

**The Dark Side of Our Freudian Inheritance:
Our Intolerance Toward Each Other and the Question of Ethics in
Psychoanalysis**

Gunther Perdigao

In 1997 Eizirik wrote: “The public attacks on psychoanalysis have been challenging psychoanalytic societies in many countries, leading to a growing awareness of a certain isolation of our institutions within the social, intellectual and scientific environment”. We have seen many recent publications about the crisis in psychoanalysis (Garza-Gerrero and others) attesting to a growing concern about how we are conducting ourselves and questioning what we can do to change the growing negative perception of psychoanalysis in the eyes of the public. In it in this spirit that this paper is being presented. We have to treat each other with more respect and address some systemic issues in our organization. Only then when our house is in order can we work together to counter and respond to the attacks on psychoanalysis.

While psychoanalysis is progressively being displaced by other approaches to treatment we spend our time attacking each other over matters that should be able to be settled by a rational civil discourse. Psychoanalytic history is full of strife and splits and righteous intolerance toward diversity

of opinion whether it is about theory, governance or training. Indeed, the very training process serves to perpetuate this problem.

Intolerance of dissent

Unfortunately, intolerance toward dissenting views has been prevalent in psychoanalysis from the beginning. In 1942 Max Graf, Little Hans's father, wrote a very laudatory article about Freud in the *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* praising his accomplishments and describing the hostility Freud encountered in Vienna which necessitated a response from him and his disciples that was forceful and “not rendered inept by hesitations, weakening, and tasteless ornamentation.” However, when describing the Wednesday night meetings he had the following to say about Freud's forcefulness: “The last decisive word was always spoken by Freud himself. There was an atmosphere of the foundation of a religion in that room. Freud himself was its new prophet who made the prevailing methods of psychological investigation appear superficial. Freud's pupils – all inspired and convinced—were his apostles. Despite the fact that the contrast among the personalities of this circle of pupils was great, at that early period of Freudian investigation, all of them were united in their respect for and inspiration with Freud. However, after the first dreamy period of unquestioning faith of the first group of apostles, the time came when the

church was founded. Freud began to organize his church with great energy. He was serious and strict in the demands he made of his pupils; he permitted no deviations from his orthodox teaching ... good hearted and considerate though he was in private life, Freud was hard and relentless in the presentation of his ideas. When the question of science came up he would break with his most intimate and reliable friends. If we do consider him the founder of a religion, we may think of him as a Moses full of wrath and unmoved by prayers. ... The original circle of his Viennese apostles began to lose its significance for Freud, particularly because his most gifted pupil turned away to follow a path of his own. Alfred Adle, who in a series of excellent discussions of his own views quietly and firmly defended the following point of view: Freud had created a new technique, the product of real genius; this technique was a new tool for investigative work, which every physician should use for independent research. He compared the Freudian technique for exploring the unconscious with the technique of great artists, which pupils would take over but which they would have to adapt to their given personalities. Freud would not listen. He insisted that there was but one theory, he insisted that if one followed Adler and dropped the sexual basis of psychic life, one was no more a Freudian. In short, Freud – as the

head of a church -- banished Adler. He ejected him from the official church.”

How many times in the course of psychoanalysis has this scenario been repeated? In the early days of psychoanalysis filial piety was demanded and defections were regarded as equivalent to the murder of the father. The disciples who stayed faithful to Freud’s views branded defections or deviations as dangerous to the movement. Rigid orthodoxy was enforced to protect what was viewed as the correct scientific domain. Up until recently the language used to describe dissent has had much in common with the language used in dictatorships or religion where any disagreements are branded as heresy. The deviants over the years were viewed with contempt as poor souls who had been insufficiently analyzed or too sick to be analyzed or villains and liars who had unanalyzable character pathology (Orgel 1990).

Discord among Analysts

Analysts have been fighting with each other since the beginning of psychoanalysis. Living in harmony has been an unattainable goal for analysts. Not recognizing his contributions to the difficulties Freud (1914) spoke pessimistically about the endless disputes among his disciples:

“I could not succeed in establishing among its members the friendly relations that ought to obtain between men who are all engaged upon the same difficult work; nor was I able to stifle the disputes about priority for which there were so many opportunities under these conditions of work in common.”

Later in 1921 Freud, thinking about the bickering and rivalry of the members of the secret group of seven wrote in *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* shortly before the group’s meeting in the Harz mountains in Lower Saxony: “When individuals come together in a group all the cruel, brutal and destructive instincts, which lie dormant in individuals as relics of a primitive epoch, are stirred up to find free gratification.” (p.79). He added that “It is unmistakable that in this whole connection men give evidence of readiness for hatred, an aggressiveness the source of which is unknown and to which one is tempted to ascribe an elementary character”. He elaborated further that for a group to function the members’ narcissism must be held in abeyance so that: “Individuals in the group behave as though they were uniform, tolerate the peculiarities of its other members, equate themselves with them and have no feeling of aversion towards them.” (p.102) Another requirement for a group to function was that the leader of a group “must himself be held in fascination by a strong faith

(in an idea) in order to awaken the group's faith; he must possess a strong and imposing will, which the group, which has no will of its own, can accept from him ... the ideas and the leader have a mysterious and irresistible power called prestige. Prestige is a sort of domination exercised over by an individual, a work or an idea. It entirely paralyzes our critical faculties and fills us with wonderment and respect." (p.81)

The history of psychoanalysis shows that analysts have not tolerated or accepted theoretical differences either at an individual and institutional level. The result has been a history of schisms and splits in the psychoanalytic institutes.

Our idealization of Freud and denial of his human failings

Eighty five years have elapsed since Freud wrote Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego. Our bickering continues unabated and our public image suffers as we show profound intolerance toward each other.

Does our idealization of Freud not hinder us from separating out his seminal contributions from some of his inescapable human failings?

Unfortunately, the published biographies of Freud are either hagiography or virulent Freud bashing, making it difficult to have a balanced view of him as a man of his time. Is idealization of Freud necessary to protect his body of work from criticisms of outsiders? No one criticizes Pasteur for not using an electron microscope, so why can we not see Freud's innovations as being

influenced by the Zeitgeist and the status of science at the “Fin de Siècle Vienna” (Schorske). Must everything he wrote in spite of obvious inconsistencies be viewed as an inviolate gospel? Can we not strike a balance between Freud bashing à la Masson (1984) and uncritical idealization?

In our discipline, unlike most sciences where truths are inherent and are not connected to the person, truths and Freud are inextricably linked. Calculus was invented by Leibnitz but it lives on successfully without him and he is never invoked to settle the accuracy of an equation or the appropriateness of a procedure. Newton is credited with explaining the concept of gravity but no apple falls because of him. The law that we use does not survive because of his authority. (Goldberg 1990). With us, arguments are settled by a quotation from Freud. Are we so frozen in our concepts that we are unable to reevaluate ideas? We have not gotten past the personal connection to the principles that transcend the person. The concept of the unconscious grows beyond its discovery by Freud and stands on its own merits.

There has been an unofficial censorship about how Freud functioned as an analyst and some aspects of his work. Recent research has revealed discrepancies between what Freud wrote about his clinical cases and how he actually behaved. Many things which today we would consider totally

unacceptable in terms of technique were done in the early days of psychoanalysis. Why must everything be cloaked in secrecy rather than recognizing that these were the first steps by a pioneer of a new discipline? Even ethical issues which today would raise serious questions such as his suggestions to one of his patients (Dr. Frink in 1922) that he divorce his wife, marry a millionaire ex-patient in order to overcome his latent homosexuality and make a contribution to the psychoanalytic fund. This is an example of a human failing that he no way detracts from the greatness of his discoveries. As Peter Neubauer one of the directors of the Freud archives stated: “You have to judge him on the entire body of work and his method. Whatever you find out about how he handled a given case does not change his contribution.”

An example of how protective we are about of Freud’s opus is the controversy surrounding the book Freud coauthored with William Bullitt: “Thomas Woodrow Wilson, a Psychological Study” in 1932. It was not published until 1966.¹ It is copyrighted by Freud and William Bullitt and Freud’s estate shared in the royalties from its sales. Barbara Tuchman (1967) reviewing the book mentions her surprise “at the anguish of the psychoanalytic fraternity, who have greeted this posthumous work of the Master as if it were something between the forged First Folio and the

¹ In a footnote in the New Introductory Lectures (Freud 1933 S.E. vol. XXII p.73) there is mention that Freud had just finished his collaboration with W.C. Bullitt who at that time was U.S. ambassador to Germany on a study of President Wilson and that the book had yet been published as of 1962. Bullitt waited until Mrs. Wilson’s death to publish the book

Protocols of Zion (p.40).” She adds that much of the writing was Bullitt’s but Freud’s characteristic ideas and anti-American prejudices affirm his presence in the book. Commenting on the psychological analysis she states: “It makes the contradictions in Wilson’s behavior fall into place with an almost audible click. But as an ... interpretation of events it falls into pieces. It is good psychology but bad history; bad because it is invalid, dangerous because it misleads us as to where the responsibilities lie.” Further along in her review she states: “Kept under control, bias can direct and inform inquiry, but Freud allows himself undisciplined prejudices with sometimes ludicrous results. As an example she quotes this passage:

“Wilson was able to flourish in America because America was a nation protected from reality during the 19th century ... a tradition which produced an atmosphere congenial to women and feminine men but intolerable to a masculine man. Had Wilson been brought up in the comparative freedom of European civilization the argument continues, he would have had to face up to his inner conflicts.”

She finishes her essay with a question: “What can the Freudian method do for history? The answer must be that as an instrument of illumination it can do much – on one condition: let it for God’s sake be applied by a responsible historian.” The controversies surrounded this book highlight the fact that though Freud’s genius manifested itself in a brilliant

psychological analysis, his own prejudices about America influenced his biased description of Wilson. For example he stated in the book that America is a country which he regarded as a “gigantic mistake and that the Treaty of Versailles was the death sentence for European civilization” (Tuchman 1967).^{2 3}

The consequences for psychoanalysis of our idealization of Freud

In recent years there has been increasing concern about what is happening to our discipline and a number of papers have been written about the crisis in psychoanalysis. Many questions have been raised about our training models and about training analyses. As far back as 1950 Ana Freud sounded an alarm about training analyses in a paper on a memorial volume to Eitingon:

“We do not hesitate to brand it as technically wrong if for the purposes of therapy an analyst selects his patients from his circle of acquaintances; if he shares his interests with them or discusses his opinions either with them or in their presence; if he forgets himself far enough to judge their behavior, to disclose his criticisms of other people, and to permit it to affect decisions;

² In the last 2006 issue of JAPA there is an article by Marc Solms describing a previously unknown manuscript by Freud that will be included in the forthcoming Revised Standard Edition. The essay is a draft of a chapter written by Freud for the book. When a typescript of the book surfaced in New York in 1956 several analysts, including Erikson, Schur and Jones felt that the rest of this “disastrously bad book” could not have been written by Freud. Anna Freud felt that only the introduction showed unmistakably the character of Freud’s writing and thinking.

³ Peter Gay in his biography documents amply Freud’s ambivalence about America and his contemptuous views about American culture and American Analysts.(Gay 1988 pp. 553-570)

if he actively manipulates the patient, offers himself to him as a pattern, and ends analysis by permitting the patient to identify with him personally. Nevertheless, we commit every single one of these deviations from the classical technique when we analyze candidates. Within the psychoanalytic societies it is a frequent complaint that training analyses are less effective therapeutically than those of ordinary neurotic patients... that they remain dependent on the training analyst or defend themselves violently against dependence by theoretical innovations which bear the character of rationalizations” (Freud, A 1950 pp. 420-421).

In the last 2 decades we have become much more aware of boundary issues and the difficulties created by behavior which violates these safeguards. We have recognized how damaging breaches of confidentiality can be and how it has taken us a long time to take to heart Ana Freud’s concerns. Sexual aspects of behavior have been much more thoroughly understood but the results of covert aggression on the part of the analyst have only been explored lately. Nowadays analysts seem better able to identify and analyze erotic countertransferences than they are to differentiate and interpret the origins and phenomena of transference idealizations and aggressions, especially unconscious admixtures of destructiveness embedded with consciously idealizing or erotic transferences. Many of us have

difficulty dealing with analysands' critical comments and judgments about our functioning as analysts and members of the analytic community. Many analysts trained in the fifties, sixties and seventies have gradually realized that their training experience included unacknowledged and unintegrated aggression by their training analysts. Many responded masochistically and later as analysts themselves acted out these same themes and inflicted similar aggression on their patients with sadomasochistic relationships or passive aggression waiting to explode into vengeful activity. In some groups, dominated by one or two powerful figures who exercised freedom denied to others, the consequences were a stifling atmosphere and a rigid and harsh superego in the next generation. (Orgel 1990). Many of the training analysts of the fifties and sixties were analyzed by the analytic pioneers, at a time when arrogant, aggressive, narcissistic behavior was not questioned. Many just followed the lead of their training analysts and acted in the same way without reflecting on their behavior or subjecting it to scrutiny. This unconscious transmission of destructive maladaptive behavior from one generation to the next has been an untoward consequence of our inability to analyze the insidious covert hostility which lies behind the idealization.

Transgenerational transmission of pathology.

Without directly addressing this topic Freud deals with the transgenerational transmission by discussing the phylogenetic traces that have been present in the human race since the beginning. They refer to the law, the prohibitions and the unifying function of the father in the family. He advances the idea of a primal fantasy which is transmitted from one generation to the next. As late as the Outline of Psychoanalysis (1940) Freud claimed that the Id contains instinctual remnants from past generations, while the superego is the guardian of their cultural acquisitions.

Family therapists have written about transgenerational transmission of pathology from un verbalized, unthinkable content which leaves no trace of what has taken place. Our idealization of Freud and denial of the consequences of his behavior vis-a-vis his disciples resulted in a perpetuation of authoritarian intolerant behavior that has continued down in several generations of analysts.

French psychoanalysts, Kaes et al (1993) studying the transmission that takes place discusses two mechanisms: the unconscious transmission via identification with the object and the transmission of taboo and guilt and culpability. Unanalyzed transferences result in a transgenerational transmission of conflicts which are then perpetuated. The challenge facing analysands is how to find their own path in the wake of their analytic

ancestors and not act out the conflicts they have unconsciously incorporated from their analysts.

Present Day consequences of Intergenerational Conflicts.

Without explicitly calling the situation intergenerational transmission Orgel (1990) has elaborated extensively on this subject.

Narcissistic issues and aggressive countertransferences of analysts a generation ago were less well analyzed by their analysts than they seem to be today; idealization, grandiosity, devaluation and fear of dependency form an essential part of the narcissistic configuration. It is the responsibility of the analyst to address the narcissism of the analysands and to help him/her arrive at manageable levels of sadomasochism, grandiosity and devaluation, exhibitionism and timidity, power, control, and dominance versus dependency dualities. Idealization of the personal analyst with the analysands experiencing personal grandiosity through identification can be highly gratifying to both partners. Denying and splitting off aggression makes it unavailable to be worked through in the transference.

Many older analysts were autocratic and used the power of the transference and their position in the institute to create disciples. This behavior provided gratification for grandiosity, exhibitionism and the desire for power and control. Institute politics provided an acceptable and convenient outlet for aggression which was displaced onto those labeled as

enemies of psychoanalysis. The inconsistencies between what was preached and what was practiced led to lasting consequences that continue to trouble us today. With the crumbling of unanalyzed transferences and the reappearance of symptoms we are tempted to turn the analysts of our parents and grandparents generations into mythic figures. These transformations reflect our continuing infantile need for great men and women in order to help us curb our patricidal and infanticidal drives. In order to deny these contradictions and hang on to our idealized transferences we construct what we insist they must have believed, instead of giving credence to our perceptions of their real selves. We rationalize and deny that many of them used their analysands, students, and younger colleagues as allies after their training analyses, as cadres of supporters in their own professional rivalries and quarrels. Unfortunately much of our intolerance toward each other is part of our transgenerational inheritance where in subtle ways many of us had to take sides in narcissistic institutional struggles.

These conflicts become particularly pertinent when we analyze candidates who wish to kill us and take our psychoanalysis away from us. Candidates wish both to become like their analysts and to replace them. We have to be able to analyze their transference idealizations, imitations and identifications as well as the preoedipal and oedipal aggressive transferences to us.

Psychoanalysis is Freud's legacy to us, and it is neither the possession of its

creators nor of its current caretakers. For so many analysts Freud represents the equivalent of the primal father and his basic ideas, his essential “soul” and power were grasped and more or less incorporated by succeeding generations in revived oedipal struggles in the personal analysis of future analysts. Many of us have replaced our own fathers with Freud as our family romance father and our original murderousness inevitably fixes on our representations of Freud. The tenacious idealization prevents us from getting in touch with the underlying hostility and ambivalence. We try but often fail to master these impulses through our transference experiences in our own personal analyses.

The choice of entering “helping professions” is often determined by defenses against wishes to attack, to cause pain, and to kill. Reaction formations against such sadistic impulses often enter into the meanings of performing ‘cures’. An underside of our therapeutic ambitions are contrary wishes not to cure, not to help not to understand but to overthrow and defeat, sadistic wishes which are both satisfied and defended against by failing in the therapeutic task. Both analyst and patient are appeased by the avoidance of full analysis of the aggressive transferences and the powerful countertransferences impulses. On the analyst’s part defenses against oedipally derived infanticidal wishes act as impedances to thorough analysis and resolution of the aggressive transference. (Orgel 1989)

Institutional Consequences of our idealization

The official histories of psychoanalysis tend to be either self congratulatory or bemoan the fact that psychoanalysis arouses such resistance and hostility in people. The unfortunate reality is that over 60 years after Freud's death, psychoanalytic institutions are still beset by rancorous destructive conflicts. The historical corollary of this intolerance is the remarkable history of schisms in psychoanalytic institutes, testifying to the difficulty in containing, much less accepting, theoretical differences, within existing organizations Eisold (1994 p.785).”

There has been a dearth of studies about our institutional turbulence indicating reluctance on the part of analysts to reflect on the status of psychoanalytic institutions (Pires Leal 2001). Kaes (1989) has stated that there is no psychoanalytic theory about its institutions.⁴ Psychoanalysis has functioned as a secret society where knowledge is the prerogative of the elders. Secret societies are set up hierarchically where the guarding and preservation of knowledge is the responsibility of the most trusted elders. The IPA was founded in 1910 but Freud continued to be anxious and alarmed about the strife between his adherents. Nothing threatened him more than enemy within i.e. the challenges to his views about psychoanalysis by

⁴ A conspicuous exception is the recently published paper: El instituto como setting para el analisis didactico: algunas reflexiones (Araujo et al)

his disciples. This uneasiness led Jones to suggest to Freud the formation of a secret committee in 1913 whose express purpose was to deal with any future dissensions. The Group of Seven with their signet ring, were charged with preserving the purity of psychoanalytic thought. They were the inner sanctum that decided what was pure psychoanalysis and what was not. This caste system has permeated psychoanalytic institutions and has been responsible for analysts' ambivalence toward their institutions which continues to this day. By in large, we have not been aware and learned to detect the unconscious at work in our institutional relationships and the collusive forces permeating our relationship with our colleagues. We are accustomed to exploring our unconscious motivations and countertransferences in our work with patients but are much less aware of group pressures. The secrecy of the inner sanctum has always generated suspicion and ambivalence. Unfortunately what started in the early nineteenth hundreds has continued to this day. Freud himself was defensive about the secrecy of the inner circle created to maintain the purity of psychoanalysis. In the New Introductory Lectures Freud (vol. XXII p. 69) he stated: "you can believe me when I tell you that we do not enjoy giving the impression of being members of a secret society and of practicing a mystical science."

There has been an ongoing concern about the impact of power and secrecy on our institutions and the ongoing conflict between orthodoxy and

heresy. The IPA pregress in Buenos Aires (1991) entitled “Between Chaos and Petrification” addressed with these very issues.

Wallerstein’s report of the proceedings of the training analyst pregress summarized the presentations and discussions of the issues raised by the invited presenters. Five of the seven presenters (Goldstein, Giovanetti, Infante, Lussier and Green) explicitly expressed concern with the deforming presence of power within the structure of organized psychoanalytic training, the exercise, abuse and the pathology of power, with all its correlates of coerced dogmatism, intolerance of dissent, enforced infantilization and narcissistic aggrandizement of those who hold and deploy power.

Goldstein commented on the struggle against the temptations of power to impose the certainty of the power holder’s ideology on the powerless. “Who decides what creation is to be celebrated and whose creation is to be cast out as transgressive thereby reestablishing dogmatic conformity and certainty.”

Giovanetti emphasized the abuse of power in the service of the narcissism of the analyst.

Lussier spoke about the stifling rigidity, the suffocating indoctrination, our failure to attract enough creative candidates, the pathogenic effects intra muros of the non analyzed transferences with their

cortege of idealizations and paranoid attitudes ... the atmosphere of indoctrination, restriction of thought and ideological nepotism. The sterilizing atmosphere is maintained by those who keep a mistrustful eye toward the younger generation's inclination to challenge the status quo and to request better opportunities to voice their mind. The quest for freedom is frequently mistaken for chaos or treated as adolescent rebelliousness.

André Green also focused on the misuse of power as the central problem in psychoanalytic training. He discusses the proliferation of "psychoanalytic tribes" sometimes in the form of sects. He adds that now there is a war of theories going on in which each actor in psychoanalytic history attempts to secure victory for his theory over those of others. This has resulted in militancy and demagoguery as each "tribe" tries to achieve institutional power

Infante too, speaks of institutional power and its corrupting effect as the central issue in psychoanalytic training. He agreed with Zusman's view presented at the IPA symposium held at Linden Hall England in 1988 that psychoanalytic institutions throughout the world share the same pathology, the inescapable pathology of power that is used coercively and often insidiously flagrantly abused.

One of the few studies about why psychoanalysis has been bedeviled by institutional splitting has been done by Eisold(1994). His thesis is that

psychoanalytic organizations are weak and vulnerable to schisms because the real allegiances of their members are to their analysts and to the lineage of analysts that define their particular school of thought. He argues further that dependency upon one's analyst has traditionally been thought a sign of unresolved transferences, and the way to ensure one's place in the lineage, one's secure place with one's analyst and his school, has been to be willing to fight on his behalf.

Narcissism and Ethics in Psychoanalysis

Ethical and moral issues have always pervaded human activity and human aspirations. Our field of endeavor deals with people's values, needs and their rights. A failure of ethics in psychoanalysis leads inexorably to technical failure, as its basic principles, especially those that structure the setting, are founded on ethical concepts of equality, respect and search for the truth (Etchegoyen 1991).

Rangell (1974, 1980), writing about the Watergate scandal, described what he called the syndrome of the compromise of integrity. "Syndromes resulting from the compromise of integrity are endogenous to human life. Not just with income tax or marital fidelity where double standards are accepted norms –or with major notorious frauds—but in the interpersonal transactions and daily traffic of everyday living." He pointed out that the

mechanisms he described did not fail to have their counterpart in psychoanalytic societies where the presence of internal conflicts of interests may result in issues being “resolved in favor of narcissism at the expense of principles.” He emphasized that the goal of psychoanalysis was the development of intrapsychic integrity, for the analytic attitude should be in its very essence a model of “relentless incorruptibility.”

“To maintain this is its core; there is no analyst, subject to the daily spectrum of transference displacements, who does not know and feel the range of pressures to which this is put, from sexual to material to narcissistic. Basic trust is rightly tested and has to be earned. The capacity to use rather than abuse transference cannot be taken for granted. Nor once achieved can it automatically continue for life; it needs to be worked at and constantly reaffirmed.” (Rangell 1974 p.11)

In recent years we have all experienced both professional and social pressures to consider the ethical issues which arise in the course of our practice. There has been a greater insistence on transparency and the secrecy of the old days is being challenged. We have evolved past the positivistic view where the analyst was considered infallible or devoid of potentially conflicted feelings and desires. The power differential has shifted such that difficulties in the analysis are no longer automatically considered to be the

result of the analysand's resistance or negative transference as compared to the limitations of the analyst.

Nowadays analysts, as we have observed above, are very attuned to breaches of confidentiality and ethical infractions of a sexual nature. The same cannot be said for acting out of aggression. Covert sadomasochistic exploiting of candidates is not as well recognized. Infractions resulting from pathological narcissism where the self is more important and superior to anyone along with claims that the self is to be served before anything else are unfortunately still prevalent in our analytic milieu. Unbridled narcissism is the enemy of integrity. In psychoanalysis there is a whole range of behaviors at the service of the senior analysts' narcissism which subtly exploit the candidates' dependency on the training system and forces them to acquiesce to demands which in any other circumstance would seem to be out of the question. The use of candidates as gurkas to fight battles by proxy has been more frequent than we care to acknowledge. The compact in these situations revolves around the promise that if the candidate shows loyalty to his or her analyst or to an important figure in the society he/she will be rewarded by advancement in the organization or by the referral of patients. The candidate or the young analyst who hopes to be accepted eventually as a training analyst then has to show strident adherence to a given theoretical position or fealty to a faction in the society. This use of younger people to

further the ambitions of senior people has permeated many of our societies and led to great ambivalence toward authority which is then projected outside the society either to other societies or to the IPA.

The effects of indoctrination

Early on Freud (1905) warned against the analyst indoctrinating his patients. The tendency to convey to the analysands one's own ideas or conflicts is always a very strong one. It can take place in a relatively open way, by means of advice or suggestions or more subtly under the guise of a formal interpretation. When this occurs, the psychoanalytic process as a therapy becomes corrupted. The psychoanalyst must always be on the alert to gauge and correct the function of the unconscious: like any other investigator he is responsible for his working instrument (Etchegoyen 1973). The role of ideology in the psychoanalytic process poses the danger of the analyst indoctrinating his patient with his own beliefs and ideas. The objectivity of the analyst may be disturbed by his own ideological beliefs (which may be religious or psychoanalytic), or by political ambitions within the institution.

As has been mentioned before, idealizations are often allowed to flower without being analyzed because of the gratification which they provide to the analyst. The other side of the coin is that the underlying

resentments of the analysands turn the analysis into a chronic sado-masochistic situation. The analysands feel used and exploited and either become resentful of authority or identify with the victimization and become victimizers themselves. As long as there was a surplus of analytic patients, with the training analysts referring patient's to their favorite candidates the unrest staid muted. Now with the shortage of analytic patients young analysts are less willing to participate in dishonest collusions.

There is one bright aspect to this picture. We are much more willing to look at ourselves and our interactions with psychoanalytic institutions and to try to remedy past mistakes so that psychoanalysis can continue to flourish.

- Eisold, K (1994) The Intolerance of Diversity in Psychoanalytic Institutes
Int. J Psychoanal. 75: 785-800
- Etchegoyen, H (1991)The Fundamentals of Psychoanalytic Technique
Karnac Books London SW7 4QY
- Freud, A. (1950) The Writings of Ana Freud v. IV pp. 420-421 Int. Univ.
Press New York NY 1968
- Freud, S. (1905) On Psychotherapy S.E. v.VII pp.257-268
- Freud, S. (1914) On the History of the Psychoanalytic Movement S.E.
v.XIV pp. 3-66
- Freud, S. (1921) Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego S.E.
v. XVIII pp. 67-144
- Freud, S. (1940) An Outline of Psychoanalysis S.E: v.XXIII pp. 141-208
- Freud, S. Bullit, W. (1966): Thomas Woodrow Wilson a Psychological
Study Houghton Miffling Co. Boston, MA
- Gay, P. (1988) Freud: A Life for our Time W.W. Norton & Co, 500 Fifth
Ave. New York, NY 10110
- Goldberg, A. (1990) The Prison House of Psychoanalysis. Analytic Press
Hillsdale, New Jersey

- Graf, Max (1942) Reminiscences of Professor Sigmund Freud. *Psychoanal. Quart.* 11:465-476
- Kaës, R. (1989) *A Instituição e as Instituições.* Casa do Psicólogo Sao Paulo, SP
- Kaës, R. et al(1993) *Transmission de la Vie Psychique Entre Générations* Dunod Paris pp 208
- Masson, J.M. ed. (1984) *The Complete Letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess 1887-1904* Harvard Univ. Press Cambridge, MA.
- Neubauer, P (1989) *The New York Times* March 6, 1990
- Orgel, S. (1989) Address to the Board of Professional Standards *J.American Psychoanal. Assn.* 37:532-541
- Orgel, S (1990) *The Future of Psychoanalysis.* *Psychoanal. Quart.* 59:1-20
- Pires Leal (2001) *Romance Institucional* *Revista Brasileira de Psicanálise* 35: 959-975
- Rangell, L (1974) *A Psychoanalytic Perspective Leading Currently to the Syndrome of the Compromise of Integrity.* *Int. J. Psychoanal.* 55 3-12
- Rangell, L (1980) *The Mind of Watergate: An Exploration of the Compromise of Integrity.* W. W. Norton, New York
- Schorske, C(1981) *Fin de Siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture* Vintage Books. Publishers New York, NY.
- Solms, M (2006) *An Unknown Freud Manuscript* *J.Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.* 54:1263-1298
- Tuchman,B (1967) *Can History Use Freud: The Case of Woodrow Wilson* *The Atlantic Monthly* Boston MA pp. 39-44
- Wallerstein, R (1993) *Between Chaos and Petrification: A Summary of the Fifth IPA Conference of Training Analysts* *Int.J.Psychoanal.* 74:165-178
- Zusman, W (1988) *Nuestra Ciencia y Nuestra Vida Científica* *Revista de Psicoanálisis* V.XLV pp1193-1215