THE JOURNAL OF ANALYTICAL PSYCHOLOGY
(1998). Journal of Analytical Psychology, 43:127-154

Family tree matters

Ernst Falzeder

The present paper investigates the form and structure of the psychoanalytic 'family tree', concentrating on the analysands of Sándor Ferenczi and Otto Rank, and their impact on contemporary psychoanalysis.

Introduction

Freud and psychoanalysis have beyond doubt shaped culture and society in the twentieth century to an extraordinary extent. Hardly any tendency in our life has escaped their impact. Freud is the most heavily cited author in social sciences and arts and humanities indices **(Megill 1982)**. 'The documentation on Freud is said to surpass in specificity and depth of insight the extant material on any other human being in history' (Henry Murray, in Mahony **1987**, p. 1). 'It would be hard to find in the history of ideas, even in the history of religion, someone whose influence was so immediate, so broad and so deep' (Wollheim **1971**, p. 9). 'There has been nothing like this since the spread of the potato and of maize, and this diffusion [of psychoanalysis] was even faster and may have deeper implications' (Gellner **1985**, p. 11).

The scientific status and therapeutic efficacy of psychoanalysis, however, are seriously challenged. In the present dispute, both critics and defenders of psychoanalysis largely draw and rely on historical research, the results of which also determine the picture we gain of its credibility.

Unfortunately, the present state of psychoanalytic historiography is unsatisfactory and, for all I know, this also holds true for the history of analytical psychology: (1) Scholars with a sound training and experience in both psychoanalysis and history are extremely rare. (2) Although Freud might be the person in history about whom most has been written, there is comparatively little literature on his chief co-workers, confidants, and disciples. (3) Well-researched literature is scarce, for several reasons. First, only relatively few primary sources, such as correspondence, have been published at all. Second, many of those published are censored or unreliable, full of errors in transcription, translation, and editorial notes (cf. **Falzeder 1996a**). Third, the bulk of unpublished, private

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

and archival materials has been transferred to English-speaking countries, particularly the United States. Many scholars in these countries have only a limited command of German, in which most of the documents are written. Lastly, there is only a handful of experts who can decipher Freud's and his disciples' Gothic handwriting.

Apart from these external circumstances, there are some crucial aspects to psychoanalytic historiography, which are unique to the field and require special attention, but have been neglected until now. They boil down to the fact that perhaps nowhere else in science are personal relationships and experiences so closely intertwined with the transmission of theory and of practical knowledge as in psychoanalysis.

The central part of the training is the psychoanalysis of the analyst-to-be by a senior and experienced colleague, followed by a supervision of clinical work. Such training is also an important way by which the central *theoretical* ideas are transmitted, by 'experiencing' them rather than by learning them from books. Through the training analysis, each psychoanalyst becomes part of a genealogy that ultimately goes back to Sigmund Freud and a handful of early pioneers. Evidently, each training and supervising analyst has her or his own theoretical and practical preferences, with which the analysands are confronted and by which they are deeply influenced. In addition, there are the influences of the 'sibling' peer group of fellow candidates, etc. All this makes one think rather of schools in the arts or in literature, or even in religion, than of the training in the sciences although there, too, the borders between theory, practice, and methods on the one hand, and the personal relationship between the trainer and the trainee on the other, are not as distinct as are sometimes proclaimed (cf. **Knorr-Cetina 1984**).

Whatever the advantages or shortcomings of this method may be, the point here is that *a history of ideas in psychoanalysis must take account of the path these ideas have taken*. Exploring that path of transmission of theoretical and technical concepts thus becomes a *via regia* for the historical investigator.

Jacob Arlow mentioned that analysts have the habit of tracing their descent from the training analyst (**1972**, p. 561). Ernest Gellner noted that 'the real central emotional bond holding the [psychoanalytic] system together is a striking network of intense binary relations of analysand to analyst' and that it was 'both sad and astonishing that little research has yet gone into establishing a full map of these networks' (**1985**, p. 55). Paul Roazen wrote to me that 'in the 1960s Geoffrey Gorer tried to get me to construct just such a family tree, but I wilted at the project' (letter of 7 September 1994). Elisabeth Roudinesco has pointed out the filiational networks in her authoritative history of psychoanalysis in France **(1982/1986)**. Recently, Bateman and Holmes have published a small genealogy of British psychoanalysis **(1995)**. Aldo Calanca (Lausanne) has drawn up a family tree for French Switzerland for private use (private communication), and Victoria Hamilton has emphasized this aspect in her teaching (private communication). In her most recent work,

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

Hamilton has carried out a cluster analysis of responses to a questionnaire, regarding influences of different theories on analytic technique, and has found 'a subset of analysts within one orientation, all of whom had been either analyzed or supervised by the same analysts' (**1996**, p. 9).

To the best of my knowledge, however, a close study of this genealogy, and a detailed investigation of how the form and structure of these filiations have influenced the paths of theory and practice, have not been undertaken until now. Although some promising beginnings have been made, a balanced intellectual history of psychoanalysis, specific to its nature, rooted in the formation and practice of psychoanalysts, and based on extensive research of primary source materials, is still missing. In a pilot study **(Falzeder 1994)**, I have carried out a provisional draft of psychoanalytic genealogy until World War II, comprising about 500 names. I have also drawn some preliminary conclusions as to the form, structure, and implications of the kind of family tree that emerges.

Generally speaking, it seems that what we now consider to be a training analysis *lege artis* was the exception and not the rule, at least in the cases that can be documented so far. Instead, there were often repeated patterns of affect- laden relationships, be they incestuous, hostile, erotic, or power relations, mixed with varying doses of analysis, leading to much confusion and suffering among those involved.

More specifically, there is evidence of many training analyses that were or became erotic relationships, or of erotic relationships that turned into analyses. Moreover, analysis was often mingled with kinship. Not only did husbands or lovers analyze each other, or were analyzed by the same analyst, not only did parents have their children analyzed by their own analysts or even analysands, but it was indeed common practice that parents analyzed their own children, aunts their nephews, men the children of their lovers. As a matter of fact, the blurring of the boundaries between professional and sexual or familial relationships was the rule and not the exception. There is even the case of the famous psychologist Jean Piaget, who analyzed, or tried to analyze, his own mother **(Schepeler 1993)**! In this context, it is noteworthy that a host of clinical papers written at the time are *disguised* accounts of the author's own analysis, of the analysis of a son or daughter, or of a lover, or, perhaps most frequently, of an autoanalysis (cf. **Falzeder 1996b**).

Another one of the findings is that it was common practice that analysts had more than one analysis. Most of them had two, many had three, some had even four, and a few were analyzed by no less than five different analysts. Although this is quite in line with Freud's advice that '[every] analyst should periodically - at intervals of five years or so - submit himself to analysis once more' (Freud **1937c**, p. **249**), this was not considered a standard feature of the professional training. It was not openly discussed, let alone written about, indeed *not* 'without feeling ashamed of taking this step' (ibid.). Moreover, the multiple analyses did not help the analysands to overcome certain problems that would probably, were they known, exclude them from analytic training today.

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

Analytic training can be compared to an 'apostolic succession' (Balint **1948**, p. **170**), originally established against the background of the impending dissension of Jung. In fact, the motive to found the Secret Committee around Freud had been 'that a small group of men could be *thoroughly analyzed* by [Freud himself], so that they could represent the *pure theory unadulterated by personal complexes*, and thus build an unofficial inner circle in the Verein and serve as centers where others (beginners) could come and learn the work' (30 July 1912; Freud & Jones **1993**, p. **146**; [my italics]). Each of the Committee's members should, in other words, undergo a purification process with the Master himself. This initiation procedure would then enable him to act as representative of 'pure theory and exact technique' **(Caruso 1975)** and to initiate others.

All these facts already challenge us to reconsider, if not to rewrite, the history of psychoanalysis, and to reflect upon the relationship between theory and practice. Evidently, there was a gap between the ideal of the training analysis and the actual analyses. When theory and practice do not correspond, actually contradict each other, theory does not reflect or explain reality. It stands for ideals not realized in reality, or it can be used to rationalize unwanted aspects of reality, to ward it off, to deny it, or to mystify it.

A family tree of psychoanalysis is a way to make literally visible, for the first time, some important aspects of this reality. In addition, the underlying structure of analytic training, as well as the *correlation potential* and the hidden implications of these data are revealed. They show, for instance, the most important training analysts (who were not necessarily the most important theoreticians), by whom today's leading psychoanalysts were analyzed, the average duration of training analyses at a given time, how many analyses were conducted with family members or lovers, which and how many analysts had multiple 'postgraduate' analyses after their initial training, differences between various countries or cities, in which aspects the psychoanalytic training changed over time, and so on.

I will not deal with C. G. Jung and the filiations of analytical psychology here, as I am certainly not an expert on them. But the little I know makes me wonder whether Jung's role in the *psychoanalytic* family tree has not been underrated by most historians of both psychoanalysis and analytical psychology. It was Jung, not Freud, who first recommended the analysis of the analyst: 'I count it as one of the many merits of the Zürich school of analysis that they have … demand[ed] that everyone who wishes to carry out analyses on other people shall first himself undergo an analysis by someone with expert knowledge' (Freud **1912e**, p. **116**). '[I]t was *he* [Jung] who demanded the "analytic community" of students and treating students like patients' (Ferenczi to Freud, 26 December 1912; Freud & Ferenczi **1994**, p. **449**). Jung also advocated training analysis in his Fordham lectures on 'The Theory of Psychoanalysis' **(Jung 1913)**.

The first generation of those who practiced psychoanalysis as a profession came to Freud almost *exclusively* via Jung, for instance Karl Abraham, Ludwig

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

Binswanger, Abraham Arden Brill, Trigant Burrow, Max Eitingon, Sándor Ferenczi, Otto Gross, Smith Ely Jelliffe, Ernest Jones, Hermann Nunberg, Hermann Rorschach, Leonhard Seif, Eugénie Sokolnicka, and Sabina Spielrein, to name only some prominent ones. Freud himself stated that '[most] of my followers and co-workers at the present time came to me by way of Zürich' (**1914d**, p. **27**), and even that '[a]ll those who are now with me came from Jung' (26 November 1912; Freud & Ferenczi **1994**, p. **43** [my translation]). It is true that neither Jung nor Bleuler conducted training analyses in the modern sense, although Jung did 'analyze' a few colleagues, thinking that a rapid summary procedure could both help them and turn them into followers, e.g., Sándor Ferenczi, Otto Gross, and Leonhard Seif. There were seminars of a more general nature, and there existed, from 1907, a 'Freud society', an informal forum for discussions where one sought to detect 'Freudian mechanisms' in hospital patients. Hilda Abraham recounted that 'the wives of the medical doctors not only listened to the discussions and participated in them, but they also told their own dreams. But, to the extent to which the comprehension of unconscious motives and impulses grew, the doctors prevented their wives from speaking about their dreams' (Hilda Abraham **1976**, p. 62 [my translation]).

A repressed heritage and the return of the repressed

During the past decades, there has been a debate over core concepts in psychoanalysis, which can be characterized by the following catchwords: drive model versus object relations model, reconstruction of the past versus importance of the present, recovering memories versus creating a narrative, theoretical insight versus emotional experience, inner phantasies versus outer reality, intrapsychical conflict versus environmental deficit, role of the father versus role of the mother, Oedipus complex versus preverbal development, transference versus countertransference, etc. In this debate, the interpersonal or object relations approach, as opposed to the intrapsychical drive and conflict model, has occupied center stage.

Could it be that, with some exceptions, there might be one direct line in the psychoanalytic family tree for the interpersonally-oriented analysts, and another one for the proponents of drive psychology? In fact, many of the latter, representing the 'mainstream' up to the 1960s or 1970s, can be traced, in their filiation, to Freud himself: Marie Bonaparte, Abraham A. Brill, Ruth Mack Brunswick, Dorothy Burlingham, Helene Deutsch, Max Eitingon, Heinz Hartmann, Eduard Hitschmann, Jeanne Lampl de Groot, Margarete Rie-Nunberg, Marianne Rie-Kris, Alix and James Strachey, and the analysands of all these, and of course also Freud's daughter and analysand, Anna, herself for instance analyst of Ernst Kris. Others belonging to this group, like Rudolph Loewenstein, did their training with mainstream analysts such as Hanns Sachs. These analysts usually acknowledged their debt to and 'descent' from Sigmund

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

and Anna Freud, and considered themselves, and were perceived as, representatives of 'pure' or core psychoanalysis. Indeed, what has been called the 'Freud factor', has been an important, if unofficial legitimation. There is the case of Jean Piaget, who wrongly claimed that his own analyst, Sabina Spielrein, had herself been analyzed by Freud, to ennoble his analytic family romance (Schepeler **1993**, p. 261). In fact, as we all know, Spielrein had been analyzed by Jung, and not by Freud.

On the other side, recent research (e.g., **Falzeder 1992**; **Haynal & Falzeder 1993**; Leitner **1997**, **1998**; **Lieberman 1985**; **Rudnytsky 1991**) has shown that influential contemporary, interpersonally-oriented concepts in post-Freudian psychoanalytic theory and practice go back, to a surprisingly large extent indeed, to two of Freud's first and most intimate colleagues: the Hungarian Sándor Ferenczi and the Viennese Otto Rosenfeld, who called himself Otto Rank, both of whom later became more or less alienated from Freud, and whose work has fallen into oblivion for a long time. Be it the importance of the early caretaker/child relationship, of the preverbal development, be it the splitting into a 'good' and a 'bad' mother, be it the theory and treatment of sexual child abuse, be it the use of regressive states, and of the repetition of trauma in the analytic interaction, be it the central role ascribed to counter- transference and to the use of the analyst's feeling as a tool, be it the interest in non-verbal interactions, the stress on the 'here and now' in the analytic situation, be it the 'relationship' model of therapy as opposed to the 'interpretation' model, or be it the concepts of splitting, of double-bind - all these, and more, can already be found in Ferenczi's and Rank's works.

Perhaps most important, the notion of a *non-conflictual* core of early disorders, of a mismatch between the infant's fundamental needs and the environment, was first clearly expressed in Ferenczi's work, especially in his papers on 'The unwelcome child and his death-instinct' **(1929)**, and on the 'Confusion of tongues' **(1933)**. Ferenczi also drew conclusions about the changes in therapeutic technique this view entails, stressing what would now be termed the holding and container function, and the therapeutic use of self by the analyst. Such an approach is now usually ascribed to theoreticians, including Michael Balint, Ronald Fairbairn, Erich Fromm, Karen Horney, Heinz Kohut, Harold Searles, Harry Stack Sullivan, William A. White, and Donald W. Winnicott, and, to some extent, Melanie Klein. Their concepts of the 'basic fault', 'basic trust/mistrust', 'existential loneliness', 'failing empathy', etc., as well as the consequent modifications of therapeutic technique, have their historical roots in Ferenczi's and Rank's efforts to counterbalance Freud's stress on the drive paradigm with that on interaction and intersubjectivity.

While some of these views were regarded as dissident when they were propounded in the 1920s and 1930s, they have obviously infiltrated and shaped present theory and practice. With few exceptions, however, the intellectual debts to Ferenczi and Rank have not been acknowledged in the literature - neither by the theoreticians themselves, nor in textbooks and overviews

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

(e.g., **Eagle 1984**; **Greenberg & Mitchell 1983**; Mertens **1981**, **1990a**, **1990b**, **1991**). Could it be that it has been inopportune to be associated with those 'heretics'? It makes one wonder that for decades not only the theories of Ferenczi and Rank, but even the subjects they dealt with (e.g., countertransference), were taboo.

A historical turning point seems to have been the serious personal and scientific conflict within the Secret Committee around Freud in the mid 1920s, which threatened not only to destroy the existence of this 'old guard', but even of the psychoanalytic movement itself and of its journals (cf.**Falzeder 1992**; **Grosskurth 1991**; Leitner **1997**, **1998**; **Lieberman 1985**; **Wittenberger 1995**). In this conflict, the group represented by Abraham, Eitingon, Jones, and Sachs 'won' over Ferenczi and Rank, with Ferenczi thereafter remaining marginalized in the psychoanalytic movement, and Rank leaving it altogether. The scale was eventually tipped by Freud. Interestingly, some of the new ideas came close to the ones formulated by the young Freud himself. When some of his closest collaborators brought them forward, Freud at first greeted them almost enthusiastically, then made some ever more cautious reservations, eventually distanced himself from them, and finally espoused the opinion of Abraham and Jones that those concepts were dissident, even heretical and dangerous.

These controversies and the way in which they were treated, acted, as Michael Balint reminded us, as a trauma for the analytic community. A decisive blow to Ferenczi and Rank fell in the 1950s at the hand of Ernest Jones, then the only survivor of this group. Jones labeled both psychotic, and their dissident theories as the outcome of psychotic thinking **(Jones 1957)**. To quote Balint again: 'the aftermath of Jones's biography was a spate of acrimonious publications' (Ferenczi **1985**, p. 220).

There were only a few to stand up publicly against these allegations. Erich Fromm (cf. **Fromm 1958**) in particular objected to what he called Jones's 'typically Stalinist type of re-writing history, whereby Stalinists assassinate the character of opponents by calling them spies and traitors. The Freudians do it by calling them "insane" … [Incidentally], Jones does not seem to be aware of the disservice he does to psychoanalysis. The picture he gives of the Central Committee is, then, that two members, and the most trusted ones, became insane. Of one, Dr Sachs, he says that Freud said he should not have belonged in the first place. Of Eitingon he says that he was not too bright. There remain Abraham and Jones, who were, according to Jones's own testimony, constantly engaged in the pettiest quarrels with all the other members. A beautiful picture of the group of those who claim to represent the sanity which follows from psychoanalysis!'[1]

This criticism might sound too harsh or exaggerated, but is rather confirmed by an astonishing blackmail letter Jones wrote to one of his critics: 'I think it is sheer nonsense [sic] to talk of my having made an attack on Ferenczi simply because there are people who cannot bear the truth. The same of course applies to Freud, Rank, etc. I have all the letters Ferenczi wrote to Freud from

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

1907 till the end. They make most painful reading as displaying a thoroughly unstable and suffering personality whom I personally had always loved. But the evidence of the increasing deterioration is only too plain. Up to the end Freud wanted him to be President of the International Association, though he advised him to keep back the paper he had written for the last Congress **[Ferenczi 1933]** since it would harm his reputation. The President of the Congress refused to admit such an obviously psychopathic paper, and it was only at my intervention that it was allowed. Naturally if anyone attacks me in public I shall have to produce some of the evidence I have taken care to suppress in Ferenczi's own interest'.[2]

In a letter to Erich Fromm dated 3 December 1957, Izette de Forest astutely commented, 'one wonders why Freud, trying to prevent Ferenczi from giving the last paper at Wiesbaden, still constantly tried to get F. accept the Presidency of the Inter[national Psychoanalytic Association]. Why would Freud want a man suffering from "mental deterioration" to be Pres.? And why did Jones work to get the last paper published, if it was "psychopathic" and bad for Ferenczi's reputation and if he loved him so much?'

It is true that the situation has changed: during the past years works on these topics have virtually exploded, while simultaneously interest in Ferenczi, and, to a lesser extent, in Rank, has significantly grown. After decades of silence or denunciation, during the past ten years or so there has been a veritable Ferenczi renaissance, and there are signs that a similar renaissance is imminent for Rank.

I am thinking of the work on Ferenczi by, e.g., André Haynal in Switzerland; Ilsa Barande, Thierry Bokanowski, Eva Brabant, Judith Dupont, Vladimir Granoff, Bela Grunberger, Claude Lorin, and Pierre Sabourin in France; Carlo Bonomi and Marco Conci in Italy; Martin Luis Cabré in Spain; Martin Stanton in England; Christopher Fortune in Canada; Lewis Aron, John Gedo, Adrienne Harris, Axel Hoffer, Peter Hoffer, William Boyce Lum, Jeffrey Masson, Arnold Rachman, Ann-Louise Silver, Judith Vida, and Benjamin Wolstein in the US; Michael Ermann, Patrizia Giampieri-Deutsch, Paul Harmat, Rudolf Pfitzner, Michael Schröter, and myself in Germany and Austria. The increasing interest in Ferenczi is also reflected by the publication of the Freud/Ferenczi and the Ferenczi/Groddeck correspondence, of Ferenczi's Clinical Diary, by the foundation of the S. Ferenczi Society (NYC), and by the panel on Ferenczi at the IPA Congress 1996 in San Francisco. As for Rank, I would like to mention the work of André Haynal, Ludwig Janus, Robert Kramer, Marina Leitner, James Lieberman, Esther Menaker, Peter Rudnytsky, Jessie Taft, Anton Zottl, and my own. Phyllis Grosskurth and Paul Roazen, although not devoting particular works on Ferenczi or Rank, certainly fostered interest in them.

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

Rank …

During the last few years, there has been a growing interest in the work of Otto Rank, who for some is 'the most extraordinary catalytic agent that ever hit the psychoanalytic movement' (Kardiner, in Lieberman **1985**, p. 235), or even 'the best mind that psychoanalysis contributed to intellectual history' (Jones **1960**, p. 219). Recently, Marina Leitner (**1997**, **1998**) has shown that the conflict between Freud and Rank was a key conflict in the history of psychotherapy of the twentieth century, and that many ideas usually attributed to Erich Fromm, Karen Horney, Melanie Klein, Margaret Mahler, Donald W. Winnicott, etc., originate in Rank. Esther Menaker sees in Rank's work the 'missing link in the historical chain of the development of theory and practice within the psychoanalytic movement' (Menaker **1982**, p. ix). Peter Rudnytsky has pointed out the similarities in Rank's and Winnicott's thinking, and maintains that Rank is 'the unacknowledged precursor of contemporary object relations theory' (**1991**, p. 48). Some philosophers and humanistic and existential psychologists, above all Ernest Becker, but also Paul Goodman and Rollo May, have credited Rank as the source and inspiration of many of their ideas, and his influence on social work is uncontested. Shortly before his death, May wrote to Robert Kramer: I have long considered Rank to be *the* great unacknowledged genius in Freud's circle (Kramer **1995**, p. 56-7).

Still, most psychoanalysts have, it seems, been loath to acknowledge Rank's pivotal role. His importance for theory and technique, but also for the politics of psychoanalysis up to the mid- 1920s, is nearly forgotten today. Besides his scientific contributions, Rank held all the strings of psychoanalytic publishing in his hands; he was the editor of the *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psycho- analyse* and of *Imago*, the head of the *Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag*, and editor of Freud's *Collected Works*. For more than ten years, Rank's name appeared on the cover of Freud's *opus magnum*, *The Interpretation of Dreams* **(Freud 1900a)**. Without doubt, he and Ferenczi were by far the closest to Freud, who still in 1924 was 'determined to hand over the presidency' of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society to Rank,[3] and who made repeated efforts to make Ferenczi president of the IPA.

Rank started his clinical practice relatively late, in 1920,[4] but soon rose to be one of the leading analysts. In 1924, he published two important books, *The Trauma of Birth* and, together with Ferenczi, *The Development of Psychoanalysis*. Both works brought forward new, important, and disturbing views, and were at the center of the scientific and personal conflict within the Secret Committee. When Rank went to the States shortly afterwards (still in **1924**), the leading analysts and psychiatrists of New York flocked to him, and he *reanalyzed 'nearly all'*[5] of Freud's American analysands along his new theoretical and technical lines. In the same letter Freud said that he was 'pleased' to learn that Rank had taken over his analysands and added that he 'thought of their analyses without any satisfaction at all. It has often seemed to me that

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

analysis suits the American man like a white shirt suits the raven'. Interestingly, in other contexts, Freud twice compared psychoanalysis with 'whitewashing negroes' (Breuer & Freud **1885d**, German edn., p. 262; Freud & Abraham **1965**, German edn., p. 52). The expression was omitted in the *Standard Edition*, and in the English edition of the Freud/Abraham correspondence was euphemistically translated as 'cleaning up neurotics' (p. 40).

Rank, however, was spectacularly successful with those ravens, pointing out to Freud: 'If you interpret the phenomenon of transference as coming from the father, you get, as the result of analysis, a homosexual fixation in the case of men, and a heterosexual fixation in the case of women. Indeed, this is true for all cases who have come to me from other analysts. The analysts among those patients have always felt this, subjectively as well as objectively: subjectively, as they have lost none of their neurosis, objectively, as they have not been able to cure their own patients with such a technique. And this is not the fault of the people here, who are no better or worse than those in Europe, but due to the shortcomings of method and technique. When they saw that they could work better and achieve better results both in their personal analyses and with their patients with the modifications pointed out by me, they hailed me as the Savior'.[6] Towards his friend Ferenczi, Rank was more outspoken, writing that he had 'saved psychoanalysis here, perhaps the life of the whole international movement. The analysts here were for the most part uncured and dissatisfied with the Professor's analysis; as they themselves and the whole world said, they came back even worse' (Lieberman **1985**, p. 245). This attack on Freud's technique was not lost on Anna Freud who commented to Eitingon: [Rank] 'is still full of hidden, cheap malice - this becomes clear if you know that the psychoanalyzed patients [sic] he speaks of are all former patients of Papa's' (Young-Bruehl **1988**, p. 149).

Among Rank's American analysands we find for example Thaddeus Ames, Lionel Blitzsten, Harry Bone, Dorothy Hankins, Abram Kardiner, Marion Kenworthy, who pioneered the introduction of psychiatry in social work and education (Lieberman **1985**, p. 268), Anaïs Nin, Martin Peck (ibid., p. 269), John Rose, Jessie Taft, John Taylor (ibid., p. 287), George Wilbur (ibid., p. 269), and Frankwood Williams (of the 'Mental Hygiene' Movement), but above all two crucial personalities: Smith Ely Jelliffe (1866-1945; cf. Burnham & McGuire 1983) and William Alanson White (1870-1937). In his letters to Freud, Rank does not mention his analysands' names, so it is not clear in all cases, which of them had previously been analyzed by Freud; Jelliffe and White certainly were not.

Apart from their important scientific contributions, Jelliffe and White were key figures in psychoanalytic publishing, editing the *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, the *Medical News*, the *New York Medical Journal*, the *Nervous and Mental Disease Monograph Series*, and the *Psychoanalytic Review* (Burnham & McGuire 1983). White was for over thirty years the head of St. Elizabeth Hospital in Washington DC, the main US governmental hospital,

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

and ‘was of great importance in shaping the entire psychiatric enterprise in the United States and elsewhere’ (ibid., p. xiv) and in spreading psychoanalysis. Like another very important figure, the Swiss-American Adolf Meyer, White did keep some distance from Freud, stating for instance that ‘[the] time has come to free American psychiatry from the domination of the Pope at Vienna’ (Lieberman **1985**, p. 174-5), but this very attitude could have contributed to his being receptive to Rank's ideas. White and his wife were analyzed by Rank in the States, ‘and White had promptly published the “Birth Trauma” lecture in the *Psychoanalytic Review* … White wanted to bring out in English the Ferenczi-Rank monograph on technique; Caroline Newton, who was analyzed by Rank in Vienna, had done the translation, which was published before long as *The Development of Psychoanalysis*’ (ibid., p. 254).

Another linkage exists between Otto Rank and Carl Rogers, perhaps ‘the most influential psychologist in American history’ (Kirschenbaum & Henderson **1989**, p. xi). Robert Kramer **(1995)** has shown in detail that Rank can be considered the precursor of client-centered therapy, and that it was ‘a personal encounter with Otto Rank in 1936 [which] revolutionized the way [Rogers] thought about psychotherapy. ‘“I became infected with Rankian ideas”, he told his biographer’ (ibid., p. 54). When asked ‘about who had been his teachers, Rogers answered: “Otto Rank and my clients”’ (ibid., p. 78).

… and Ferenczi

When we have a look at Ferenczi's analysands, we find among them for example Michael Balint, Therese Benedek, Claude D. Daly, Marga Dubowitz, David Eder, Izette de Forest, Margery Franklin, Georg Groddeck (who also analyzed Ferenczi in turn), Lewis Hill, Ernest Hoffman, István Hollós, William Inman, Ernest Jones, Melanie Klein, Sándor Kovács, Barbara Lantos, Kata Lévy, Lajos Lévy, Sándor Lorand, Erzsébet Révész-Radó, John Rickman, Geza Róheim, Ada Schott, Elisabeth Severn, Eugénie Sokolnicka, Clara Thompson, and Rudolf von Urbantschitsch. Perhaps most crucial in retaining Ferenczi's views within the psychoanalytic community were two of them, Michael Balint and Clara Thompson.

Ferenczi writes in an unpublished note of 26 September 1932, when he knew already how ill he was: ‘Balint takes up things there where I got stuck’ (Dupont **1994**, p. 212). Balint succeeded Ferenczi as the head of the Budapest psychoanalytic outpatient clinic, he became his literary executor (also for the Freud/Ferenczi correspondence and Ferenczi's Clinical Diary), and after Ferenczi's death took over his patients. It is interesting, though, that while Balint did credit Ferenczi for some ideas (e.g., the notion of primary object love, or the dismissal of the theory of primary narcissism), he did perhaps not make it sufficiently clear that his own most central contributions are elaborations of Ferenczi's ideas. For instance, I have tried to show that Balint's concept of the basic fault **(Balint 1968)** can be traced to Ferenczi's view of two

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

irreconcilable worlds (that of the infant and that of the adults, that of tenderness and that of passion, that of pre-guilt and that of guilt) **(Falzeder 1986)**, and that his view of the three phases of trauma **(Balint 1969)** is little more than a paraphrase of Ferenczi's ideas as developed in that 'obviously psychopathic paper', 'The confusion of tongues' **(1933)**. Similarly, Balint's therapeutic technique owes much to Ferenczi: the rejection of the 'mirror/abstinence/anonymity illusion' **(Cremerius 1983)**, the stress on the therapeutical relationship, the importance of the 'atmosphere' in treatment, the recognition of countertransference as a tool, and the work with regressive states and non-verbal communication. Balint's concept of the 'new beginning' also goes directly back to Ferenczi (Ferenczi **1932**, p. 271).

Even Balint's interest in medicine and his collaboration with G.P.s in so-called Balint groups is a continuation of Ferenczi's ideas, who, as early as in 1923, had published a paper on 'Psychoanalysis in the service of the general practitioner' **(Ferenczi 1923)**, and who in 1926 had written what sounds like a manifesto for Balint groups: 'It becomes ever clearer that in one way or another one has to take care of the practical training of [medical] colleagues who are not specialized analysts. Their practice gradually *forces* all doctors to view their cases from our point, and it would be unfair to make them turn to a psychoanalyst for every more or less psychically complicated case. A few things could be done by the analytically-orientated family doctor himself'.[7]

Balint brought these ideas to Great Britain, where they fell on fertile ground in the British 'Middle Group' and since have influenced present psychoanalytic thinking, particularly in Europe. Interestingly, Balint also had a considerable impact on post-war psychoanalysis in Germany, analyzing or supervising key figures such as Wolfgang Loch, Edeltrud Meistermann-Seeger, Alexander Mitscherlich, and Margarete Mitscherlich-Nielsen. There is even a connection with my home country, Austria, in the person of Balint's analysand Erich Pakesch, founder of the psychoanalytic society in Austria's second biggest city, Graz (and himself the analyst of some of Austria's leading analysts: Rainer Danzinger, Angela Kozlik, Gert Lyon, August Ruhs).[8] Pakesch had a second analysis (as well as supervision) with the founder of the *Austrian Study Groups for Depth Psychology*, and was co-founder, with Erich Fromm and others, of the *International Federation of Psychoanalytic Societies* (Caruso **1982**, p. 13).

Regarding Ferenczi's impact on psychoanalysis in the United States, his stay there in 1926/27 played a pivotal role. For most of the time, he stayed in New York City, where he regularly lectured at the New School for Social Research.[9] He also gave talks at the New York Psychiatric Society (on the relationship between pedagogics and psychoanalysis, at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel),[10] before the National Research Council, the Child Study Association of America, the New York Society for Clinical Psychiatry,[11] the Greenwich Psychiatric Round Table Society (a group of psychiatric social workers), at Columbia University, and last but not least at the Hungarian Medical Society in New York.[12] In short, he 'had the opportunity to get to know, officially and

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

privately, all the leading psychiatrists of New York and Albany'.[13] He also went to Philadelphia to talk before the 'very conservative' Medical Society there - with great success.[14] 'For three days, I was in Washington, and gave a talk on the theories of genitality and sexuality at the combined Psychoanalytical and Psychopathological Association. Then *four* long papers for practising psychoanalysts on technical questions. Dr W. A. White was very accommodating; he is a reliable friend of psychoanalysis, and influences his medical staff in this sense'.[15]

In addition, Ferenczi led a busy practice, analyzing for eight hours a day (although only for five on Saturdays …)[16], like Rank reanalyzing a couple of analysts who had previously been with Freud (e.g., Joseph Asch, 'a hard morsel' in Ferenczi's words,[17] a 'pathological fool' in Freud's[18]). And also like Rank, Ferenczi implicitly criticized Freud when he wrote to him that 'many doctors in leading positions have told me they regret that I did not come ten years earlier; the way in which psychoanalysis has been presented to them has discouraged them'.[19]

It was a matter of controversy that he carried out what he called *training* analyses with non-medical persons, with whom he also met for weekly seminars,[21] and whom he encouraged to organize themselves[20] contrary to the position against so-called lay analysis, taken by the American Psychoanalytic Association. This led to tensions with the 'official' representatives of psychoanalysis: 'The bigwigs, Brill, Oberndorf, Stern, Kardiner, Monroe Meyer, stayed away from me throughout'.[22]

In the wake of his stay in America, many Americans followed Ferenczi to Europe for analysis,[23] for example, George Amsden,[24] but above all Clara Thompson. Thompson's role in bringing Ferenczi's ideas to the United States is comparable to the one played by Balint in England. She can perhaps be considered Ferenczi's main direct successor on the North American continent, through her general orientation and more specifically through her work on countertransference and the role of the analyst's personality (cf. **Thompson 1956**). ('Jones … already has me labelled as deluded', she writes to Erich Fromm.[25]) 'Thompson had personal analysis with Ferenczi in Budapest during the summers of 1928 and 1929, and for two years continuously from 1931 until Ferenczi's death in 1933. In an unpublished paper, Thompson … attributed to Sullivan her decision to seek analysis from Ferenczi. "… I would not have gone to Ferenczi, because who would have the nerve to go to Budapest all alone, if Sullivan hadn't insisted that this was the only analyst in Europe he had any confidence in, and therefore, if I was going to Europe and get analyzed I had just better go there. So, I went"' (Noble & Burnham **1969**, p. 30).

As to Harry Stack Sullivan, it is true that the validity of his theories is disputed up to the present day, culminating in Steven Marcus's verdict that 'what he had were *terms* that masqueraded as ideas' (Marcus **1984**, p. 237), and that his views were a 'goulash of double-talk, spiced with drivel and served up as the blue-plate special of psychobabble', an 'incomprehensible

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

nonsense [that] would be no more than good for some laughs today had Sullivan not been taken seriously by considerable numbers of highly intelligent people' (ibid., p. 242). Marcus's statement might be as exaggerated as Chrzanowski's 'that history will give Sullivan … a place only surpassed by that of Freud' (**1977**, p. 377), but there is no doubt that his influence on American psychoanalysis and psychiatry has been enormous. According to Greenberg and Mitchell, Sullivan is 'one of the most influential, most ambitiously radical, and most frequently misread figures in the history of psychoanalytic ideas' (**1983**, p. 80).

The Ferenczian heritage in Sullivan's case is not as explicit as in Thompson's, but nonetheless discernible and important. He 'had been much impressed by Ferenczi's address on "Present-Day Problems in Psychoanalysis" before the American Psychoanalytic Association at its Christmas meeting in 1926' (ibid.), and it seems that his influencing Thompson to have analysis with Ferenczi was also motivated by his idea to have a second-hand Ferenczian analysis in turn. Sullivan was influenced of course by other figures, including George Herbert Mead. But many of his core ideas and concepts bear a close resemblance to those of Ferenczi, while being couched in a different terminology. When Thompson denies that there was any influence of Ferenczi on Sullivan (**1944**, p. 105), she obviously disregards her own close personal and analytical relationship with both. Sullivan himself 'at no time discussed, and only rarely alluded to, anyone who had contributed to his thinking' (Silver **1993**, p. 647).

There is another, perhaps less well known example, where analytical links are mixed with personal ones: when Ferenczi lectured before the Washington Psychopathological Society, he also 'gave a series of seminars at the home of Philip Graven' (Noble & Burnham **1969**, p. 15). Graven became the analyst of Ernest Hadley (ib.), who in turn not only analyzed the owner and medical director of the Chestnut Lodge Sanitarium in Rockville, MD **(Silver 1995)**, Dexter Bullard, Sr., but also Harold Searles (Ann Silver, personal communication). Silver showed (**1993**, p. 651) how close the concepts of Searles come to those of Ferenczi, while Aron commented, 'I believe that Searles may be the contemporary American answer to Ferenczi' (**1992**, p. 183). Speaking of Chestnut Lodge, whose pioneering role in the theory and treatment of psychoses is uncontested, would it not be interesting to have a look at the 'family tree' of Searles's predecessor, Frieda Fromm-Reichmann? Fromm- Reichmann's views, too, bear a close resemblance to those of Ferenczi. In an autobiographic taped interview (brought to my attention by Ann Silver), she said her first analyst was Wilhelm Wittenberg from Munich (who later also analyzed Erich Fromm), and that in 1928 she began her training analysis with Hanns Sachs (Erich was analyzed by him as well).

In addition, she as well as her former husband (and analysand!) Erich Fromm were deeply influenced by another repressed figure in psychoanalytic history: Georg Groddeck. Frieda worked closely together with Groddeck

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

in the latter's sanitarium in Baden-Baden, serving as hostess at Groddeck's scientific meetings. Erich later stated, if only in a private letter, that 'of all the analysts in Germany I knew, he was … the only one with truth, originality, courage and extraordinary kindness … I always felt a deep gratitude to him and, if you like, to life, to have had the privilege of having known him, and I am sure that even if I was never his student in any technical sense, his teaching influenced me more than that of other teachers I had'.[26] As it happens, Groddeck had been a very close friend of Ferenczi's (cf. **Ferenczi & Groddeck 1982**), and the two of them had even occasionally analyzed each other. As Ann Silver reminds us, 'Ferenczi's major impact on the Washington area occurred with the arrival of Fromm-Reichmann at Chestnut Lodge in 1935 … [in bringing] the spirit of Groddeck's and Ferenczi's and certainly her own work to The United States through her work at Chestnut Lodge; however she, like Sullivan, did not reminisce about the specific contributions of colleagues who had shaped her views. During those years, Ferenczi's and Groddeck's names had become anathemas; the psychoanalytic applications to treating severely ill patients were often heavily attacked' (**1993**, p. 647-9).

In this context, I was excited to find out, in the still unpublished part of the Freud/Ferenczi correspondence, that Fromm-Reichmann did have a *tranche* of analysis with Ferenczi. When Ferenczi stayed with the Groddecks in Baden- Baden after his American trip, she 'came over to me once a week from Heidelberg. She is an astute, analytically extremely talented person'.[27]

Ferenczi's and Rank's impact

American psychoanalysis in the 1920s and early 1930s, particularly in Boston, Philadelphia, Washington and Baltimore, was dominated to a great extent by Rank, Ferenczi, and their analysands. There was hardly yet any psychoanalytic movement to speak of on the West Coast. How precarious the situation had become for the *echt* Freudians, as they have been called, can be guessed from their cutting Ferenczi, and from their polemical, *ad hominem* attacks on Rank (for instance, by Mary Chadwick and Abraham Brill), publicly calling him an 'idiot', 'maladjusted', and 'confused' (Lieberman **1985**, pp. 291-2).

Although from a contemporary point of view, Ferenczi and Rank brought similar ideas to the States, it should be noted that they had already broken with each other when Ferenczi came to New York two years after Rank. When they met by chance in Pennsylvania Station, Ferenczi cut Rank. 'He was my best friend', said Rank, 'and he refused to speak to me' (Taft **1958**, p. xvi). In 1930, Ferenczi's and Rank's analysands White and Thompson were president and vice-president of the Washington Psychoanalytic Society, while Sullivan was still vice-president of the American. James Strachey wrote to his wife Alix on 5 October 1924 that 'Brill … gives gruesome accounts of Rank's

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

activities in the States. Only 3 Americans stand out against him: Brill, Frink, and Oberndorf! The others say that one must have one's Father Complex analyzed by Freud & one's Mother Complex by Rank' (Meisel & Kendrick **1986**, p. 80). The New School for Social Research, receptive to Ferenczi's and Rank's ideas, gained increasing importance. The Washington/Baltimore area had, under the influence of Sullivan and White, always steered an independent course. In Boston, in '1928-29 the Rankians dominated: Peck, Wilbur, and John Taylor had been Rank's patients and students; Leolia Dalrymple was analyzed by Peck that year. Those psychiatrists attended the Rankian seminars in New York. Forty-five years later Dalrymple recalled the lively sessions in Frankwood William's large living-room in lower Manhattan. The fifteen to twenty participants came from hospitals and universities, from Philadelphia and Boston as well as New York' (Lieberman **1985**, p. 287). Harvard psychologist Henry Murray, who for some time was involved in the Boston Psychoanalytic Society, was much interested in Rank's work (ibid., p. 345), and in 1935 invited him to speak at Harvard. In Philadelphia, '*relationship therapy*' - not 'interpretive therapy' - was the emphasis of the Philadelphia School (Kramer **1995**, p. 59). '[Child] psychiatrist Frederick Allen [was] an enthusiastic admirer' (Lieberman **1985**, p. 345). Allen (probably an analysand of Rank's) was the director of the Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic; an important collaborator of his was Rank's analysand Dorothy Hankins, who worked there for over 30 years (Leitner **1998**, p. 225).

In 1929, Brill succeeded W. A. White as President of the American Psychoanalytic Association. In 1930, the Boston Society reorganized; 'The Freudians took control; the Rankians had to convert or leave' (ibid., p. 287-8). Finally, with the arrival of the immigrants, the 'counter-revolution' fully set in. The European immigrants tended sometimes to adhere to a strict and somewhat limited interpretation of psychoanalysis, wanting to rescue its 'core' from what they viewed as its being watered down, and striving to establish psychoanalysis as a natural science. Having lost their home and home country (many of them for the second or third time), their language, and often their family, psychoanalysis became all the more important for them as a constituent of their identity, which had to be preserved in a 'pure' form. The views of Erich Fromm, Karen Horney, Smith Ely Jelliffe, Harry Stack Sullivan, Clara Thompson, and William Alanson White, were gradually replaced by those of Heinz Hartmann, Ernst Kris, and Rudolph Loewenstein. Fromm, Horney, and Thompson formed their own Society (though later they themselves split from each other). Otto Rank was expelled from the American Psychoanalytic Association, of which he had been an honorary member (Lieberman **1985**, p. 263). Persons who had had their training with him or Ferenczi were required to have a re-analysis with an officially approved, medical training analyst in order to qualify.

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

Paradoxical interventions

So far, I have tried to show that a direct, although forgotten, genealogical line links theoreticians, who stand for leading paradigms of contemporary psychoanalysis, with two early pioneers. But instead of expanding this further and quoting more examples, I would like to investigate some cases where this is not so. Evidently, not *all* of the 'object relations' theorists can trace their genealogy back to Ferenczi or Rank, and not all of the drive psychologists can trace theirs to Sigmund and Anna Freud.

To start with, we have to be reminded that a family tree of psychoanalysis gives a bird's eye view of the channels through which a transmission of ideas took place; what it does *not* show is a close-up view, the *contents* of the transmission, the *sort of influence* exerted in those analyses, how this was *experienced* by the analysands, and how they *reacted* to it. Let us have a closer look at some cases of important psychoanalysts who did *not* take over their analysts' views, and at the interrelationship between how they experienced their training and supervisory analyses, and the kind of theoretical and clinical views they developed.

Perhaps the best example is Ferenczi himself. He started out with the hope of having in psychoanalysis an objective method to clarify human relationships. But this hope was destined to be thoroughly disappointing in the cases of the analyses of his mistress's daughter Elma Pálos with himself and Freud (cf. **Haynal & Falzeder 1991**), and of his own analysis with Freud. (Ferenczi had at least four analyses: with Jung and Freud, and mutual analyses with his colleague Groddeck and his patient Elizabeth Severn **[Fortune 1994]**). Instead of solving the problems, the intervention of psychoanalysis made those relationships more difficult.

I have tried to show **(Falzeder 1996b)** that Ferenczi had developed a full-blown transference neurosis towards Freud already before his analysis with the latter, and that, moreover, this transference neurosis was only inadequately dealt with in the analysis itself and therefore could not be dissolved. A dream of Ferenczi's, dreamed shortly before that analysis, reveals his attitudes, his hopes, and his anxieties towards what would follow, in particular his extreme preoccupation with Freud himself (ibid.). The underlying *rationale* is at the same time a desire to free himself from this influence, his difficulties in doing so, his urgent plea to Freud to help him to become more independent from that very Freud, an act of submission to him, and the hope that a psychoanalysis with Freud would help him to find a way out of all this. To this powerful and contradictory message, Freud reacted by consenting to an analysis. Not surprisingly, it was a failure. Freud had contributed to the complicated situation by constantly blurring the boundaries between the professional and the private spheres in his relationship with Ferenczi. He had not yet fully developed the tools to handle this, having conceived the notion of transference neurosis only shortly before he took Ferenczi into analysis; he introduced the notion of

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

transference neurosis in ‘Remembering, repeating and working through’ (Freud 1914g), finished at the end of July 1914 (29 July 1914, Freud & Abraham **1965**, p. 187); Ferenczi started the first part of his analysis with Freud on 1 October 1914. Moreover, Freud had at least two personal agendas in this analysis: to convince Ferenczi that he should marry Gizella, not Elma, and not to lose Ferenczi as a ‘son’, a stalwart defender and promoter of the Cause and of himself. Although Freud felt entitled to violate nearly all the rules he had just set up for beginners in his technical papers, he underestimated the effects and overestimated his ability to control the ensuing situation - an analysis that continued to be, in Freud's words, ‘at an end’, but not ‘terminated’, or terminated, but without end. Ferenczi's struggle with Freud would persist until the end of his life, as is witnessed by their correspondence and by Ferenczi's Clinical Diary **(1985)**.

In these episodes, Ferenczi had to realize painfully that psychoanalysis is not an instrument which can function independently of the person using it. Very probably this played a major role in making him recognize the analyst's attitude as a variable in the therapeutic equation, and therefore placing this very attitude (or, if you prefer, countertransference) at the center of his interest.

In his relationship to Freud, Ferenczi clearly identified with the role of the analysand/child, with the person who is not supposed to know what the analyst does know. When he was not helped by the analysis, indeed suffered from it, he reacted like the child suffering from unpredictable or mad parents, turning into their ‘psychiatrist’ (Ferenczi **1933**, p. 165). To some extent, I agree with Bela Grunberger's **(1974)** point of view that Ferenczi's theory and technique were a consequence of his failed analysis with Freud, a kind of ‘acting out’ or an outcome of his ‘transference neurosis’. However, I disagree with the conclusion that Ferenczi was therefore *wrong* in his ideas and methods. I would like to venture the idea that the evidence from other cases also suggests that those who suffer from their analysts’ behavior, are driven to find an explanation for this very behavior: they tend to focus their interest on the therapist's contribution to the analytical relationship, and the therapeutic use of the analyst's self, and will therefore develop a theory of ‘countertransference’. Those, however, who take a more parental or narcissistic stance - like Freud - will be more prone to explain why their patients/children make *them* suffer, and will rather develop a theory of ‘transference’, i.e., a theory that treats the therapist's contribution as a constant factor and thus shifts it out of focus.

Is there further evidence to substantiate this hypothesis? In 1926, Helene Deutsch had published a paper on ‘Occult processes occurring during psychoanalysis’, which treated countertransference. Deutsch introduced an important distinction which subsequently fell into oblivion, and was later re-introduced by Deutsch's pupil Racker, to whom it is now ascribed: the concept of ‘concordant’ and ‘complementary’ countertransference. It seems, however, that the first paper ever written specifically on countertransference appeared as late as 1939, and it was written by Alice and Michael Balint. They cautiously discuss

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

'personal factors' in the analyst, maintaining that these play a role in shaping the analysand's transference. 'The analytical situation is the result of an interplay of the patient's transference and the analyst's countertransference', with the consequence 'that anything approaching an "uncontaminated" [*keimfrei*] analytic method does not exist at all' (ibid., p. 219). After Alice Balint's early death, Michael Balint further pursued this line of thinking, particularly in his book *The Basic Fault* **(1968)**.

I have already pointed out to what a great extent Balint's technique and theory are a continuation of his analyst's, Ferenczi. Before going to Ferenczi, however, Michael as well as Alice had been in analysis (for two years) with Hanns Sachs in Berlin. Sachs had the reputation of being a very 'strict' analyst, pushing the analyst's abstinence to an extreme. For instance, he is reported to have said not more than a couple of words in weeks of analysis. Michael Balint later told Bluma Swerdloff in an interview **(1965)** that he was 'very dissatisfied' with that analysis, that in fact 'it wasn't analysis'. 'It was rather theoretical. Rather theoretical. One discussed one's dreams. It was very interesting and very illuminating'. According to Balint, Sachs 'had an excellent taste, really first rate taste - not only in literature but in women and in wine and cigars and what you want. But he was a very neurotic man'. Balint decided to go back to Budapest, and continue his analysis there, and he had two more years with Ferenczi. This second analysis 'was quite different. [Question:] Did you feel changed? [Balint:] Oh, yes, that's why I became an analyst'.

Donald W. Winnicott is usually credited, together with Margaret Little and Paula Heimann, with having (re)introduced the concept of countertransference as a therapeutic tool, in his seminal paper on 'Hate in the counter-transference', delivered to the British Society on 5 February 1947 **(Winnicott 1949)**. Winnicott's filiational heritage is thoroughly mixed: he was analyzed by Freudian James Strachey, (then) Kleinian Joan Riviere (1940-1946), and supervised by his wife's analyst, Melanie Klein herself (1935-1940), by her estranged daughter, Melitta Schmideberg, and by Nina Searl (cf.**Grosskurth 1986**; **Kahr 1996**; **King & Steiner 1991**; **Meisel & Kendrick 1986**; **Phillips 1988**). Winnicott's ten-year analysis with Strachey was conducted, '[in] all probability, … on six days of the week' (Kahr **1996**, p. 50). Winnicott wrote to Ernest Jones in 1952 that 'Strachey made practically no mistakes and he adhered to a classical technique in a cold-blooded way for which I have always been grateful' (ibid., p. 55), even calling him, in his obituary, 'my favourite example of a psycho-analyst' (ibid., p. 55). James W. Andersen, however, 'has characterized Winnicott's encounter with Strachey as highly ambivalent. After all, Strachey underlined the vital importance of interpretation as a clinical tool, whereas Winnicott … would eventually become very suspicious of colleagues who interpreted too much' (ibid., p. 54). Kahr mentions Strachey's homosexuality and conjectures: 'In view of Winnicott's sustained childlessness, his lack of professional interest in adult genital sexuality, and his preoccupation with impotence, I suspect that Strachey did Winnicott a great disservice by not

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

analysing fully, if at all, these aspects of his character structure', and Kahr regards this 'neglect' even 'as a woeful instance of *malignant countertransference*' (ibid., pp. 51-2 [my italics]). One might also speculate (as I have proposed elsewhere **[Falzeder 1991]**) that Winnicott's multiple allegiances may have contributed to his thinking about 'transitional space', 'transitional phenomena', 'impingement', etc., and to his central role in the British 'Middle' School.

In 'Counter-transference and the patient's response to it', Margaret Little **(1951)** described how she was led to reflect upon countertransference after an interpretation of hers was felt to be off the mark and unempathic by her analysand. In an autobiographic report of her three analyses (Little **1990**, p. 36) she revealed, however, that this was a disguised account of her *own* analysis with Ella Freeman Sharpe, an interpretation from somebody whom Little had felt 'as a massive interference' (ibid.). 'I knew that my real troubles had never been touched; instead of empathy there had been "confusion of tongues" (Ferenczi)' (ibid., p. 37).

Paula Heimann's article on countertransference **(Heimann 1950)** appeared at a critical period in Heimann's relationship, both personal and analytical, with Melanie Klein. 'Heimann's paper has been accepted as an essential part of the Kleinian corpus [Footnote: Curiously, it was never delivered to the British Society. The paper does not contain a single reference to Klein.]; but few analysts seem to know that Klein and Heimann had a serious disagreement over it, Klein insisting that countertransference is something that interferes with analysis'. Heimann, however, claimed that the analyst 'must use his emotional response as a key to the patient's unconscious' (Grosskurth **1986**, p. 378). She later told William Gillespie that Klein 'had "seduced" her into analysis' (ibid., p. 381), while simultaneously warning her 'against telling anyone that she was in analysis with her' (ibid., p. 383). Regarding Heimann's paper, Grosskurth asks: 'Was Heimann in some way telling Klein something about the unsatisfactory nature of her own analysis?' (ibid., p. 379).

Melanie Klein is certainly another story, and a very interesting one at that, as she was analyzed by two of the most prominent, but differently orientated, among Freud's disciples at the time, Sándor Ferenczi and Karl Abraham. The analysis with Ferenczi (circa 1919; **Balint 1965**) took place before Rank had started his analytical practice; the one with Abraham **(1924/25)** was the obvious choice during her stay in Berlin. In a future study, I want to investigate how her work can be viewed as a unique synthesis of both her analysts' orientations, as on the one hand, it is almost exclusively about early object relations, but on the other, it is from the vantage point of drive- or one-person psychology. Later she had analysis with Sylvia Payne (1933?/34; **Grosskurth 1986**), and possibly also with her former analysand Paula Heimann (ibid., p. 242).

Coming back to Rank, there is an interesting dispute about the implications of Rank not having been analyzed. Jones had offered to analyze Rank in 1914, but this did not work out because of the beginning of World War I. Later, in 1922, when there were serious tensions between Rank and Jones, Freud took

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

sides with Rank and wrote to the Committee 'that during 15 years of an ongoing and intimate working collaboration with Rank, it hardly ever came to my mind that he would still need a piece of analysis'.[29] But two years later, on the occasion of the publication of Rank's book *The Trauma of Birth* **(1924)**, Freud complained to him that 'you would not have written this book had you yourself undergone an analysis'.[30] Rank rejected this reproach categorically: 'In this context, I have felt curiously touched by the fact that you, of all persons, suggest that I would not have adopted this concept had I been analyzed. This might well be so. But the question is whether this is a cause for regret. I, for one, can only consider myself lucky, after all the results I have seen with analyzed analysts'.[31] But when ever greater pressure was put on Rank by his colleagues and Freud to withdraw his theory of the birth trauma, he did have some 'analytical talks with the Professor,'[32] the effects of which he described in an astonishingly submissive tone (reminding one, in fact, of the 'self-criticisms' in Stalinist trials): 'Suddenly, I re-emerged from a state that I can now recognize as neurotic … I could understand my reaction [to Freud's illness] as stemming from my personal child- and family-history, from the Oedipus and brother complex … the Professor found my explanations satisfactory and he forgave me personally, too'.[33] We know, however, that Rank's 'conversion' did not last and he later told Anaïs Nin that 'Freud tried to analyze [him], but this was a failure' (Nin **1966**, p. 279).

Conclusion

Unofficially, the importance of psychoanalytic filiations has always been known and acknowledged. This can also be seen from the fact that '[as] to the matter of appointing certain members of the institute faculty "training analysts", it is widely known that this issue is the most frequent source of discord within institutes' (Gedo **1984**, p. 176). A well documented example are the so- called Freud/Klein controversies within the British Society **(King & Steiner 1991)**, which were fought particularly over the question of who would be able to exert control over the training of the candidates. As we have seen, such an influence may indeed lead to the desired outcome, and result in the building of a school or of a local orthodoxy, but it may also backfire in that candidates develop contrary or opposed views.

Recently, the president of the IPA, Otto F. Kernberg, listed 'Thirty methods to destroy the creativity of psychoanalytic candidates' **(1996)**; he includes, for example, slowing down the processing of applications and the provision of information, preventing the early participation of candidates at scientific meetings, a strict separation between undergraduate and postgraduate seminars, a strengthening of graduation rituals, stipulating that candidates never attend seminars by their training analysts, restricting candidates' reading to Freud and to papers by the leading local members only, the avoidance of exposure to alternative schools, and to up-to-date courses on psychoanalytic technique,

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

silent and critical supervisors, fostering paranoid fears, referring all problems 'back to the couch', maintaining discretion, secrecy and uncertainty about how to become a training analyst, etc.

Surprisingly, perhaps the best historical example of an institute that avoided much of this is the one in Berlin in the 1920s. The stature and the extremely broad scope of theoretical views held by Abraham's and Sachs's analysands are astonishing indeed. Abraham analyzed, for example, Felix Böhm, Helene Deutsch, Robert Fliess, Ella Freeman Sharpe, Edward Glover, James Glover, Karen Horney, Melanie Klein, Hans Liebermann, Josine Müller-Ebsen, Karl Müller-Braunschweig, Sándor Rado, Theodor Reik, Ernst Simmel, and Alix Strachey; with Sachs were Franz Alexander, Alice Balint, Michael Balint, Suzanne Bernfeld-Cassirer, Siegfried Bernfeld, Ella Freeman Sharpe, Erich Fromm, Karen Horney, Hans Lampl, Rudolph Loewenstein, Barbara Low, Heinrich Meng, Josine Müller-Ebsen, Sacha Nacht, and Sylvia Payne. Practically all of these were to become important clinicians and theoreticians in their own right.

Some factors seem to have been particularly important: (1) The Berlin institute was the first and only one which offered a more or less standardized training at the time. Consequently, candidates from the most different backgrounds and from all over Europe, from Germany, Austria, Hungary, England, etc., came there. (2) Notwithstanding their theoretical orientation regarding abstinence or their behavior during sessions, the leading analysts like Abraham, Eitingon, Sachs, or Simmel, met with their analysands at the institute, at seminars, or socially, even invited them into their houses or paid them visits at theirs. This reminds one rather of the role of the traditional family doctor, and counterbalanced the development and introjection of an idealized transfer- ential image. (3) Training analyses were much shorter than today. (4) The dominating and perhaps intimidating figure of Freud was in Vienna, not in Berlin. (5) There was a vivid communication and interaction within the peer group of candidates. (6) 'Abraham was really - I must say that - the very best president I ever met in my life. He was simply magnificent, what he could do … Fair, and absolutely firm. No nonsense. And kept the thing very well in hand … he was an absolutely reliable, firm, fair man' **(Balint, 1965)**. (7) Abraham built no school of his own. He was certainly true to Freud, but although he has been regarded as *the* pillar of orthodoxy, he also succeeded in bringing forward views that significantly differed from Freud's. 'Although Abraham was … among the staunchest of [Freud's] supporters, he was not an idolater' (Good **1995**, p. 1146). Michael Good goes so far as to call 'Abraham … the first psychoanalytic "rebel", albeit an ambivalent and tentative one' (ibid., p. 1159).

The golden age of psychoanalysis in the United States, when it was a highly respected branch of science, with its representatives dominating academia and psychiatry, is over. Whether or not one agrees with Alan Stone's diagnosis that its 'scientific center crumbles' (Stone **1997**, p. 35), this has become the

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

prevailing opinion, even among some leading psychoanalysts. According to Julia Kristeva, two great confrontations endanger the very existence of psychoanalysis as we knew it: 'The first is its competition with the neurosciences: "The cocktail or the word!", which is now the question of to be or not to be. The second is the test to which psychoanalysis is subjected by the desire *not to know*, which converges with the apparent ease offered by pharmacology, and which characterizes the negative narcissism (as André Green said) of modern man' (Kristeva **1994**, p. 16).

In my view, it is vital for psychoanalysis in its present struggle to find its place, to investigate further conditions under which trainees are able to develop along their own creative lines, and to remain open towards new developments in its own field and in neighboring sciences (cf.**Haynal 1993**). It is my hope that a rewriting of psychoanalytic history will help to avoid mistakes made in the past and still made today, and that the word and the desire to know will survive.

Notes

1 Letter to Izette de Forest, 31 October 1957; Erich Fromm Archives.

2 Letter to Dr Magoun, 28 November 1957; Erich Fromm Archives.

3 Freud to Rank, 23 May 1924. Unpublished Freud/Rank correspondence was kindly made available to me by Rank's daughter, Helene Veltfort Rank (San Francisco), and by Judith Dupont (Paris), whom I also thank for permission to quote.

4 Freud to Ferenczi, 20 March 1924.

5 Freud to Rank, 23 August 1924 [my italics].

6 Rank to Freud, 9 August 1924.

7 Circular letter, 13 [18 ?] April 1926, Archives Judith Dupont [my translation].

8 Gert Lyon, letter to the author, 6 May 1997.

9 Ferenczi's circular letter, 25 July 1926.

10 Ferenczi to Freud, 30 November 1926.

11 Ferenczi's circular letter, 13 December 1926; Ferenczi to Freud, 31 December 1926.

12 Ferenczi's circular letter, 26 February 1927.

13 Ferenczi's circular letter, 13 December 1926.

14 Ferenczi's circular letter, 26 February 1927.

15 Ferenczi to Freud, 21 May 1927.

16 Ferenczi to Freud, 10 October 1926.

17 Ferenczi to Freud, 30 June 1927.

18 Freud to Abraham, 4 May 1924.

19 Ferenczi to Freud, 8 April 1927.

20 Ferenczi's circular letter, 13 December 1926.

21 Ferenczi to Freud, 10 October 1926.

22 Ferenczi to Freud, 30 June 1927.

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

23 Ferenczi to Freud, 30 June 1927.

24 Ferenczi to Freud, 5 August 1927.

25 Letter of 5 November 1957; Fromm Archives.

26 Letter to Sylvia Grossmann, 12 November 1957; Erich Fromm Archives.

27 Ferenczi to Freud, 19 August 1927.

28 Jones to Abraham, 1 January 1923; Library of Congress.

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

29 15 May 1922; Butler Library, New York [my translation].

30 23 July 1924 (ibid.).

31 9 August 1924 (ibid.).

32 Rank to members of former Committee (20 December 1924, ibid.).

33 (ibid.).

References

Abraham, H. (1976). *Karl Abraham, Sein Leben für die Psychoanalyse*. München: Kindler.

Arlow, J. A. (1972). 'Some dilemmas in psychoanalytic education'. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 20, 556-66. [→]

Aron, L. (1992). 'From Ferenczi to Searles and contemporary relational approaches: Commentary on Mark Blechner's "Working in the countertransference"'. *Psychoanal. Dial.*, 2, 181-90. [→]

Balint, M. (1948). 'On the psycho-analytic training system'. *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, 29, 153-73. [→]

Balint, M. (1965). 'The Reminiscences of Michael Balint'. *Two interviews, 6 and 7 August 1965, by Bluma Swerdloff*. Columbia University, NYC: Oral History Research Office. (Partly published in Falzeder 1987.)

Balint, M. (1968). *The Basic Fault. Therapeutic Aspects of Regression*. London: Tavistock. [→]

Balint, M. (1969). 'Trauma and object relationship'. *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, 50, 429-35. [→]

Balint, M. & Balint, A. (1939). 'On transference and counter-transference'. *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, 20, 223-30. [→]

Bateman, A. & Holmes, J. (1995). *Introduction to Psychoanalysis. Contemporary Theory and Practice*. London & New York: Routledge.

Breuer, J. & Freud, S. (1885d). *Studies on Hysteria*. [Freud's contributions in S.E. 2.] [*Studien über Hysterie*. G.W. I.] [→]

Burnham, J. C. & McGuire, W. (1986). *Jelliffe: American Psychoanalyst and Physician, and His Correspondence with Sigmund Freud and C. G. Jung*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Caruso, I. A. (1975). 'Reine Lehre und exakte Technik?' *Zeitschrift für Klinische Psychologie und Psychotherapie*, 23, 196-205. [→]

Caruso, I. A. (1982). 'Versorgung und Institution in Psychoanalyse. Erich Pakesch in memoriam'. In *Psychoanalyse und Institution*, ed. R. Danzinger et al. Vienna: Verband der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaften Österreichs, 13-21.

Chrzanowski, G. (1977). 'Das psychoanalytische Werk von Karen Horney, Harry Stack Sullivan und Erich Fromm'. In *Tiefenpsychologie. Band 3: Die Nachfolger Freuds*, ed. D. Eicke. Weinheim: Beltz, 346-80.

Cremerius, J. (1983). 'Die Sprache der Zärtlichkeit und der Leidenschaft'. *Psyche*, 37, 988-1015. [→]

Deutsch, H. (1926). 'Occult processes occurring during psychoanalysis'. In *Psychoanalysis and the Occult*, ed. G. Devereux. New York: International Universities Press.

Dupont, J. (1994). 'The notion of trauma according to Ferenczi: Progress or regression in psychoanalytic theory?' In *100 Years of Psychoanalysis, Contributions to the History of Psychoanalysis*, eds. A. Haynal & E. Falzeder. Geneva: Cahiers Psychiatriques Genevois, Special Issue, 205-15.

Eagle, M. (1984). *Recent Developments in Psychoanalysis: A Critical Evaluation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987. [→]

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

Falzeder, E. (1986). *Die 'Sprachverwirrung' und die 'Grundstörung'. Die Untersuchungen Sándor Ferenczis und Michael Balints über Entstehung und Auswirkungen früher Objektbeziehungen*. Salzburg: Salzburger Sozialisationsstudien.
Falzeder, E. (1987). 'Michael Balint im Gespräch'. *Werkblatt, Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse und Gesellschaftskritik*, 4, 81-94. [→]
Falzeder, E. (1991). 'Book review: The Freud-Klein Controversies, P. King & R. Steiner (eds.)'. *Psychothérapies*, 11, 163-4.
Falzeder, E. (1992). '1924-le trauma de naissance de nouvelles perspectives en psychanalyse'. *Psychothérapies*, 12, 241-50.
Falzeder, E. (1994). 'The threads of psychoanalytic filiations or Psychoanalysis taking effect'. In *100 Years of Psychoanalysis, Contributions to the History of Psychoanalysis*, eds. A. Haynal & E. Falzeder. Geneva: Cahiers Psychiatriques Genevois, Special Issue, 169-94.
Falzeder, E. (1996a). 'Whose Freud is it? Some reflections on editing Freud's correspondence'. *Int. Forum Psychoanal.*, 5, 77-86. [→]
Falzeder, E. (1996b). 'Dreaming of Freud: Ferenczi, Freud, and an analysis without end'. *Int. Forum Psychoanal.*, 5, 265-70. [→]
Ferenczi, S. (1923). 'A psychoanalysis a gyakorló orvos szolgálatában' [Psychoanalysis in the service of the practising physician]. *Gyógyászat*, No 23/24. [→]
Ferenczi, S. (1929). 'The unwelcome child and his death-instinct'. *Final Contributions to the Problems and Methods of Psychoanalysis*. New York: Basic Books, 1955, 102-107. [→]
Ferenczi, S. (1932). 'Integration and splitting'. *Final Contributions to the Problems and Methods of Psychoanalysis*. New York: Basic Books, 1955, 270-71.
Ferenczi, S. (1933). 'Confusion of tongues between adults and the child'. *Final Contributions to the Problems and Methods of Psychoanalysis*, New York: Basic Books, 1955, 156-67. [→]
Ferenczi, S. (1985 [1932]). *The Clinical Diary of Sándor Ferenczi*, ed. J. Dupont. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.
Ferenczi, S. & Groddeck, G. (1982). *Briefwechsel 1921-1933*. Frankfurt/M.: Fischer, 1986. [English edition forthcoming; ed. C. Fortune.]
Ferenczi, S. & Rank, O. (1924). *The Development of Psychoanalysis*. New York & Washington: Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing Co., 1925.
Fortune, C. (1994). 'A difficult ending: Ferenczi, "R. N.", and the experiment in mutual analysis'. In *100 Years of Psychoanalysis, Contributions to the History of Psychoanalysis*, eds. A. Haynal & E. Falzeder. Geneva: Cahiers Psychiatriques Genevois, Special Issue, 217-23.
Freud, S. (1900a). The Interpretation of Dreams. *SE*, 4, 5.
Freud, S. (1912e). 'Recommendations to physicians practising psycho-analysis'. *SE*, 12, 111-20. [→]
Freud, S. (1914d). 'On the history of the psycho-analytic movement'. *SE*, 14, 7-66. [→]
Freud, S. (1937c). 'Analysis terminable and interminable'. *SE*, 23, 216-53. [→]
Freud, S. & Abraham, K. (1965). *A Psycho-Analytic Dialogue. The Letters of Sigmund Freud and Karl Abraham, 1907-1926*, eds. H. Abraham & E. Freud. London: The Hogarth Press. [*Briefe 1907-1926*. Frankfurt/M.: S. Fischer, 1965.]
Freud, S. & Jones, E. (1993). *The Complete Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Ernest Jones 1908-1939*, ed. R. Andrew Paskauskas. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. [→]
Freud, S. & Ferenczi, S. (1994). *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and*

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

Sándor Ferenczi, Volume 1, 1908-1914, eds. E. Brabant, E. Falzeder & P. Giampieri-Deutsch. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. [→]

Fromm, E. (1958). 'Psychoanalysis-scientism of fanaticism?' *Saturday Review*, New York, 41 (14 June 1958), 11-13, 55-6. [→]

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

Fromm, E. (1959). *Sigmund Freud's Mission. An Analysis of His Personality and Influence*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
Gedo, J. (1984). *Psychoanalysis and Its Discontents*. New York: The Guilford Press.
Gellner, E. (1985). *The Psychoanalytic Movement or The Cunning of Unreason*. London: Paladin.
Good, M. (1995). 'Karl Abraham, Sigmund Freud, and the fate of the seduction theory'. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 43, 1137-67. [→]
Greenberg, J. R. & Mitchell, S. A. (1983). *Object Relations in Psychoanalytic Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. [→]
Grosskurth, P. (1986). *Melanie Klein. Her World and Her Work*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. [→]
Grosskurth, P. (1991). *The Secret Ring. Freud's Inner Circle and the Politics of Psychoanalysis*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
Grunberger, B. (1974). 'Von der "Aktiven Technik" zur "Sprachverwirrung". Studie zu Ferenczis Abweichung'. *Jahrbuch der Psychoanalyse*, Band 2, Bern: Huber, 1979, 100-24. [→]
Hamilton, V. (1996). *The Analyst's Preconscious*. Hillsdale, NJ: The Analytic Press.
Haynal, A. (1993). *Psychoanalysis and the Sciences. Epistemology History*. Berkeley, CA: The University of California Press.
Haynal, A. & Falzeder, E. (1991). '"Healing through love"? A unique dialogue in the history of psychoanalysis'. *Free Associations*, 2, 1-20. [→]
Haynal, A. & Falzeder, E. (1993). 'Empathy, psychoanalytic practice in the 1920 s, and Ferenczi's Clinical Diary'. *J. Am. Acad. Psychoanal. Dyn. Psychiatr.*, 21, 605-21. [→]
Heimann, P. (1950). 'On counter-transference'. *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, 31, 81-4. [→]
Jones, E. (1957). *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud, Volume 3, The Last Phase, 1919-1939*. New York: Basic Books. [→]
Jones, J. (1960). 'Otto Rank: A forgotten heresy'. *Commentary*, 30, 219-29.
Jung, C. G. (1913 [1912]). 'The theory of psychoanalysis'. *Psychoanal. Rev.*, 1913-1915, 1 and 2. [Versuch einer Darstellung der psychoanalytischen Theorie. *Jahrbuch für psychoanalytische und psychopathologische Forschungen*, 1913, 5, 307-441.]
Kahr, B. (1996). *Donald W. Winnicott. A Biographical Portrait*. London: Karnac. [→]
Kernberg, O. F. (1996). 'Thirty methods to destroy the creativity of psychoanalytic candidates'. *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, 77, 1031-40. [→]
King, P. & Steiner, R. (eds.) (1991). *The Freud-Klein Controversies 1941-45*. London & New York: Tavistock/Routledge, 1992. [→]
Kirschenbaum, H. & Henderson, V. L. (eds.) (1989). *Carl Rogers: Dialogues*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
Knorr-Cetina, K. (1984). *Die Fabrikation von Erkenntnis. Zur Anthropologie der Naturwissenschaft*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.
Kramer, R. (1995). 'The birth of client-centered therapy: Carl Rogers, Otto Rank, and "The Beyond"'. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 35, 54-110. [→]
Kristeva, J. (1994). 'Psychoanalysts in times of distress'. In *Speculations After Freud. Psychoanalysis, Philosophy and Culture*, eds. S. Shamdasani & M. Münchow. London: Routledge, 13-26. [→]
Leitner, M. (1997). 'Too Rankian for the Freudians or too Freudian for the Rankians: Otto Rank's contributions to psychoanalysis in the 1920 s'. *J. Am. Acad. Psychoanal. Dyn. Psychiatr.*, 25, 37-70. [→]

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

Leitner, M. (1998). *Der Konflikt zwischen Sigmund Freud und Otto Rank. Ein Schlüsselkonflikt für die Entwicklung der Psychotherapie des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Vienna: Turia & Kant [forthcoming]. [→]

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

Lieberman, J. (1985). *Acts of Will. The Life and Work of Otto Rank*. New York: The Free Press.
Little, M. (1951). 'Counter-transference and the patient's response to it'. *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, 32, 32-40. [→]
Little, M. (1990). *Psychotic Anxieties and Containment. A Personal Record of an Analysis with Winnicott*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson. [→]
Mahony, P. (1987 [1982]). *Freud as a Writer*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press (expanded edition).
Marcus, S. (1984). *Freud and the Culture of Psychoanalysis. Studies in the Transition from Victorian Humanism to Modernity*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1987.
Megill, A. (1982). 'The reception of Foucault by historians'. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 48, 117-41.
Meisel, P. & Kendrick, W. (eds.) (1986). *Bloomsbury/Freud. The Letters of James and Alix Strachey 1924-1925*. London: Chatto & Windus.
Menaker, E. (1982). *Otto Rank. A Rediscovered Legacy*. New York: Columbia University Press. [→]
Mertens, W. (1981). *Psychoanalyse*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
Mertens, W. (1990a). *Einführung in die psychoanalytische Therapie, Band 1*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
Mertens, W. (1990b). *Einführung in die psychoanalytische Therapie, Band 2*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
Mertens, W. (1991). *Einführung in die psychoanalytische Therapie, Band 3*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
Noble, D. & Burnham, D. (1969). *History of The Washington Psychoanalytic Society and The Washington Psychoanalytic Institute*. Washington, DC: privately printed.
Nin, A. (1966). *Diary, 1931-1934*, ed. Gunther Stuhlman. New York: Swallow Press and Harcourt, Brace & World.
Phillips, A. (1988). *Winnicott*. London: Fontana.
Rank, O. (1924). *The Trauma of Birth*. New York: Harper Torchbook, 1973. [→]
Roudinesco, E. (1982, 1986). *La bataille de cent ans. Histoire de la psychanalyse en France*. Vols 1 & 2. Paris: Seuil.
Rudnytsky, P. (1991). *The Psychoanalytic Vocation. Rank, Winnicott, and the Legacy of Freud*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
Schepeler, E. M. (1993). 'Jean Piaget's experiences on the couch: Some clues to a mystery'. *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, 74, 255-73. [→]
Silver, A. S. (1993). 'Countertransference, Ferenczi, and Washington, DC'. *J. Am. Acad. Psychoanal. Dyn. Psychiatr.*, 21, 637-54. [→]
Silver, A. S. (1995). 'Introduction to Fromm-Reichmann's "Female Psychosexuality" and "Jewish Food Rituals"'. *J. Am. Acad. Psychoanal. Dyn. Psychiatr.*, 23, 1-6. [→]
Shamdasani, S. (1997). Personal communication.
Stone, A. (1997). 'Where will psychoanalysis survive?' *Harvard Magazine*, January-February, 35-9. [→]
Taft, J. (1958). *Otto Rank*. New York: The Julian Press.
Thompson, C. (1944). 'Ferenczi's contribution to psychoanalysis'. *Psychiatry*, 7, 245-52.
Thompson, C. (1956). 'The rôle of the analyst's personality in therapy'. *Am. J. Psychother.*, 10, 347-59.
Winnicott, D. W. (1949). 'Hate in the counter-transference'. *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, 30, 69-74. [→]
Wittenberger, G. (1995). *Das 'Geheime Komitee' Sigmund Freuds. Institutional- isierungsprozesse in der Psychoanalytischen Bewegung zwischen 1912 und 1927*. Tübingen: edition diskord.

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

Wollheim, R. (1971). *Freud*. London: Fontana.
Young-Bruehl, E. (1988). *Anna Freud. A Biography*. New York: Summit, 1990.

Acknowledgements

I am indebted to Carlo Bonomi, Michael Good, André Haynal and Sonu Shamdasani for their friendly criticisms and suggestions. My thanks go to Rainer Funk for permission to quote from unpublished letters held by the Erich Fromm Archives in Tübingen, Germany.

Quotations from unpublished Freud letters are reproduced with kind permission of A. W. Freud *et al*. © 1997 A. W. Freud *et al*., by arrangement with Mark Paterson & Associates.

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.

Article Citation [Who Cited This?]
Falzeder, E. (1998). Family tree matters. *J. Anal. Psychol.*, 43:127-154

Copyright © 2016, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing. All Rights Reserved. This download is only for the personal use of PEPWEB GENERIC.