



## **Markus Fähr<sup>1</sup>**

# **Opening Remarks**

Dear Colleagues

I welcome you very warmly to the first conference of the European Confederation of Psychoanalytic Psychotherapies ECPP here in the beautiful country of Slovenia, in this marvellous town Ljubljana.

### **WHAT IS ECPP?**

Another professional organization in the field of psychoanalytic and psychodynamic psychotherapy?

---

<sup>1</sup> Marcus Fähr, Dr. phil., Freud-Institut, Zürich (Switzerland), President of European Confederation of Psychoanalytic Psychotherapies. E-mail: mfaeh@tele2.ch

### **WHY ECPP?**

Is IPA — the International psychoanalytic Association — not enough? Over 0000 psychoanalysts throughout the whole world are organized in this proud and old association founded by Sigmund Freud in 1908.

Is EFPP — the European Federation of Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy in the Public Sector — not enough? This organization has more than 5000 members all over Europe, it is fostering the development of psychoanalytic Psychotherapy in many ways, and it is a successful organization.

### **WHY ALSO ECPP?**

Is ECPP just another prove that psychotherapists are very creative in splitting, projecting, quarrelling?

Is it narcissistic megalomania to get into concurrence with two important international organizations?

Am I masochistic to accept the role as the founding president of ECPP, being also a member in the two other big organizations?

Are we only looking for unnecessary trouble?

Of course nothing of this is the case.

The answer to the question "Why ECPP?" is quite simple

It is: Because ECPP is urgently needed!

ECPP can do and will do things the other two organization do not.

I will give you six reasons for this

#### **1. First Reason: ECPP is a forum not a bureaucracy**

The two other organizations — especially the IPA — are the guardians of the Holy Grail. They want to protect the essence of psychoanalysis by establishing formal training procedures, membership and qualification criteria and procedures. The result is a powerful organization at its best — with strong structures but little openness and creativity.

It is like an ocean steamer, like the Titanic. Once driving in one direction at a certain speed, it can't change its direction easily. It can't quickly react to the challenges of the present difficult situation for PT.

EFPP is but the small brother of IPA, with the same Holy Grail Keeper mentality.

This is the reason why we need a flexible non-bureaucratic organization, a forum to discuss and to develop strategies for establishing PT as a widely spread therapeutic modality all over Europe.

## **2. Second reason: ECPP is standing for a revolution of the petrified training model of PT**

The IPA standards of psychoanalytical training are severe, they guarantee high quality, they are very formal und rigid. They cant be met by many psychoanalytically minded people in countries where there is no established psychoanalytic training culture.

Shuttle analysis for example — where the analysand is travelling abroad for his his personal training analysis— is only for people who can afford it. If this is the only way to get analytic self experience in countries where there are no IPA-certified training analysts — many psychologists, psychiatrists and other professionals who are willing to learn psychoanalytic work in countries without established psychoanalytical training institutes will be excluded from psychoanalytic training and working.

ECPP is the forum, which will develop training standards and strategies which are adapted to the specifics of ”emerging psychoanalytical markets“.

## **3. Third reason: ECPP is giving new answers to the old question of stimulating the development of PT into the whole of Europe**

In many countries there are no established psychoanalytical institutes. How to build up a psychoanalytical culture in these countries? We need new models, not just copies of the old Berlin Model of analytical training.

We need a ”teach the teachers“ model, which is training advanced clinicians in the emerging countries. These advanced clinicians will train their colleagues. So a psychoanalytical pyramid is built with upon a broad basis! From the bottom up not top down!

ECPP will und stimulate and support these models.

**4. Fourth Reason: ECPP is effective outreach for the cause of PT**

IPA's new campaign is outreach: Bringing Psychoanalysis and PT back to society! ECPP is a powerful outreach project because it reaches all the psychoanalytically minded and — interested clinicians and the wider public.

**5. Fifth reason: ECPP is an effective integration of PT into the whole field of psychotherapy — leading PT out of its isolation**

ECPP is integrated in EAP and therefore part of the discussion between the different psychotherapeutic methods. This integration helps leading PT out of its scientific and professional isolation within the psychotherapeutic field.

**6. ECPP is opening PT to research findings**

ECPP is keeping its eyes wide open, it supports the development of clinical practice by informing about scientific findings, by keeping a close contact to the psychotherapy research scene

These six reasons give ECPP the legitimation to act as a representative of PT.

ECPP is pursuing the true Freudian Tradition of bringing Pt not only to a small group of middle and upper class patients, but also to the masses, to all the people in need of psychoanalytic help.

“collective regressive phenomena” is re-created, which includes rigid, almost paranoid, devotion to particular psychoanalytic doctrine, strengthened by “religious nature of such institutes’ administrative structure”. Meanwhile in some leading Western institutions there are no systematic educational programs. By the way, Otto Kernberg has already pointed at the same shortcomings of psychoanalytic institutes (1993)<sup>9</sup>.

There is another specific feature of existing educational model, that is (more and more unsuccessful) attempt to maintain psychoanalytical ecumenism (doctrinal unity of different schools) and educational syncretism (inseparable connection between therapeutic and up-breeding processes) as well as hopeless attempt to monopolize psychoanalytic movement under the aegis of an international organization. Again, as a result of professional society’s protest behaviour, new associations and federations were established in Europe that declare and fulfil qualitatively different principles of their organization and activity, in particular: membership is based on candidates’ acceptance of psychoanalytic theory in general (not the “only true” understanding of it) and their work with transference and resistance. I have no doubts that future will show their effectiveness.

Simultaneously the opposite process takes place. The prominent component of contemporary Western psychoanalytic ecumenism is constant maintenance of specific myths, in particular, there would always be glorification of one’s group (organization) in contrast to all others, which are analogues of “disbelieves”; in result, some orthodox psychoanalytic schools resemble totalitarian sects.

I have already seen at a psychoanalytic school’s forum that someone’s ideas associated with another school would be immediately rejected with such amazing simplicity that there is no hope for discussion at all. In fact, here we meet a kind of religious dogma: “How can we discuss something contradictory to the true belief?!”. Any renegades from a psychoanalytic society would be at least disapproved by it. In Russia we are immanently open for any contacts and have deep respect to corporate ethics (but not dogmas) of every psychoanalytic trend and organization, but at the same

---

<sup>9</sup> Kernberg O.F. The Current Status of Psychoanalysis. — Journ. of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 1993, # 41, pp. 45–62.

time we generally agree that everyone who accepts psychoanalytic paradigm, who works with transference and resistance and fulfils the standards of professional training, could belong to psychoanalytic society. Now we widen this position, for someone who accepts psychoanalytic paradigm may not want to practice, thus to pass through a long training process. Certainly, it results in “overproduction” of psychoanalytically oriented specialists; in Russia there are more than a thousand such specialists, but only about 100 of them fulfilled the standards and have their own practice. I am certain that in future proportion (10 to 1) will be the same.

### **PROBLEM OF FILIATION**

Filiation (in original sense of the term, that is, admitting of fatherhood or illegal children) is another anachronistic problem of some part of Western psychoanalysis, that Vladimir Granov very delicately (almost without criticism) wrote about.

What does it mean? If you want to join an orthodox psychoanalytic institution, nobody would be interested in your theoretical education and practical qualification, in your experience and effectiveness of your scientific and professional activity. The main question will be your loyalty to the organization, and then, who were your analyst and your supervisor?

They should both be members of group or school, which you apply for membership. It resembles ordain or christening. For example, if you were “christened” by International Association of Analytical Psychology (IAAP that is, Jungians) you have no chance to be admitted as “true believer” by International Psychoanalytic Organization (IPA). This is obvious anachronism. In our organization (NFP) some specialists had analysis with Freudian, some with Jungian or Reichian specialists; they are able to work together, and their effectiveness doesn’t depend on where and by whom they were “christened”.

### **Education or work of penance?**

I would like to return back to the topic of psychoanalytic “education and work of penance”, which has been mentioned in previous chapter.

There is another specific aspect — “admission to christening”. In most of contemporary Western schools before the long procedure of candidate’s “ordain” he would be repeatedly (although indirectly) tested in respect of his loyalty to the organization, and only then they would invite you... not to study, only to have personal analysis and simultaneously read the papers admitted as “canonical” by this school. After many years (usually, 5–7) in result of this education in combination with personal analysis you would get, as Cezar Gatza-Guerrero aptly puts it, “as-if-certification”, that is, you would be included in the list of specialists of public organization.

For example, in 1990 (later data weren’t available for me) 2\3 from 28 psychoanalytic institutes in USA gave their graduates “internal” (that is, admitted nowhere except a particular institute) certificates. Only 1\3 from these institutes have a system of control for theoretical knowledge and diploma.

There is another specific detail of Western psychoanalytical education. Our patients come to us with their problems, and we treat them for months, sometimes for years. But if you come to psychoanalytic institution, your treatment would always take many years. Thus, some specialists ask: “Is it true that a candidate is always sicker than any other patient?”. It’s not an idle question. Is it possible that it is true? Maybe we had better change names of our societies to “therapeutic societies of former patients”?

For example, average duration of education in psychoanalytical institutes in USA is 8,5 years, but some candidates study for 10 or even 15 years. Is it a matter of capacities? Or the absence of system? Or maybe something else? Considering the fact that goals of personal training are clearly formulated long ago, it is something else. Candidates from Russia (shuttle-analysands) were educated in accelerated way, twice faster in average. Almost all “canons” of personal training and setting were violated. I will tell more about it, but the main task was obvious: not to violate the canon of filiation.

Taking in account the uncertain status of graduates and the length of their “work of penance”, we won’t be surprised that the average number of students in American psychoanalytic institutes decreased three times since 1960 and is about 24 student per institute (if we measure to our

system, where one year is one course, and divide it to 8 years, then each institute accepts 3 persons per year). This is certainly a crisis. Manpower resources are absent.

Compare it with our East European Institute of Psychoanalysis in St-Petersburg that accepts about 100–150 students per year including students from Western countries. When we ask them why do they prefer our Institute, they answer: “First of all, it is 10–20 times cheaper. Second, we have tried to study in Western institutes already, there wasn’t any system of education. Third, you give us diploma of psychologist with psychoanalytic specialization by Russian Health Ministry, we would easily approve it on the West, and it’s enough for professional activity, we can become psychotherapists with psychoanalytical orientation”. Of course, they flatter us and exaggerate a bit. They might join a society afterwards and would be less independent. But probably it won’t be an orthodox society.

Let us return to the essence of previous passage. In Western psychoanalytic institute unity of therapeutic, educational and indirect up-breeding tasks is obligatory (with unclear duration of education and resulting qualification). If you haven’t had your own treatment, you won’t be accepted to an institute, no matter how strong is your desire to study psychoanalysis! We can say slightly exaggerating that it is a kind of “forceful treatment” for a person who only wanted to acquire an education and a profession! In Soviet times there was a practice of forceful treatment, even combined with acquiring some vocational skills, but only for alcoholics. Even for them such totalitarian model doesn’t exist any more.

In addition, my Western colleagues frequently notice (they asked me not to mention their names, which is an important sign itself) that psychoanalytical education requires non-critical acceptance of knowledge of “a group of initiated authors”, “canonical books” or “special schools”, and any step beyond these limits is disapproved. There is neither discussion, nor even studying of other concepts and other psychoanalytic schools. Magazines and books by other psychoanalytic societies are not forbidden, of course, but they are not ordered for libraries, not recom-



mended for study and, in general, not read at all (indeed, “why should true Muslim believer read Christian magazine?”).

Such concept as interdisciplinary approach to psychopathology is very rarely met with. As we know, C. G. Jung compared quite seriously personal analysis with initiation. We can’t deny that such elements exist in any profession, but they shouldn’t become its core essence.

### **Idealization and dictate**

Most of psychoanalytic societies, in spite of obvious imperatives of XXI century, make consistent effort for idealization of anachronistic model of psychoanalytical education; in result, these societies are prone to dogmatic transmission of knowledge (in the limits of particular school only) and keeping traditional educational system, combined with less and less successful attempts of an international society to dominate over national associations and individual members. As former soviet people we know this model pretty well — it is like Communist Party and so-called “social camp”. And we know better than others how it ends...

These attempts to reanimate psychoanalysis as a world-wide movement of “initiated” and at the same time to maintain it’s status as a unique profession are utopian (like communist utopia), but this attitude still determines the inertia in changes of most psychoanalytic institutions’ activity.

However, as we’ve mentioned, these ideas are being revised now, which is manifested in establishment of new international psychoanalytic societies and associations based on quite different principles.

### **Problem of self-isolation**

The distinct negative factor is persistent tendency of psychoanalysis towards self-isolation, including isolation from academic science and even its closest sectors such as psychology, psychotherapy and psychiatry. Here we see the manifestation of the same stereotype: how can a movement pretending to be exclusive cooperate with science?

In result psychoanalysis developed its own terminology, which is not understood outside our professional audience; we have tradition of verbal

sophistication and indirect tendency to confessional isolation. In result most of our books and papers are read by our specialists only. In contrast to Freud and his followers, we rarely condescend to share our knowledge (expressed at understandable language) with wider (or at least wider professional) audience. We almost haven't systematic research (or, as we mentioned, they are very few). So we return to Otto Kernberg's statement (1986<sup>10</sup>, 1993) that students and teachers of traditional psychoanalytic institutes are involved in a "monastery" model or model of vocational training school. In Russia we consistently avoid such model. But we also have the tendency to self-isolation. However, when psychoanalytically orientated specialists condescend to share their ideas with wider professional audience, it accept them with respect and attention. Especially when it is done in a gifted manner. Maybe one of our best achievements in Russia is implication of psychoanalysis in contemporary philosophy, where Freud, Jung or Lacan are mentioned as often as Hegel, Weber or Derrida.

Problem of self-isolation of psychoanalysis have also another consequence: psychoanalytic ideas (including the most genius ones) were repeatedly taken, accepted or rejected or even distorted outside of psychoanalysis while it maintained its silent self-isolation.

## PSYCHOANALYSIS AND CULTURE

Psychoanalysis has become a cultural phenomenon, and we are indebted for that to Freud and his followers who could write about complicated topics in a simple manner understandable for every educated person. Even their mistakes are charming as a piece of arts. In contrast to classic works, some modern essays are full of such leaps of thought that even specialists can't understand what has author meant, except that "he had a case" and "what a skilled therapist he was with his brilliant interpretations". The content of treatment is touched upon in such papers only slightly, just to illustrate author's ideas, hypotheses or reflections.

---

<sup>10</sup> Kernberg O.F. Institutional Problems of Psychoanalytic Education. — Journ. of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 1986, # 34, pp. 799–834.