'overlap'—the area of thoughtful and emotional linking within analysis. The latter has been variously referred to as 'transitional space' (Winnicott, 1971), 'the analytic third' (Ogden, 1994), 'reflective space' (Hinshelwood, 1994) etc. The psychic space itself as understood in psychoanalysis implies a certain development (Winnicott, 1958; Grotstein, 1978; Britton, 1989, 1995).

Of course, the concept of psychic space is not necessarily deduced from or to be equated with the concept of analytic space. Nonetheless, analytic space bears, if only potentially, various characteristics of psychic space, which belong to different developmental stages and which may be actualised at different moments or stages of analysis. And undoubtedly analytic space should be and ideally always is a reflective, 'triangular' (Britton, 1989) space, although in practice the patient and his analyst may fall out of the reflective space. Then analysis ceases to be analysis, either temporarily or irreversibly. While my current account touches predominantly those factors that seem to put pressure on and restrict the analytic 'triangular' space from *without*, there are a number of factors and processes that could place analytic space under profound threat or in a state of chaos from *within* (as shown by Bion, 1959, 1962, 1963, 1992, and many others). The lack of space for thought and feelings and the lack of the living space, in both the metaphorical and the literal sense, have been a difficult legacy for people in Russia nowadays, psychotherapists and analysts included.

Even in the late 1980s, when political restrictions were eased and psychotherapy and psychoanalysis attracted increased attention again, the space we were able to create in order to do analytic work with our patients (be it insight-promoting psychotherapy or something we called 'psychoanalysis'), was extremely limited, even in its concrete, physical dimensions. To give a personal example, the head of my department in the psychiatric hospital where I then worked as a clinical psychologist suggested something extraordinary to me. She said that, to her mind, it would be highly desirable if I concentrated on psychoanalytic consultations and even psychotherapy with those patients who might be interested! I was thrilled and felt honoured by the offer, but the immediate problem, which I humbly dared to raise with her, was where I could do psychotherapy as I shared an office with three other psychiatrists. She thought for a few moments and responded, 'Well, we shall ask them not to talk loudly when you are seeing your patients'. In the majority of psychiatric hospitals in Russia it is still quite difficult for a doctor or psychologist to

see a patient in private. Offices are usually shared by several colleagues, and quite often I hear from colleagues that they have to see their patients either after the end of the working day, or in wards, corridors or dining halls.

By the end of the 1980s, some of my colleagues had left psychiatric hospitals to set themselves up in so-called 'private practice': we just started to see our patients in the places where we lived. However, the possibility of creating analytic space in the crowded conditions in which most of us lived and worked was also pretty questionable. I guess that quite a few of my Russian colleagues might recognise the sort of situation described by Rotmann from his experience of working with some of us:

> A female therapist begins her report with the enigmatic sentence: 'When this patient entered my office I felt there was a man in my bedroom'. Because of no other space available, she would meet her patients in her bedroom that for that purpose looked like an office with dark furniture and a computer. During office hours she would never think of this room being her bedroom (1996, p. 2).

Indeed, meanwhile, we had learned quite a lot from our clinical experience in the settings of bedrooms/dining-rooms/kitchens etc.-turned-into-consulting rooms. However, one of the lessons we learned then was that in such a setting the mental and emotional space needed for analytic work was frequently either contaminated or lacking altogether.

Therapists often felt quite unprotected or vulnerable in their struggle to contain their patients' projections, which they might consider to be aggressively invading their mental space; while patients found themselves being subjected to retraumatisation through overstimulation, with their own space being dominated and intruded upon by the therapist, who became a prime source of interfering impact. A mutually agreed defensive solution for this problem frequently appeared as a denial on the part of one or the other side, or both. What was lacking in the 'bedroom-turned-into-consulting room' setting was the dynamic boundary between the actual space of the consulting room and what Britton (1995) called 'the other room' of imagination: the space which in phantasy is occupied by the primary (mother) object in her absence, that is, when she is thought to be with the other (third) object of the oedipal situation. This other room is conceived as a space into which phantasies could be projected. Anyway, the intrusive confusion between 'my room' and 'other room' puts analytic transitional or reflective space into profound instability.

As stated above, the situation began to change in the mid-1990s, when several Russian colleagues began their analytic training in the West. For the majority of them it was a shuttle training, and above all personal shuttle analyses. I have neither the capacity nor the time to describe this experience in detail here. But, as regards our subject, I may suggest that this experience provided us with the space and freedom for thinking and feeling about ourselves that we had been searching for. Take into consideration that, for the most part, we were and are travelling abroad mostly only for our analyses and for supervisions, leaving behind our families, jobs, everyday routine and duties, and it will be clear that in such a setting the problem was having a bit too much space and being too deeply immersed in analysis.

Nevertheless, thanks to this experience, among the first good things we imported to Moscow was this new feeling of having more space. It is noteworthy that, soon after we began our shuttle enterprise, many managed to move their practices to separate premises, like small studios or tiny flats, where we set up our modest, but nice and comfortable consulting rooms. Of course, the analytic space we have created so far seems quite unstable and is still in the transition from what Sebek (1999) calls 'anality of the underground economy' to the more oedipal or triangular 'world of legal competition and legal taxation'. We still have a long way to go. But, looking back, one can see what a long road was covered in a comparatively short time. As far as I know, the majority of analysts qualified by the IPA do see their patients in analyses in the standard analytic setting. There are sufficient numbers of patients interested in seeing us. We have our weekly peer-supervision seminars and, since 2000, an annual Russian-speaking psychoanalytic meeting in Moscow. The latter is organised by the Russian members of the IPA and analysts in training, and has already attracted much attention in a wider psychotherapeutic community. And there is the productive dialogue both among ourselves and with colleagues in the West and East. Sometimes the debates among Russian colleagues get pretty heated and even begin to resemble the famous 'controversial discussions'. Besides those who want to develop 'purely' Russian psychoanalysis, there are now representatives in this country of what might perhaps be called 'French-Russian', 'German-Russian', 'British-Russian' and 'American-Russian', as well as more or less 'independent' views. As a result, our community is trying to learn greater tolerance of pluralism. In short, in Russia there are now not only psychoanalytic associations, but also psychoanalysts themselves and they are at work. We may hope that the results in terms of clinical sophistication, theoretical grasp and institutional development are worth waiting for.

To conclude this guided tour, I would like to repeat Han Groen-Prakken's words concerning the future of psychoanalysis in the East (I'd like thank Tamara Stajner Popovic, private communication, and Stajner Popovic, 2003, who recalled these words of Han's to our memory):

> We were sometimes pessimistic about the future of psychoanalysis. We have no reason to be so about the East: There is a great hunger among people for the opportunity for free thought. There are large numbers of disturbed and traumatised patients. Psychoanalysis started in Central Europe with its roots in the East. There is cultural affinity between the 'East' and psychoanalysis, and there are a number of gifted and promising analysts.

To my mind, these words have a direct bearing on Russia too.

Translations of summary

Title.

References

Agrachev S (1998). Perenos, kontrperenos i trevoga otechestvennyh psychoterapevtov [Transference, countertransference and Russian psychotherapists' anxiety]. *Moskovsky psychoterapevtichesky zhurnal*, Psychoanalyz **2**:9–18.

Bion W (1959). Attacks on linking. *Int J Psychoanal* **40**:308–15.
Britton R (1989). The missing link: Parental sexuality in the Oedipus complex. In: Steiner J, editor. *The Oedipus complex today*, p. 83–101. London: Karnac.
Britton R (1995). Reality and unreality in phantasy and fiction. In: Person ES, Fonagy P, Figueira SA, editors. *On Freud's 'Creative writers and day-dreaming'*, p. 82–106. New Haven, CT and London: Yale Univ. Press.
Curtis H (2001). Miller MA, *Freud and the Bolsheviks* [Review]. *J Applied Psychoanal Stud* **3**:69–75.
Danto A (1998). The ambulatorium: Freud's free clinic in Vienna. *Int J Psychoanal* **79**:287–300.
Etkind A (1993). *Eros nevozmozhnogo. Istoria psychoanaliza v Rossii*. St. Petersburg: Meduza. [(1997). *Eros of the impossible: The history of psychoanalysis in Russia*, Rubens N, Rubens M, translators. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.]
Etkind A (1995). Russia (until 1989). In: Kutter P, editor. *Psychoanalysis international*, vol. 2, p. 333–44. Stuttgart–Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog.
Ermakoff I (1924). Russian Psycho-Analytical Society. *Bull Int Psychoanal Assoc* **5**:507–9.
Fisher R, Fisher E (1995). Russia (after the ending of dictatorship). In: Kutter P, editor. *Psychoanalysis international*, vol. 2, p. 345–50. Stuttgart–Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog.
Freud A (1928). Report of the Tenth International Psycho-Analytical Congress. *Bull Int Psychoanal Assoc* **9**:132.
Freud S (1895) Project for a scientific psychology. SE **1**, p. 281–93.
Freud S (1910a). The future prospects of psycho-analytic therapy. SE **11**, p. 141–51.
Freud S (1910b). 'Wild' psycho-analysis. SE **11**, p. 221–7.
Freud S (1912). The dynamics of transference. SE **12**, p. 99–108.
Freud S (1914). On the history of the psycho-analytic movement. SE **14**, p. 7–66.
Freud S (1927). *The future of an illusion*. SE **21**, p. 5–56.
Freud S (1929). *Civilization and its discontents*, SE **21**, p. 64–145.
Freud S (1939). *Moses and monotheism*. SE **23**, p. 1–138.
Green A (2000) What kind of research for psychoanalysis? In: Sandler J, Sandler A-M, Davies R, editors. *Clinical and observational psychoanalytic research: Roots of a controversy—André Green and Daniel Stern*. London: Karnac.
Grotstein J (1978). Inner space: Its dimensions and its coordinates. *Int J Psychoanal* **59**:55–61.
Hinshelwood R (1994). Attacks on reflective space: Containing primitive emotional states. In: Schermer V, Pines M, editors. *Ring of fire: Primitive affects and object relations in group psychotherapy*. London: Routledge.
IJP (1922). Psychoanalysis in Russia. *Int J Psychoanal* **3**:513–20.
IPA (1923).The psycho-analytical movement. Russia. Report of the International Psycho-analytical congress in Berlin, September 25-27, 1922. *Bull Int Psychoanal Assoc* **4**:522–5.
Jones E (1953–7). *The life and work of Sigmund Freud*, 3 vols. New York: Basic Books.
Jones E, Abraham K (1924). Report of the Eighth International Psycho-Analytical Congress. *Bull Int Psychoanal Assoc* **5**:391–408.
Kadyrov I (2000). In search of analytic space: Some considerations regarding practising in Moscow. Paper read at 'How to practise psychoanalytic therapy in periods of social instability'. The 8th East European Psychoanalytical Conference, Kiev: 26–59.
Kadyrov I (2001). The influence of ideology and idealisation in post-totalitarian society. Paper presented at the EPF Main Conference, 5–8 April, Madrid.
Kaplan-Solms K, Solms M (2000). *Clinical studies in neuro-psychoanalysis: Introduction to a depth neuropsychology*. London: Karnac.
Karush S (1998). Psychoanalysis in Russia. *Russia Monthly* **5**:30–3.
Klain E (1995). Croatia. In: Kutter P, editor. *Psychoanalysis international*, vol. 2, p. 268–76. Stuttgart–Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog.
Klein P (1995). Serbia. In: Kutter P, editor. *Psychoanalysis international*, vol. 2, p. 351–59. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog.

Komarova L (1988). Between omnipotence and helplessness: On the experience of wanting to become an analyst in a place without training. Paper presented at the 7th Eastern Europe Psychoanalytic Seminar in Moscow.

Laplanche J, Pontalis J-B (1973). *The language of psychoanalysis*, Nicholson-Smith D, translator. New York: W.W. Norton [(1996). *Slovar po psychoanalizu*. Moscow: Vyshaya shkola..] [(1967). *Vocabulaire de la psychanalyse*. PUF: Paris.]

Luria A (1923). The Kazan Psycho-Analytical Society, Russia. *Bull Int Psychoanal Assoc* **4**: 397–9.

Luria A (1924). Russian Psycho-Analytical Society. *Bull Int Psychoanal Assoc* **5**:258–61.

Luria A (1925). Russian Psycho-Analytical Society. *Bull Int Psychoanal Assoc* **6**:243–5.

Luria A (1926). Russian Psycho-Analytical Society. *Bull Int Psychoanal Assoc* **7**:294–5.

Luria A, Schmidt W (1927). Russian Psycho-Analytical Society. *Bull Int Psychoanal Assoc* **8**: 454–5.

McGuire W, editor (1974). *The Freud–Jung letters*. London: Hogarth Press.

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

Ogden T (1994). The analytic third: Working with intersubjective clinical facts. *Int J Psychoanal* **75**:3–19.

Ovtcharenko V, Leibin V (1999). Antologija rossiiskogo psychoanaliza [Anthology of Russian psychoanalysis] vol. 1. Moscow: MPSI.

Pocius V, Augis R (1989). Lithuania and psychoanalysis: A long way to Europe. *Psychoanal Europe* **33**:87–9.

Rado S, Fenichel O, Müller-Braunschweig, editors (1930) *Zehn Jahre Berliner Psychoanalytisches Institut. Poliklinik und Lehranstalt* [The first ten years of the Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute]. Wien: Int. Psychoanal. Verlag.

Reshetnikov M (1998). The conceptual approaches of the National Psychoanalytical Federation. Paper read at the 7th East European Psychoanalytic Seminar, Moscow.

Reshetnikov M (1999). Speech of the President of the National Federation of Psychoanalysis. *Psychoanalitichesky vestnik* **1**:215–20.

Rosenfeld H (1971). A clinical approach to the psychoanalytic theory of the life and death instincts: An investigation into the aggressive aspects of narcissism. *Int J Psychoanal* **52**:169–78.

Rosenfeld H (1987). *Impasse and interpretation*. London: Tavistock.

Rotmann JM (1996). The setting and its significance. Paper read at the East European Psychoanalytic Summer School, 4–10 August, Preddvor, Slowenia.

Rotmann JM (2001). Idols as an obstacle to psychoanalytic listening in different traditions. Paper presented at the EPF Main Conference, 5–8 April, Madrid.

Schroter M (2002). Max Eitingon and the struggle to establish an international standard for psychoanalytic training (1925–1929). *Int J Psychoanal* **83**:875–93.

Sebek M (1998). Searching for identity and authority: How to become a psychoanalyst in the post-totalitarian reality. . *EPF Bulletin* **51**:66–73.

Sebek M (1999). The 'invention' of psychoanalytic training in Eastern Europe. Paper read at the East European Pre-Congress 'Psychoanalysis and metropolis: Vienna 1900—Berlin 1920—Budapest 1930—Eastern and Central Europe 2000', 25 March, Berlin.

Stajner Popovic T (2003). Il futuro dell analisi [The future of psychoanalysis]. *Riv Psicoanal* **2**:371–7.

Szonyi G (1998). Still life and rebirth of a society: Glory and pitfalls in recent history of Hungarian psychoanalysis. Paper presented at the 7th Eastern Europe Psychoanalytic Seminar, Moscow.

Timofeeva M (2000). S chego nachinajetsya rodina … [What does the motherland begin with …]. *Moscovsky Psychoterap Zhurnal* **4**:39–54.

Uskov A (2000). Izvrashjennost: problema lichnosti I obshjestva [Perversity: A problem of the person and society]. *Moscovsky Psychoterap Zhurnal* **4**:55–69.

Van Waning A (1992). The works of pioneering psychoanalyst Sabina Spielrein—'Destruction and coming into being'. *Int Rev Psychoanal* **19**:399–414.

Vuco A (2000). Beyond bombs and sanctions. Paper presented at the 8th East European Psychoanalytical Conference, Kiev: 88–115.

Winnicott D (1971). *Playing and reality*. London: Tavistock.

Wulff M (1930). Zur Stellung der Psychoanalyse in der Sowjetunion [On the state of psychoanalysis in the Soviet Union]. *Die psychoanalytische Bewegung* **2**:70–5.

Zoshchenko M (1986). *Sobranie sochineniy* [*Collected Works*], 3 vols. Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaya Literatura.