

FREUD AS AN ENTREPRENEUR:

IMPLICATIONS FOR CONTEMPORARY PSYCHOANALYTIC INSTITUTES

Charismatic authority, Weber (1947) postulated, arises because of faith in a leader believed to be endowed with exceptional qualities. In order to sustain charisma, charismatic leadership must be routinized -- that is, firmly established -- within a framework of rational-legal authority, a belief in the inviolability of formal norms.

That is what had begun to happen when, in the autumn of 1901, at the suggestion of Wilhelm Steckel, Freud addressed postcards to Steckel, Alfred Adler, Max Kahane, and Rudolf Reitter, inviting them to meet with him at 19 Bergasse to discuss his work (Jones, 1953a). The weekly meetings that followed became the Wednesday Psychological Society and, on April 15, 1908, the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society.

According to Weber, charisma includes five components: 1) an extraordinary “gifted” person; 2) a social crisis or situation of desperation; 3) a set of ideas providing a radical solution to the crisis; 4) a set of followers who are attracted to the exceptional person and come to believe that he or she is directly linked to transcendent powers; 5) the validation of that person's extraordinary gifts and transcendence by repeated successes (Weber, 1947).

All of these conditions were present for Freud. Furthermore, he met other criteria for the charismatic leader (House, 1977): “ extreme high levels of self-confidence, dominance, and a strong conviction of moral righteousness of his beliefs” and “a high need to have influence over others.” His behavior was consistent with that of other leaders described as charismatic: he offered himself as an effective role model, he created the impression of competence and success, he articulated ideological goals, he communicated high expectations plus confidence in his key followers, and he stimulated them to want to be as capable and insightful as he was.

That Freud was charismatic is beyond question. But why did he seek to sustain charismatic leadership? Was it not enough to become famous for discovering a revolutionary method of learning about and understanding feelings, thoughts, and behavior? Couldn't one, like Einstein, be contented with a place in history for conceptualizing those insights? Obviously, for Freud the answer was, "No. The reasons lead us to the psychological logic behind founding a psychoanalytic organization, and, in turn, to its structure and ultimately the influence of that structure on the theory and practice of psychoanalysis as mediated by psychoanalytic institutes.

Psychodynamics of Entrepreneurial Behavior

According to the various biographies, Freud was the preferred eldest child of a loving mother who required his brother and sisters to defer to him and his need to study. He would also be their somewhat authoritarian teacher. She encouraged his scholarship and professional aspiration. Her doting affection and his family position supported that degree of narcissism that led to a high level of self-confidence. "This self-confidence, which was one of Freud's prominent characteristics, was only rarely impaired and he was doubtless right in tracing it to the security of his mother's love" (Jones, 1953a).

His father apparently was rather weak and ineffectual. Classically, such a family constellation encourages the son to think that his mother prefers him over his father and that he should out-do him. When he is unable to resolve his Oedipal rivalry by solidifying his identification with his father, the rivalry persists. That sets the stage for entrepreneurial behavior. (Schumpeter, 1961). Entrepreneurial personalities, still protesting behaviorally against the father, have great difficulty with supervision and control (Levinson, 1971). Jones (1953a) reports that Freud disliked being hampered and fettered. Entrepreneurial behavior also is characterized by rebellion. As Gay (1988) puts it, Freud came to see himself as a destroyer of illusions and found this stance most

congenial, and further, "Psychoanalysis aimed at nothing less than the overthrow of the reigning schools of psychiatry and psychology (p. 499)." McIntosh (1970) argues that charisma can be an "...acting out the universal Oedipal fantasy of the sons rising to overthrow the father through the rebellious qualities of both the leader and the followers." On his 50th birthday, his followers presented him with a medallion with his likeness on one side and Oedipus solving the riddle of the Sphinx on the other, thereby acknowledging his Oedipal role as well as the central position of that role in his theory.

The Freuds were immigrants to Austria from Moravia (now Czechoslovakia) where his father had experienced the hostility of woolen manufacturers. Vienna was not cordial to provincial Moravians. It was even less cordial to Jews. Sociologists generally recognize both circumstances as fertile ground for the development of entrepreneurs.

Inasmuch as his father was hardly a strong model for his masculinity, let alone his professional path, he leaned heavily on his professors and was as devoted to meeting their exacting demands and expectations, as he was to those of his mother. The perfectionistic striving, however, could not have been a product solely of external factors. Necessarily, the unresolved Oedipal rivalry must have left its residue of unconscious rage. That is a major source of the intense aggressive energy that drives entrepreneurs and makes it difficult for them to manage rivalry. The unconscious guilt, the product of primary process thinking that accompanies such rage exacerbates self-critical superego functioning and the resulting press for perfection. Jones reports that in a letter to Emil Fluss, Freud bemoaned his dread of mediocrity and was not easily satisfied with himself. Harshly self-critical, he was also necessarily hypersensitive to criticism by others. That configuration of forces, coupled with the narcissism and rebellious posture referred to earlier, is conducive to condescension. It also is conducive to ready dependency, for self-doubt is never far from a severe superego, despite the manifest self-confidence. "A profound self-confidence had been marked by strange feelings of inferiority, even in the intellectual sphere, and he had tried to cope with these by

projecting his innate sense of capacity and superiority onto a series of mentors, on some of whom he then became curiously dependent for reassurance. Thus he idealized six figures who played an important part in his early life: Brucke, Meinert, Fleischl, Charcot, Breuer, and Fliess, all of whom were good friends to him” (Jones, 1953b). They, his later adherents and the public at large, became the sources of applause and recognition he needed to counteract the superego demands that threatened his self-image as reflected in his deprecation of his various papers.

Most entrepreneurs are too rivalrous to sustain close friendships. Freud was an exception. “An intimate friend and a hated enemy have always been indispensable to my emotional life. I have always been able to create them anew, and not infrequently my childish ideal has been so closely approached that friend and enemy have coincided in the same person, but not simultaneously, of course, as was the case in my early childhood” (Jones, 1953a). Breuer, Fliess (on whom he was most dependent when he worked in painful isolation for ten years after separating from Breuer), and Jung were his only close friends. All became enemies. He would also split with Adler, Steckel, Ferenczi, and Rank.

The Leader and the Follower

Weber contended that if the leader does not repeatedly validate his charisma, he loses his authority and the solidity of the movement he started is jeopardized. Trice and Beyer (1986) point out, “Charismatics apparently understand very well the pivotal role of success in maintaining their authority for they go to unusual lengths to claim and redefine success.”

That meant he needed followers. A rebel seeking adherents naturally attracts other rebels. The rebel followers are likely to be of three kinds: 1) those who identify fully with the leader and can become his acolytes; 2) those who are tentative, either distantly interested or who become involved and then lose interest; 3) those whose identification with the leader is only a mechanism for

grafting their own ideological propensities onto his. The last, after having matured in their own eyes, usually separate to go their own ways. Freud had many of all three kinds. One could argue that the third kind were the Oedipal rebels who had to overthrow Freud's dominance as he had to undermine significant psychological verities of his time. One could argue alternatively that they brought varied experiences to their construction of meaning, and offer even more speculative psychoanalytic reasons.

Freud's organizational troubles seemed to begin when, in its fifth year, Rank became the first paid staff person, the secretary of the Wednesday Psychological Society. Rank's job was to take notes at each meeting, collect dues, and record attendance. He was the first psychoanalytic bureaucrat. The appointment of a secretary was the beginning of structure. Structure implies status, degrees of power and politics. All began to appear. After Rank's appointment, "The meetings grew testy, even acrimonious as members sparred for position, vaunted their originality, or voiced dislike of their fellows with a brutal hostility masked as analytic frankness" (Gay, 1988). Besides, as the organization grew the members became a varied lot, few of whom could approach Freud's level of conceptual thinking. Freud tried to cope with their conflicts by reorganizing the group into the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, allowing some to drop out or to change their relationship to the group.

In this experience lies a fundamental problem that has troubled psychoanalytic societies since that time. Following scientific tradition, Freud wanted to stimulate the greatest exchange possible among those interested in his work. He encouraged originality. Unlike the classical entrepreneur or other charismatic leaders, he was unwilling to impose inviolable doctrine on his followers. He wanted the respect and acceptance of the scientific community (Gay, 1988). He did not want mere echoes.

Preserving the Creation

But, like all entrepreneurs, he also wanted to preserve his creation, his “baby.” The Swiss psychiatrist, Eugen Bleuler, told Freud that he was an artist who wanted to preserve his creation intact and was passionately eager to secure its acceptance (Hale, 1971).

In the business world, entrepreneurs, men who have failed to win their mothers, build organizations and then usually “marry them” (Levinson, 1971). (Few female entrepreneurs have built large organizations.) In effect, they create their own psychological families and become one with them. It is difficult to separate the person from the organization; he is it and it is he. The “baby,” and the family of unconscious fantasy, often is more important than their literal families. Indeed, spouses of such men frequently complain that they desert their families for the business. To preserve his “baby,” Freud had to start an organization.

Charisma is routinized by: 1) the development of an administrative apparatus that stands apart from the charismatic, to cope with the ongoing operating needs generated by putting the charismatic’s program into practice; 2) the transformation and transference of charisma to others in the organization by means of rites, ceremonials, and symbols; 3) the incorporation of the charismatic’s message and mission into the written and oral traditions of the organization; and 4) the selection of a successor who resembles the charismatic sufficiently to be like a reincarnation (Eisenstadt, 1968); and 5) the degree to which the organization (or other collectivity) continues to express, to work toward, and to cohere around the charismatic message and mission of the founder (or reformer) (Trice & Beyer, 1986). To these I would add identification with the *behavior* and underlying psychodynamics of the charismatic leader: narcissism (reflected in pursuit, conviction, promulgation, wish to perpetuate), together with rebelliousness and projective identification.

Weber (1947) suggests that routinization is hampered by the direct involvement of the charismatic in the mundane features of administration. Anything that tends to dilute the

exceptionality dilutes the charisma. Grete Bibring (1978) reported that among the members of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, there was much dream interpretation and socializing. Freud was much too involved with his followers and their organization and did not maintain sufficient psychological distance from them for idealization to be sustained.

Trice and Beyer (1986) add that when an organization fails to develop a strong reinforcing culture -- including ritual and ceremonies to transfer and diffuse charisma, together with written testament and oral tradition to guide behavior -- the organizing force behind the charisma tends to fade away over time. None of that was sufficiently present in the early days of the Wednesday Psychological Society or the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society. Although most of the followers at the time wanted to be able to think like Freud, they seemed to be more concerned with becoming practicing psychoanalysts.

In short, the ego ideal of the entrepreneurial Freud was in conflict with the ego ideal of the scientific Freud. That made it impossible for the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society of Freud's time to become the model society and to meet Freud's hoped-for support and perpetuation of his work. Yet, the imperative need for such support of prominent men is well established (Bird, et al, 1983).

Karl Abraham and Max Eitingon in Berlin, Ernest Jones in London, and Sandor Ferenczi in Budapest became the rescuers of Freud's hopes and ambitions. Their ego ideal task was primarily to protect the "baby." At one time or another, they all had been guests at the Wednesday Psychological Society. Abraham founded the Berlin Psychoanalytic Society in 1908. Subsequently, that Society developed its own clinic and training program that became the model for the rest. Societies took root in other countries. Their big advantage was that they were distant geographically from Freud and therefore could idealize him. At Freud's instance, Ferenczi proposed the formation of the International Psychoanalytic Association at the International Congress of Psychoanalysts in Nurnberg in 1910. This proposal reflected the fact that Freud had now turned from Vienna to a worldwide network. He had intended all along that his work be recognized worldwide and to have a

worldwide effect (Gay, 1988).

Two persistent nagging problems drove the protective effort. One was the threat to the reputation of the nascent movement by "wild" analysts and others, now in various parts of the world, who would not only vitiate or trivialize its findings, but also undermine its scientific reputation. Freud was uneasy about what the "human rabble" might make of his work.

The second was the need to "hold on to the homogeneity of the core" of psychoanalytic knowledge and practice as more people became psychoanalysts by the mere expedient of declaring themselves to be. He wrote to Bleuler that he feared the extravagances of some of his followers and needed a central headquarters to control their polemics (Hale, 1971).

Beneath both problems was Freud's need to preserve and perpetuate his "baby" and to immortalize himself. In addition, Freud had to cope with the hostility of the Vienna medical and neurological communities and those outside of Vienna, the growing criticism of his ideas, and the defections from the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society. Sandor Ferenczi, Otto Rank, Hans Sachs, Karl Abraham, and Ernest Jones, at Jones' suggestion, (Jones, 1953a) in 1912 formed a protective coterie around Freud. "I daresay it would make living and dying easier for me if I knew of such an association existing to watch over my creation," he had said about the formation of that group of six. Obviously, the broader, more comprehensive worldwide group would be even more important to him.

Developing Institutes

To foster that group, he recognized, required not only developing the International, but also training institutes "to guarantee the authenticity of his teaching and the competence of the taught." "Freud took the initiative not only in organizing the movement in Europe and America, but also in defining a psychoanalyst as one who accepted his theories" (Hale, 1971). In these efforts, Freud

turned out to be what Gay (1988) describes as a true politician, “ more devious than in the rest of his conduct, and his struggles with Adler brought out all his latent gifts for navigating among contending forces in pursuing his program.” These efforts took much of his time and energy.

Clark (1972) has identified five "carrying missions" essential to fulfill organizational sagas: 1) a key group of believers who routinize the charisma of the leader in collegial authority; 2) program embodiment, which involves the visible practice with which claims of distinctiveness can be supported (that is, unusual courses, noteworthy requirements, or specific methods of teaching); 3) a supporting social base among outside believers devoted to the organization; 4) an allied student subculture, which “steadily and dependably transferred this ideology from one generation to another;” 5) imagery of the saga “widely expressed as a generalized tradition in statues and ceremonies, written histories, and current catalogs even in the 'air about the place' felt by participants and some outsiders.”

Under such circumstances all members gain charisma just by being members (Kanter, 1972). The routinization is most likely when “secondary leaders have taken the initiative in advancing their interest” (Madsen & Snow, 1983).

The Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute worked out a detailed training program with courses on theory and technique. Some, like Grete Bibring (1978), felt it to be rigid. “That was different from Vienna where we were not rigid. We were what we would call *schlumpig*; *schlumpig* is sloppy". But under Abraham and Eitingon, it was solid because both were unswerving admirers of Freud. Candidacy at that time, as Hans Sachs put it, corresponded to a novitiate in a church because the guidelines mandated a training analysis (Gay, 1988). In 1925, at the Ninth International Psychoanalytic Congress at Bad Homburg, Eitingon reported that in five years there had been sixteen didactic analyses. At the same meeting the concept of endorsement by local societies of the applications for training by the many from overseas who sought to get that training in Berlin and Vienna was approved. By 1929 admissions and training standards were in place, including the

concept of being analyzed oneself before analyzing others. The primary emphasis was on becoming a good practicing analyst.

That emphasis carried over into the United States. The American psychoanalytic movement began with two streams, one primarily in Boston and the other in New York. The Boston stream started with Freud's journey to Worcester and his Clark University presentations, followed by his visit to the summer home of James Jackson Putnam. With Putnam's endorsement and leadership, given his prestigious academic position, and that of others of like repute, psychoanalysis took root. But it was not until Ives Hendrick, John Murray, M. Ralph Kaufman, and Helen Tartakoff returned from Berlin and Vienna that a more formal structure evolved. Gifford (1978) reports that Hendrick exaggerated the standards of the Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute where he trained and applied them to the newly formed Boston Psychoanalytic Institute: "He seemed to create a model of efficiency more German than the German analysts themselves, and this personal model of strictly impersonal regulations, and a concrete complex structure was imposed on the Boston analytic community. Hendrick's unswerving pursuit of this ideal may also have influenced the procedural apparatus of the American Psychoanalytic Association through his indefatigable work on its committees."

In New York, A. A. Brill was the dominant figure. The early New York analysts, under Brill's leadership, insisted on psychoanalysis as a medical discipline, an issue never fully resolved with Freud. The New York group tended to be the most orthodox and over identified with Freud. Its training program became a yardstick for others (Levine, 1962).

There seemed not to be much theoretical debate of the kind that characterized Freud's original followers, except among the American pioneers themselves. However, there were vigorous debates in both the Boston and New York Institutes about how standards were to be maintained and who should do so. These debates threatened the older analysts who had pioneered those societies and who wished that authority remain with them as training analysts rather than be taken over by the education committees as the International required. The younger analysts, fresh from their European

training, advocated meeting the standards of the International. They won. Sicherman (1978) contends that the new orthodoxy transformed the American psychoanalytic movement from an optimistic and reformist creed to a professional specialty.

A crucial question was who becomes a training analyst and how. Discussions on that topic had been going on for years. Early on, after the era of simply declaring oneself to be an analyst, those who wished to become proficient psychoanalysts attached themselves to an established analyst. Then came the Institutes and their rules. But one still had to be analyzed and that analysis had to be accepted as valid by the education committee of a psychoanalytic institute. Earlier the International had delegated that task to the oldest member of a society it favored in each city (Hendrick, 1961). The Boston Society imported Franz Alexander to be its training analyst, the New York Society invited Sandor Rado. Hans Sachs, said by some to be the gadfly of the Boston Society, took the traditional position.

Hitler precipitated the influx of European analysts, representing the first generation of Freud's students' analysands. They readily became training analysts and influential figures in the American institutes. In addition to their culture and learning, they brought another perspective: some of the Europeans' condescension toward Americans (shared by Freud himself because he was fearful of the Americans as potential charlatans) and a sense of being elite, but they invigorated what before had seemed to be a small club. It subsequently became a larger, more rigid club.

Insider Games

“Most human systems,” says John W. Gardner, (Gamarekian, 1989) “...move toward being what I call insider games. They set up barriers against outsiders knowing what's going on, perhaps even unintentionally. And successive regimes strengthen those barriers so that they can carry on their businesses without a lot of interruption. Unless there is someone out there who insists that is not the way it is going to run you get yourself into a terrible mess. Pretty soon the system

doesn't even work for the insiders.”

That is what seemed to happen to many psychoanalytic institutes. The organizations were stymied significantly because these now old disciples maintained their elite manner as guardians of the truth and the method for getting it. First there was the general problem: who was a training analyst? The Education Committee of the International said one who was a practicing analyst in an affiliated society for five years and who had made at least two contributions to the psychoanalytic literature. But in some institutes, the Boston Psychoanalytic being one, no one knew how to go about becoming a training analyst. People were tapped on the shoulder by one of those who was established in that role. Others were left in the dark. The social structure of the Institute, it is said, became more rigid with hapless candidates at the bottom of the ladder who had to be examined and write papers. Gone was the tradition of open discussion as the second generation disciples guarded the treasure.

According to Jacobs (1983), “Through Freud they (the devoted teachers) had been given the gift of psychoanalysis to preserve, to nourish and to develop and by exercising that responsibility with care and wisdom and with creativity, they sought to make that dream come true.” The ego ideal still was to be a guardian, to protect the “baby.”

As a result, there soon began to be defections. In New York, Rado, Karen Horney, and Clara Thompson were read out of the party. Elsewhere there were splits. Open discussion of theoretical ideas was not tolerable. Whatever the specific manifest issues, behind them lay the issues of power and status on the one hand and intellectual examination on the other, together with the possession of the charisma.

The internal pressures against the over control were exacerbated in the 1950s and the 1960s with the growth of numbers of candidates and analysts, and the liberating spirit of the increased openness that characterized the rest of society. To the older analysts it sounded as if the younger ones had no confidence in them. For the younger ones to be able to interact with their seniors in the

psychoanalytic institute was as expectable as their customary interaction with their parents, teachers, bosses and public officials. And, after all, was the psychoanalytic society not a family, a metaphor used widely? To be a family member was to share the charisma.

The conflict between these issues -- preserving the “baby” and sustaining the tradition of open discussion -- was reflected in the conflict between the membership and Board of Professional Standards of the American Psychoanalytic Association (Kris, 1976). On the one hand, the task of the American is to establish psychoanalysis as a profession through high standards of training. On the other, its purpose is also to advance psychoanalysis as a science and to become a partner in the quest for scientific knowledge and the welfare of man. Although nominally the Board of Professional Standards has a responsibility for setting and reinforcing the standards for Institute training, as a matter of fact it is a toothless tiger, Kris reported, and, he said, the Institutes wanted it that way. As a consequence many Institute graduates did not apply for membership in the American which in effect required them to be certified again.

That the Institutes want to retain their power seems to be consistent with Kernberg's (1986) criticism. Kernberg argues that all too often the atmosphere of the psychoanalytic institute is one of indoctrination rather than exploration in which “certain teachers ignore others and discuss Freud uncritically.” He contends that candidates are sheltered from sharp disagreements, that they don't hear about their supervisors' cases and do not learn about the theory of technique from snippets in the literature. Furthermore, he feels the idealized literature doesn't present a realistic conception of the true nature of psychoanalytic work, that training analysts don't share with candidates what they do in a continuing way. This results in candidates' idealizing psychoanalytic technique and senior members of the faculty. It also results in the ultimate authority lying with the training analysts and not the rest of the faculty that then deprecates the authority of the faculty and the education committee. That, he argues, makes the training analysts the real bosses, the supervisors secondary and the courses tertiary. Those who are not training analysts and the junior faculty become

demeaned. They do not get involved in evaluating the candidates, withdrawing from those who are privileged or are non-performing. All this then creates a paranoid atmosphere as a senior faculty reactivates the fantasy of the secretive Oedipal couple. He feels that the apparent arbitrariness of the appointment of training analysts is often political and further exacerbates these negative conditions. Furthermore, this mode of functioning results in diminished creative thinking and scientific productivity as well as narrow intellectual view. He argues that there is a need for explicit public policies for appointment and there need to be explicit criteria of faculty functioning so that incompetents are not protected as their work is then exposed to their colleagues and students.

Kernberg argues that the candidates should be exposed to all theories and techniques so that they can evaluate them for themselves. He argues further that the faculty should be willing and able to engage in scientific debate, to expose their theories and clinical work. Otherwise the self-perpetuating elite will tend to exacerbate the idealization to retain maximum power to compensate for their waning creativity, productivity and sexuality, and financial security. That then paves the way for ambivalence leading to idealization, leading to splitting and to other schools of thought. The training analyst doesn't lead as he or she should and can be corrupted, a point made by John Gardner quoted earlier. In effect then the analysand identifies with the aggressor. Balint (1954) had earlier discussed the training analyst's unconscious wish to mold his analysand into a clone, rather than offer the kind of treatment he would to a non-candidate patient.

Cultural Changes

Through the extended period from the early 1900s when Freud's work first began to get attention in the United States, his influence expanded as anthropologists, sociologists, social workers, psychologists, historians, and others applied its insights to their work. Many sought psychoanalytic training to enrich their efforts. Early on, also, work began with adolescents, child

guidance clinics, and in psychosomatic medicine. These were offshoots of European efforts but gained new momentum in this country. Franz Alexander became the first professor of psychoanalysis at the University of Chicago in 1930 and Hans Sachs was appointed to a similar professorial post at the Harvard Medical School in 1932.

Research on psychosomatic medicine, on infants and children, in child development, and adult life stages expanded the purview of psychoanalysis. In 1932, Clifford Beers, assisted by mental health professionals, organized the first international conference on mental hygiene. That signaled the beginnings of the development of a citizen action organization to reform mental health facilities and foster public education in mental health. Because of the constriction of psychoanalysis as a medical discipline, non-medical psychoanalytic centers developed and trained psychologists and social workers. All of these diverse activities broadened the conceptions of psychoanalytic institutes to include the application of psychoanalytic thinking to the wide range of social issues and problems that Freud had envisioned.

During World War II, the military psychiatric leadership had been psychoanalytic and significant advances in the psychiatric treatment of military traumatic casualties demonstrated both to physicians and the military that psychoanalytic understanding had much to offer. Following that war, large numbers of physicians sought psychoanalytic training. In addition, as a product of that military experience, many psychiatric departments were headed by psychoanalysts and psychoanalysis became a necessary credential in many such settings for both admission to the faculty and advancement. Training facilities developed over the country, facilitated by the Veterans Administration.

Many who were in psychoanalytic training were also heads of clinical facilities as part of their training and professional growth. Their function in these new roles also brought them face-to-face with the complexities of organization structure, authority relationships, and group processes, which they saw first hand, had an effect on their staffs as well as their patients. Already they were

involved with the families of their patients. That direction, in turn, led to family therapy. The need to help people who were not appropriate candidates for psychoanalysis, or who could not afford it, or for whom there simply were not enough resources to help them that way, led to group therapies and a range of brief therapies that were intended to help people with specific problems. The pragmatic view simply had to prevail in the face of the ego ideal therapeutic intention.

Psychoanalytic centers moved westward but the political strictures remained rigid, still guarding the “baby.” There was severe conflict within the American Psychoanalytic Association even while psychoanalytic leaders were moving to unshackle the American Psychiatric Association from its rigidity by the formation of the Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry that they headed.

Although there was considerable effort to maintain the American Psychoanalytic Association as a federation of psychoanalytic societies, it became increasingly centralized and authoritarian, producing more splits (Millet, 1966). The American ethos of openness, questioning of authority, and pragmatism collided with psychoanalytic propositions. These were insufficient to deal with the complexity of the phenomena to which some wanted to apply psychoanalytic theory as the complexity extended beyond what the theory could handle. In the words of Kuklek (1989), in another context, “The Americans were not content that an aristocracy of the talented should lead them and they questioned the scientific ideal embraced in the nineteenth century.” Some spoke of the inadequacies of a hydraulic model in an age whose paradigms were based on information processing and electronic telecommunications.

Then came psychopharmacology. The various pharmacological agents, it turned out, were lifesavers. Although they didn't cure mental illness, nevertheless they made it possible for many people to leave institutions and others to operate more comfortably in their daily lives. Although the slower psychotherapeutic processes often were more effective over the longer term, pragmatic therapists of all disciplines were soon prescribing drugs and various therapies, including behavior modification, social learning, and other conceptions that frequently were helpful for

specific kinds of problems. Genetic research that demonstrated that certain kinds of illnesses ran in families under girded some of the application of pharmacological agents. All this, in turn, moved psychiatrists more in the direction of medicine as they sought to differentiate themselves from social workers and psychologists on the one hand, and to identify themselves with neurobiological advances on the other. Fewer psychiatrists were willing to undertake the extended psychoanalytic training. More psychologists and social workers did. Following the anti-trust suit filed by psychologists, the barriers of medical training collapsed and a new era began in which the psychoanalytic and psychotherapeutic proficiency became the new version of the professional ego ideal for those mental health professionals as well.

Unwilling to accept the theories about women, which even Freud himself felt he would be criticized for, female psychoanalysts moved to study more carefully their own psychological dynamics. They began to offer a more accurate understanding of the psychology of women. That contradicted the passivity with which male psychology used to characterize them. They called attention to their particular sensitivities to the feelings of others as well as their capacity for greater empathy than men. The theory began to yield, as it had already started to do to accommodate object relations theorists, as well as concepts of Klein, Kohut, and Kernberg.

DIMINUTION OF CENTRAL CONTROLS

Peter Drucker (1989), whom the *Wall Street Journal* labels one of America's wisest essayists, points out that we live in an age of pluralism. Governments don't try to evolve comprehensive policies much anymore, but they tackle each issue separately. Central cities are losing their importance as work sites because so many work centers are now in the suburbs and so many people work at home. Given the need for using "knowledge workers," and for making decisions closer to the point of action, much of the power of executives has been delegated downward. In what may be

an important parallel to understand with respect to psychoanalysis, he notes that economists must make do with special theorems that apply to one problem. They don't any longer presume to fit those concepts into an overarching economic theory such as Keynesianism. Cool pragmatism drives policy, he says, and moral crusades no longer have any power. Charisma is a remnant of a past era; most of the achievements in this country are the work of people who are not charismatic.

Contemporary chaos theory from physics now applied to social phenomena suggests that we are affected by things we can't even measure. According to the so-called butterfly effect, butterflies flapping their wings in the Amazon affect the weather in Chicago.

In management, delegation of authority to the point of action and the disappearance of status boundaries when the action becomes necessary, is reflected in a wide range of businesses and industries and in many different studies (Pfeiffer, 1989). "The chain of command is much in evidence but when tension is running high, all work together as specialists among specialists on an equal footing in a more collegial atmosphere...the system works."

With increased telecommunications, more people have greater knowledge. It becomes impossible for the Soviets, for example, to exercise control over their people once telecommunications develop. They have had great difficulty ever since Sputnik, when they had to begin to get scientific knowledge from outside their sphere. That together with the growing pressure everywhere for young people to be involved in the decisions that affect them means that all over the world there is more interaction as hierarchy is narrowed and those at the bottom become more empowered and unencumbered by managers. There is a parallel of greater equality in clinical practice as those who seek help who once were invariably called patients are these days more frequently referred to as clients.

Lodge and Walton (1989) describe how many large corporations work much more closely with their suppliers and their customers to the point that they have their staff people in their customers' suppliers' establishments. They seek to increase the quality of their product or service, to lower the costs for the user and at the same time meet the user's particular needs. Lodge and Walton note that such a drastic change in the way of managing was disruptive to many industries,

particularly the financial industry. That industry was fragmented in the early 1980s as a result of the breakdown of the older more traditional relationships. There was a period of unusual innovation and experimentation, however, through the instability. Both suppliers and users of capital have been searching for more stable and secure relationships in the future. A new form of integration based on long-term relationships will arise. They note that in the future there will be teams of managers, each one of whom will be skilled at a different function. This mode of operation is already old hat in mental hospitals, where the teams of health care professionals have for years been concentrating their specialties on the needs of patients. However, one implication of greater quality is that those same people want to take part in the governance of their institutions. No doubt that participation will increase. The psychoanalytic society may well become an alliance of specialists who preserve an evolving core of basic theory when it becomes clearer that specific variants of practice may well fit specific patients or problems.

Implications for Psychoanalytic Institutes

Psychoanalysis is gaining considerable support from recent research on brain functioning. It has become clear from recently reported studies (Goleman, 1989) that feelings come before thoughts and actions. The thesis upon which psychoanalysis has long stood now is verified experimentally. No doubt there will be many other studies that give a systematic scientific footing to the theory. That, together with research on psychoanalytic therapy and the greater emphasis on the need for psychoanalytic diagnostic criteria before undertaking various therapies, will serve to facilitate clinical interaction and at the same time foster that research, that exchange of ideas, that Freud so devoutly wished and encouraged.

Going beyond Kernberg's suggestion of the psychoanalytic institute as a combination art school and university college, and to take advantage of the now wide ranging fields with which psychoanalysis should be related, Holzman (1990) argues that the best way for psychoanalytic

institutes to get in touch with new knowledge that might enrich psychoanalysis is for psychoanalytic institutes to give up their night school practice and to become components of universities. There their faculties could interact with members of other disciplines, participate more actively in research, and be abreast of evolving trends in many other fields. Simons (1990) feels that psychoanalytic institutes are increasingly ready to move in that direction.

Holzman proposes, and I agree, that psychoanalysis, whether in contemporary psychoanalytic institutes or in university settings, be taught as a classical technique. Although the clientele base has been narrowed, there still is no more effective way to grasp what goes on in people's minds and to have a criterion against which to judge the merits of technical and theoretical variations and departures. Once a trainee has developed basic skill and understanding, then he or she would have a frame of reference for the debates that Kernberg argues for. Then, with rotating mentors who are not involved in the trainee's analysis, the trainee's technical skill might well be broadened. In addition, trainees might minor in other disciplines, as is currently the university practice. In some cases for instance, among non-psychoanalytic professionals, psychoanalysis in effect would be a minor if another discipline is major.

Professional schools that are not integrated into university settings run the risk of becoming merely independent trade schools. Of course, not all university departments are creatively productive, nor is psychoanalysis necessarily research-based. The mere movement into universities by itself would not guarantee renewed innovation and intellectual excitement. But, stimulation and cross-fertilization is much more likely than isolation to stimulate debate, foster conceptual advances, and counteract dogma. Freud never got the professorship he so ardently sought. As a result, he formed his own supporters outside the university. Since so many prominent in psychoanalytic ranks also hold professorial appointments, perhaps now is an ideal time to explore the possibilities of integration with the academic community.

The fact of the activation of many competing factions in the contemporary psychoanalytic

movement seems to bear out the thesis I have advanced and which the experiences of Kris and Kernberg seem to verify. Rangell (1988) expresses a sense of gravity and concern for the science. He feels that the separation between competing schools has become all but overt. He has little faith that gathering the competing schools under one administrative umbrella will do much for integration, "...group formations to preserve and further psychoanalytic theory have never been satisfactorily achieved," he contends, because individuals within those subgroups are not independent of group pressure.

Meissner (Kirschner, 1988) is more sanguine. He sees the fragmentation as a necessary dialectic, "less a series of conclusions than a method." "The human experience is always of some kind of fragmentation," he observes. "Whatever integration that occurs is always partial."

In his discussion of what is not adequately taught in business schools -- namely about human behavior, Leavitt (1989) observes that business schools teach students how to analyze problems, but not much about how to act on them in a worldwide context, "about the critical, visionary, entrepreneurial, pathfinding part of the managing process." The coalition between large mass-production factories and the academic commitment to measurement, observation and scientific authority drove the individual pathfinder away from large organizations and drove out pathfinders and pathfinders.

There was parallel within psychoanalysis. The ego ideal of preserving the "baby" drove away innovators. Now the innovators stay within the family normally, but if Kernberg and Rangell are to be believed, the alliance is tenuous.

Healing those divisions perhaps calls for another metaphor. Wray (1989), drawing on the work of Robert Terry, offers the metaphor of improvisational jazz in which no one is totally in charge, people play off each others' strengths, in which anyone picks it up, and in which there are different voices that are respectful of differences. People are individually competent but contribute to a whole that is greater than the sum of its parts, although there is room for solos. This implies

individual and group competence, together with sensitivity, and flexibility of roles changing over time. That, it seems, was what Freud was trying to encourage from the beginning.

References to Freud as an Entrepreneur

Balint, M. (1954). Analytic Training and Training Analysis. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*. 35:157.

Bibring, G. (1978). Panel Discussion. Psychoanalysis in Boston. In Gifford, G.E.(Ed.) *Psychoanalysis, Psychotherapy and the New England Medical Scene, 1894-1944*. New York: Science History Publishers.

Bird, H. W., Martin, P. A. & Schuham, A.(1983). The Marriage of the Collapsible Man of Prominence. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. March, 140:3, 290-295.

Clark, B. R. (1972). The Organizational Saga in Higher Education. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17: 178-184.

Drucker, P.F. (1989). *The New Realities: In Government and Politics, In Economics and Business, In Society and World View*. New York: Harper & Row.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1968). *Max Weber: On Charisma and Institution Building – Selected Papers*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

- Gamarekian, B. (1989). A Philosophical View of a Capital Career. *New York Times*, July, 21, A8.
- Gay, P. (1988). *Freud: A Life for Our Time*. New York: Norton.
- Gifford, G.E. (1978). Psychoanalytic Experience in Boston. Innocence and Experience. In Gifford, G.E. (Ed.) *Psychoanalysis. Psychotherapy and the New England Medical Scene, 1894- 1944*. New York: Science History Publishers.
- Goleman, D. (1989). Brain's Design Emerges as a Key to Emotions. *New York Times*, August 15, C1.
- Hale, N. G. Jr. (1971). *Freud and the Americans*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hendrick, I. (1961). *The Birth of an Institute*. Freeport, ME: Bond Wheelright
- Holzman, P. S. (1990). Personal communication.
- House, R. (1977). A 1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership. In Hunt, J.G. and Larson, L.L. (Eds.) *In Leadership: The Cutting Edge*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Jacobs, T. J. (1983). Dreams and Responsibilities: Notes on the Making of an Institute. In the Chicago Psychoanalytic Institute (Eds.) *The Annual of Psychoanalysis*, XI, 29-49. New York: International Universities Press.
- Jones, E. (1953 a). *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*. I. New York: Basic Books.

- Jones, E. (1953b). *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*. II. New York: Basic Books.
- Kanter, R. M. (1972). *Commitment and Community*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kernberg, O.F. (1986). Institutional Problems of Psychoanalytic Education. *Journal of American Psychoanalytic Association*. 34:4, 799-834.
- Kirschner, L. (1988). Interview: William W. Meissner, S.J., M.D. *Boston Psychoanalytic Society & Institute Newsletter*. April 19, 4:1,1.
- Kris, A. O. (1976). The Problem of Membership in the American Psychoanalytic Association. *Journal Philadelphia Association for Psychoanalysis*. III, 1 & 2.
- Kuklek, K. (1989). Ideals of Psychologists. *Science*, 243: 414.
- Leavitt, H. J. (1989). Educating Our MBAs: On Teaching What We Haven't Taught. *California Management Review*, Spring, 38-50.
- Levine, B. D. (1962). Reminiscence and Retrospect. In Waugh, M. (Ed.) *Fruition of an Idea: 50 Years of Psychoanalysis*. New York: International University Press.
- Levinson, H. (1971). Conflicts That Plague Family Business. *Harvard Business Review*, March-April, 45: 90-98.
- Lodge, G. & Walton, R. (1989). The American Corporation and its New Relationships. *California*

Management Review, Spring, 9-24.

Madsen, D. & Snow, P. G. (1983). The Dispersion of Charisma. *Comparative Political Studies*, 16: 3, 337-362.

McIntosh, D. (1970). Weber and Freud: On the Nature & Source of Authority. *American Sociological Review*, 35: 901-912.

Millett, J. A. P. (1966). Psychoanalysis in the U.S. In Alexander, F., Eisenstein, M. & Grotjahn, M. (Eds.) *Psychoanalytic Pioneers*. New York: Basic Books.

Pfeiffer, J. (1989). The Secrets of Life at the Limits: Cogs Become Big Wheels. *Smithsonian*, July, 20:4, 38-48.

Rangell, L. (1988). The Future of Psychoanalysis: The Scientific Crossroads. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 57: 313-340.

Schumpeter, J. A. (1961). *The Theory of Economic Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sicherman, B. (1978). Isidore Coriat: The Making of an American Psychoanalyst. In Gifford, G. E. *Psychoanalysis, Psychotherapy and the New England Medical Scene*. New York: Science History Publishers.

Simons, R. C. (1990). Our Analytic Heritage: Ideals and Idealizations. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 38: 5-38.

Trice, H. M. & Beyer, J. M. (1986). Charisma and Its Routinization in Two Social Movement Organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*. 8: 113-164.

Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. (Henderson, A.M.& Parsons, T. (Eds. & Trans.). Glenco, IL: Free Press.

Wray, L. D. (1989). *Setting the Stage*. Paper presented to Society of Psychologists in Management, Tampa, FL, Feb. 18.