Introduction

Historical Background

As German authors of a textbook on psychoanalysis, we believe that some comments on the dissolution of psychoanalysis in our country during the 1930s and its new beginning are appropriate.

Both as a method of treatment and as theory, psychoanalysis thrives off the fact that it directs the cognitive processes at the rediscovery of an object which assumes a new form the instant it is rediscovered, i.e., the instant it reaches consciousness through interpretive illumination. In personal life history and in the therapeutic process, as well as in the psychosocial sciences in general, Heraclitus' dictum that you cannot step twice into the same river is of great significance: Object-finding is not only a rediscovery, but also a new discovery. The reader familiar with Freud's works will not miss the allusion to Freud's formulation that "the finding of an object is in fact a refinding of it" (1905d, p.222). Psychoanalysis has become part of our intellectual history and can thus be rediscovered, even though historical circumstances can lead, and in Germany did lead, to an interruption of this tradition. During the Third Reich, the works of Freud were inaccessible to most Germans, and the science he had founded was outlawed. Jewish psychoanalysts shared the fate of all Jews in Nazi Germany and the occupied territories of Europe. Freud, at his advanced age, was able to save himself and his immediate family by going into exile in England. His sisters, who could not accompany him, died in a concentration camp. All generations of German psychoanalysts bear the burden of history in a way which goes beyond the general consequences of the holocaust as expressed by the President of the Federal Republic of Germany, R. von Weizsäcker (1985), in his speech marking the 40th anniversary of the end of World War 11. Although modern psychoanalysis is, of course, independent today of its founder, and as a science stands apart from any religious creed (not to speak of racist weltanschauungen), nevertheless an analyst is necessarily born into a Jewish genealogy and acquires his professional identity through identification with Freud's work. This situation produces numerous difficulties, reaching deep into the unconscious, which German psy-choanalysts have attempted to resolve in one way or another since 1945.

These problems become more comprehensible if we consider the ideas

which Klauber presented in 1976 at a symposium on the identity of the psychoanalyst called by the Executive Council of the International Psychoanalytical Association (Joseph and Widlöcher 1983). Klauber (1981) convincingly demonstrated the lasting consequences which the identification with the intellectual father of psychoanalysis has had on his students and thus on the history of psychoanalysis. Freud himself described the consequences of identificatory acceptance in *Mourning and Melancholia (*1917e) and in *Transience* (1916a). Klauber believes that psychoanalysts have not been able fully to accept Freud's death. The unconscious processes associated with this lead on the one hand to a restriction of our own thinking, and on the other hand to the inability to perceive how transient all scientific, philosophical, and religious ideas are, Freud's theories among them. Klauber's interpretation provides an explanation for the fact that rigidity and revolt run parallel in the history of psychoanalysis, and also that the question of the psychoanalyst's identity has been the focus of interest for quite some time. The fact that the identity of the psychoanalyst was chosen as the theme for the IPA symposium itself shows that analysts feel they can no longer rely on their identification with Freud. Not the least of the reasons why psychoanalysis undergoes changes is that original contributions by psychoanalysts themselves have demonstrated the transient nature of some of Freud's ideas. Klauber's fundamental reflections, which we have summarized here, make it clear why the psychoanalytic profession, more than any other, is concerned with its identity (Cooper 1984a; Thomä 1983c).

The concept of identity introduced by Erikson (1959), with its social psychological implications, sheds light on the insecurity of German psychoanalysts from 1933 to the present. Their dilemma, when thought through to its conclusion at the level of the unconscious, amounts to the fact that they seek to identify with the ideas of a man whose fellow Jews were murdered by Germans. We shall return to the question of formulating some aspects of this conflict in specifically Eriksonian terms, but first, in order to be able to grasp other, comparatively superficial aspects of the problems German analysts experience with identification, it is necessary to take a short look at the dismantling of psychoanalytic institutions in Germany in the 1930s.

After the closure of the distinguished Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute and of the German Psychoanalytic Society, along with its study groups in the southwest, in Leipzig, and in Hamburg, the few remaining, non-Jewish psychoanalysts sought ways to maintain their professional existence. On the one hand, they turned to private practice; on the other, they retained a measure of independence within the German Institute for Psychological Research and Psychotherapy (Deutsches Institut für psychologische Forschung und

Psychotherapie), founded in 1936, which was led by M. H.. Goring (a cousin of Hermann Goring) and called, for short, the Goring Institute. The training of young psychoanalysts continued there, although the Institute's goals exerted considerable pressure on them. The aim of bringing all schools of depth psychology (Freudians, Adlerians, Jungians) under one roof, namely an institute located in Berlin with branches in other cities (e.g., Munich, Stuttgart and, later, Vienna) was to promote Aryan psychotherapy *(deutsche Seelenheilkunde;* Goring 1934) and create a standard psychotherapy. The testimony of Dräger (1971), Baumeyer (1971), Kemper (1973), Riemann (1973), Bräutigam (1984), and Scheunert (1985) as well as the study by Lockot (1985) illuminate various aspects of the influence of the historical circumstances on the working conditions at the Institute.

Cocks (1983,1984), in his historical studies, reaches the conclusion that the gathering of the different schools at one institute had long-term consequences and side effects which, in his estimation, are on the whole positive. Yet it cannot be pointed out too strongly that these completely unintended effects can in principle be judged as positive only if they are absolutely independent of the *ideologically* determined psychotherapy which was the official aim. Even though evil may be the father of good, doubts remain about the offspring; we may think, in the words of the prophets Jeremiah (31, 29) and Ezekiel (18, 2),[1] "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." A psychoanalytic point of view, indeed, would suggest precisely that ideologies become intimately connected with unconscious processes, and in this way survive and even take on new substance. Lifton (1985) has correctly pointed out that Cocks paid too little attention to this question; and it is to the credit of Dahmer (1983) and others that this problem has recently been brought into the open.

The incorporation of all psychotherapists employing depth psychology into one institute led to the development of communities of interests, and to a consensus on various issues between advocates of different approaches. The pressures of the time strengthened the bonds between them. The idea of a synopsis — a synoptic psychotherapy, an amalgamation of the important aspects from all the schools — survived even longer. The foundation, in 1949, of the German Society for Psychotherapy and Depth Psychology (Deutsche Gesellschaft fur Psychotherapie und Tiefenpsychologie, later renamed to include psychosomatics) has had considerable positive consequences right up to the present day. For instance, professional interests are pursued jointly. The annual congresses provide a forum for analytically oriented psychotherapists. It is one thing, however, to follow common interests based on agreements regarding general principles in depth psychology; it is quite another to apply a

method of investigation and treatment consistently and to develop, test, and retest a theory.

The idea of synopsis springs from a yearning for unity which takes on numerous forms. Viewed scientifically, the efforts to achieve a synoptic psychotherapy and an amalgamation of schools were naive, and involved the underestimation of group-dynamic processes (Grunert 1984). Current research into general and specific factors in psychotherapy is helping to identify both the common features and the differences of the various approaches. Of course, it is necessary to define the methods used and the basic theories; and an eclectic approach to practice therefore places the highest demands on professional knowledge and ability. Moreover, the disparate elements not only have to be compatible, they also have to be capable of integration, above all by the patient.

The numerous consequences of the long years of isolation became apparent after the war. Groups formed around H. Schultz-Hencke and C. Müller-Braunschweig. Schultz-Hencke, who had gone his own way even before 1933, believed he had developed psychoanalysis further during the years of isolation. As Thomä (1963, 1969, 1986) has shown, the restricted understanding of transference in this neopsychoanalytic approach had lasting effects just at the time when extension of the theory and practice of transference was beginning in the international scientific community. On the other hand, Schultz-Hencke's criticism of libido theory and metapsychology at the first postwar congress of the International Psychoanalytical Association, held in Zurich, would today cause no sensation, and would actually be shared by many analysts. At that time, however, concepts and theories were even stronger markers of one's psychoanalytic identity than today.

The emigrant Jewish psychoanalysts and the members of the International Psychoanalytical Association placed their confidence in Müller-Braunschweig, who had remained faithful to Freud's teachings and who did not claim to have developed them further during the years of isolation or to have given them a new language. Substantive, personal, and group-dynamic differences led to a polarization, and Schultz-Hencke was the prime candidate for the role of scapegoat. In 1950 Müller-Braunschweig founded the German Psychoanalytic Association (Deutsche Psychoanalytische Vereinigung, DPV) with nine original members, all in Berlin, while the majority of the nearly 30 psychoanalysts in Germany after the war remained in the existing German Psychoanalytic Society (Deutsche Psychoanalytische Gesellschaft, DPG). This split proved to be a fateful turning point: only the new German Psychoanalytic Association was recognized as an affiliate of the International Psychoanalytical Association. The traditional German Psychoanalytic Society, originally founded in 1910, is no longer a component society of the International Psychoanalytical Association,

but instead is affiliated with the American Academy of Psychoanalysis.

Berlin not only provided the setting for the division into two professional groups; the demolished city was also the center of the *reconstruction* of psychoanalysis after 1945. A decisive factor in the recognition of the German Psychoanalytic Association by the International Psychoanalytical Association was that the Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute, whose membership was identical to that of the German Psychoanalytic Association, commenced the training of analysts. German psychoanalysts of the first postwar generation could gain membership in the International Psychoanalytical Association only through this Institute. At first there was only one West German member of the International Psychoanalytical Association outside Berlin, F. Schottlaender in Stuttgart.

The later official recognition of psychoanalysis by the public health insurance organizations also began in Berlin. The Institute for Psychogenic Illnesses (Institut fur psychogene Erkrankungen) was founded in Berlin in 1946 under the direction of W. Kemper and H. Schultz-Hencke. It was the first psychotherapeutic outpatient clinic to be financially sponsored by a semistate organization, the later General Communal Health Insurance (Allgemeine Ortskrankenkasse) of Berlin. This was a foundation stone for the acceptance of psychoanalytic therapy by all public health insurance organizations. Nonmedical psychoanalysts were always active at this clinic, and were able later, after the introduction of a professional standard for practicing psychologists at the German Institute for Psychological Research and Psychotherapy (Deutsches Institut fur psychologische Forschung und Psychotherapie), to participate without any major obstacles in the treatment of patients. Psychoanalysts without medical qualifications have had the right to treat patients within the framework of the public health insurance system since 1967.

In West Germany the Psychosomatic Hospital of the University of Heidelberg was founded in 1950 on the initiative of V. von Weizsäcker and with the support of the Rockefeller Foundation. Under the direction of A. Mitscherlich, it grew into an institution in which psychoanalytic training, treatment, and research were united under one roof. Thus for the first time in the history of German universities, psychoanalysis was able to establish itself in the way Freud (l919j) had envisaged in a paper which was originally published only in Hungarian and has remained relatively unknown (Thomä 1983b). The subsequent founding of the Sigmund Freud Institute in Frankfurt, a public institution, was due to the efforts of Mitscherlich, supported by T. W.. Adorno and M. Horkheimer.

Many of the first generation of psychoanalysts in Germany after the war began as self-taught practitioners. Their training analyses were relatively short. They shared intellectual curiosity and an enthusiasm (even love) for Freud's

works, whose recognition they fought for zealously. This kind of access to psychoanalysis is characteristic of productive pioneering times (A. Freud 1983). Something that made a profound impression on the postwar generation was the fact that German-speaking psychoanalysts living abroad put aside personal feelings and offered their assistance, despite having been forced to flee from oppression in Nazi Germany, and even despite the murder of members of their families.

One significant event symbolizes this help from abroad and at home: a series of lectures on "Freud in the Present" (Adomo and Dirks 1957). These lectures were organized to commemorate the hundredth anniversary of Freud's birth. E.H. Erikson presented the first lecture on May 6, 1956, in the presence of the then President of the Federal Republic of Germany, Theodor Heuss. Eleven American English, and Swiss psychoanalysts held the series of lectures at the Universities of Frankfurt and Heidelberg during the summer term of 1956. These lectures resulted from initiatives by Adomo, Horkheimer, and Mitscherlich, and received substantial support from the government of the state of Hesse.

The further development of psychoanalysis in West Germany was influenced very positively by the fact that full-time training was made possible at several locations, as A. Freud (1971) demanded for up-to-date psychoanalytic training. The German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) began to support the new generation of analysts by providing financial support for training and supervisory analyses as a result of a report it had commissioned, entitled *Denkschrift zur Lage der ärztlichen Psychotherapie und psychosomatischen Medizin* (Gorres et al. 1964). Intensive supervision, case discussions with numerous European and American psychoanalysts representing nearly all schools of psychoanalysis, and periods spent working abroad made it possible for German psychoanalysts of the postwar generation to overcome the deficit in knowledge created during the Nazi period and attain an international standard of work by the mid-1960s (Thomä 1964). Making numerous identifications during the transfer of knowledge appears to have deleterious consequences only if the identifications remain unrelated to each other and are not integrated with Freud's work in a scientific manner by means of critical discussion.

The rapid growth of psychoanalysis in West Germany can be seen in the fact that the two psychoanalytic organizations, the German Psychoanalytic Association (DPV) and the German Psychoanalytic Society (DPG), currently have a total of about 650 members. Considerable interest in psychoanalysis is also shown by those in neighbouring disciplines, although genuine interdisciplinary cooperation is limited to a few locations. The number of

doctors and psychologists seeking psychoanalytic training is very large in comparison to other countries. Psychoanalysts head departments of psychotherapy and psychosomatics at many German universities; if Freud's paradigm can be permanently established and extended at the universities, there is a good chance that the urgently necessary intensification of psychoanalytic research will take place. The significance of the medical application of psychoanalysis goes far beyond its specific technique of treatment, and Balint's ideas on this topic have been accepted more widely by physicians in Germany than anywhere else. There are more Balint groups in Germany than in other countries; participants examine their therapeutic activity from interactional points of view in order to achieve a type of doctor-patient relationship which has a favorable influence on the course of the illness.

Despite the internationally recognized reestablishment of psychoanalysis in Germany since 1945, many more German analysts have problems with their professional identity than do their colleagues in other countries. Most of them are insecure and show an orthodox and submissive attitude toward representatives of the International Psychoanalytical Association regardless of the latters' personal feelings (whether positive or negative) about the standards of German psychoanalytic training (Richter 1985; Rosenkötter 1983). Viewed against the background of historical events, however, it is hardly surprising that German psychoanalysts are unusually vulnerable to the unconscious processes interpreted by Klauber. Many cannot do enough to idealize the work of Freud, others strive to affirm their own identity, while others again make a point of questioning it (prophylactically, no doubt, since they fear being criticized for arrogant independence). All this is symptomatic of that form of ontogenetic identity crisis which Erikson has characterized as "autonomy *versus* shame and doubt" (Erikson 1959). They cannot comfortably mark off their own professional identities in the usual way through theoretical criticism of Freud (the founding father), because this feels like a symbolic identification with those who rejected him politically and racially and persecuted him and his people; hence the ambivalence between subservient orthodoxy and a "neurotic" reaction formation against it. Again, even though there may be legitimate scientific reasons for seeking an agreed "synoptic" theory of depth psychology (which could be corroborated by different schools of practice and would avoid ill-founded idiosyncrasies), German analysts cannot sympathize with this project without feeling that they are selling out to the Nazis' malevolently motivated "Aryan psychotherapy."

But such preoccupations serve to chain creative and critical potential to the past and to make the solution of current problems in psychoanalysis more difficult. Doubt, however, as an impetus for change and progress, must not be

restricted to the past and to historical questions regarding which components of Freud's teachings were sacrificed here or there in the course of accommodating to political circumstances or for other unscientific reasons. The incrimination of real and intellectual parents and grandparents, and the demonstration of their personal and political lapses, can also be employed outside psychoanalytic therapy as a form of resistance to the mastering of current tasks. A promising basis for a fruitful new beginning appears most likely to emerge from a comparison between past and present problems. Freud reaches an encouraging conclusion in his reflections on the *transience* of beauty, art, and intellectual achievement. He states that mourning is at some point exhausted and the loss is accepted, and that young people then "replace the lost objects by fresh ones equally or still more precious" (Freud 1916a, p.307).

Signpost

After a survey in Chap. 1 of the problems currently facing psychoanalysis, the remaining chapters of this volume are organized into three sections. The first of these, comprising Chaps. 2-5, covers the fundamental concepts and theories of the psychoanalytic technique of treatment, such as transference and the analytic relationship, countertransference, resistance, and dream interpretation. We begin by paying special attention to transference, the hub of psychoanalytic therapy. The analyst's contribution to all manifestations of transference depends not only on his countertransference, but also on his theory of the origin of neuroses and psychosomatic illnesses.

In the second section (Chaps. 6-8), we describe and critically discuss the necessary steps in the initiation and the conducting of psychoanalytic treatment. Chapter 6 deals with the initial interview and the influence of third parties on the psychoanalytic process, and Chap. 7 covers the rules which analysts employ and follow. Chapter 8 is particularly extensive, since the means, ways, and goals to which this chapter is devoted are great in number. Means, ways, and goals are interrelated in the psychoanalytic process, and we do not agree that interpretation is the only means, or that the way is the goal. We also do not wish to commit ourselves to a specific, limited goal.

The third section begins with Chap. 9, in which we discuss the usefulness of models of the psychoanalytic process in the classification of the clinical descriptions which we have presented in the discussion of means, ways, and goals. The relationship between theory and practice forms the silent background to the whole book, and is the focus of attention in Chap. 10. This issue constitutes one of the greatest and most significant problems in both the theory

and the practice of psychoanalysis.

The foundations of psychoanalytic technique have traditionally been sought in the general and specific theory of neurosis. In light of the divergence resulting from pluralism and of the increase in knowledge on the autonomy of treatment problems, however, we are not able to derive psychoanalytic practice from a generally accepted theory of the origin and course of psychic illnesses. Such ideal assumptions have always been illusory in view of the complex relationship between theory and practice.

The goal of our discussion of the theory of therapy and its most important concepts is to safeguard the application of the psychoanalytic technique to a broad spectrum of psychic and psychosomatic illnesses. In preparing the manuscript, our exposition of the central concepts eventually reached such proportions that no room was left for detailed presentation of actual cases within the confines of a single volume. Not being ones to do half a job, we will be introducing various types of psychoanalytic dialogues in a second companion volume, where they will be discussed thoroughly with reference to the points of view presented in this first volume. We believe that dividing *principles* and *practice* into two volumes does better justice to each than squeezing them both into one book, where lack of space would prevent us from developing our themes sufficiently to show that the principles and the practice legitimate each other. For the moment the theoretical arguments will have to speak for themselves.

At this juncture we would like to devote a few words to Chap. 1, where we introduce the problems facing psychoanalysis. After consideration of the *current state of psychoanalysis* and examination of our own practice, we have arrived at a *position* which now determines our views on problems of theory and practice. Our leitmotif, the *analyst's contribution* to the psychoanalytic process, pervades the whole book. The remarks on our position, our choice of leitmotif, and our assessment of the state of psychoanalysis supplement each other.

In the section on the *crisis of theory* we review the consequences of the controversy over whether psychoanalysis is to be comprehended as an *explanatory* or an *understanding* science. We show that the criticism of metapsychology has a much greater relevance to practice than is generally thought. There are numerous indications that Freud's paradigm will emerge renewed from the crisis. In order to demonstrate these tendencies clearly, we discuss the current state of psychoanalysis from several points of view. The last section of the first chapter deals with *convergences*. We discern within psychoanalysis many attempts at integration, or at least serious scientific endeavors to resolve differences of opinion more clearly than before. We hope that the argumentative style of this book will contribute to integration. Finally,

we cannot fail to observe the convergence of psychoanalysis and neighboring disciplines, which might eventually lead to the establishment of a greater degree of unity than could be expected based on the numerous divergences evident in the current situation. As an example of the stimulus provided by inter-disciplinary cooperation, we discuss the significance of some aspects of neonatological research for psychoanalytic practice.

In calling these remarks "Signpost," we are alluding to the passage from Wittgenstein which we quote in Sect. 7.1. In this passage, Wittgenstein refers to the numerous functions that a signpost may have, depending on the position and the goals of the traveller. Like a signpost, our remarks here cannot indicate everything the traveller will find when he arrives at his destination, or how it will compare with the expectations he has formed over a long period of time. We must ask indulgence for our decision to restrict ourselves to only a few definite recommendations and instead to urge critical contemplation of means, ways, and goals. This approach represents an alliance of our personal style with the conviction that it is more favorable, in the long term, to examine the function of rules from the very outset, rather than to let them dictate the way we should go.

One recommendation we would make to the less experienced traveller is to begin with the chapters which we consider less difficult. It is probably a good idea to start by reading about our general position and the leitmotif of the book, the analyst's contribution to the psychoanalytic process (Sects. 1.1, 1.2). The chapter on rules (Chap. 7) is particularly important for the psychoanalytic method, although the rules only come to life when considered in the context of transference, countertransference, and resistance in the analytic situation. It might also seem natural to start with the initial interview and the role of third parties (Chap. 6). So we could go on, but we do not wish this signpost to deter the reader from going his own way. One last word: our use of the generic masculine in the text was dictated by convenience—we find it clumsy always to say "he/she" or "(s)he" and so on.

---

[1] It is important to say a word about the context of this quotation. The prophets refer to the new covenant between the Lord and the houses of Israel and Judah, to the effect that "ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel" (Ezekiel 18, 3). The new covenant makes everybody responsible for his own sins only: "But every one shall die for his own iniquity: every man that eateth the sour grape, his teeth shall be set on edge" (Jeremiah 31, 30). Thus the Mosaic law as stated in Exodus (20, 5) is dissolved: "For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generations of them that hate me." (See Lamentations 5, 7: "Our fathers have sinned, and are not; and we have borne their iniquities.")