

Benveniste, D, with Adriana Prengler Czernik and Laura Etchegoyen (eds.) (1998) **Moments in the Life of a Latin American Analyst: An Interview with R. Horacio Etchegoyen.** *Fort Da.* Fall 1998. Vol. 4, No. 2.

Moments in the Life of a Latin American Analyst: An Interview with R. Horacio Etchegoyen

Daniel Benveniste

Editors:

Dr. Laura Etchegoyen is a member of the British Psychoanalytic Society. She practices psychoanalysis in London, England.

Dr. Daniel Benveniste, is a psychoanalytic psychotherapist in private practice in San Francisco. He is a Lecturer in the School of Social Welfare at the University of California at Berkeley and an Adjunct Faculty member at The Wright Institute and CSPP.

Spanish to English Translator:

Dra. Adriana Prengler Czernik is an associate member of the Sociedad Psicoanalítica de Caracas. She practices psychoanalysis in Caracas, Venezuela.

Interviewers:

Dr. Daniel Benveniste - (see above)

Dr. Luca Di Donna is an advanced candidate at the Psychoanalytic Institute of Northern California and is the former editor of *Fort Da.*

INTRODUCTION

In the spring of 1998 R. Horacio Etchegoyen, author of The Fundamentals of Psychoanalytic Technique (1991) and the former President of the International Psychoanalytic Association, traveled from his home in Buenos Aires, Argentina to San Francisco, California to give a number of lectures to the San Francisco Bay Area psychoanalytic community. He came to San Francisco at the invitation of the Northern California Society for Psychoanalytic Psychology and the Psychoanalytic Institute of Northern California. On May 1st, during the course of this visit, Drs. Luca Di Donna and Daniel Benveniste conducted the following interview (partially in Spanish) with Dr. Etchegoyen for fort da. They met in Dr. Etchegoyen's hotel suite in San Francisco along with his daughter, Dr. Laura Etchegoyen.

THE INTERVIEW

Luca Di Donna - Dr. Etchegoyen, to begin with I wonder if you could tell us, what was the most important influence in your development to become a psychoanalyst?

R. Horacio Etchegoyen - The main influence in my psychoanalytic life was definitely Heinrich Racker. He was my analyst. Actually I had three psychoanalytic experiences. My first analyst was Luis Rascovsky, the brother of Arnaldo Rascovsky. He was also known as 'Lucio'. He was an intelligent man who had a great ability to understand the unconscious. This analysis, however, ended badly. I think that he lacked some subtlety for dealing with a patient like me who was very anxious at the time and most anxious to become an analyst. He thought that wish of mine - to be an analyst - was the main resistance to be analyzed. He finally concluded that he could not go on with my analysis and he decided to stop it. This was a terrible blow for me. Lucio told me that I was a very clever man and that perhaps I might have a good development as a mathematician or even a medical doctor but never, in his opinion, as an analyst. He definitely thought I would never become an analyst.

Di Donna - So you have proven the contrary quite well.

Etchegoyen - (laughter) Possibly... Even though I was very anxious at the time and had quite a lot of pathology that needed analysis, I think he was wrong. I do not think he was able to deal with the material appropriately. Of course, I never dared to say this to him. When he informed me that he had decided to stop my analysis he said "I have analyzed my countertransference, and my countertransference cannot bear it any longer." In a courageous or naive move I dared to ask him then, "With whom?" That is, with whom had he analyzed his countertransference. He answered angrily "WITH MYSELF, OF COURSE!!" Well, that was the end of that analysis. I had really a very bad time.

Not too long after this I started analysis again with Racker. Enrique Pichon-Rivière, a great man who was a teacher of us all, helped me very much at that moment. He sent me a patient, for instance, and he managed to get another analyst for me. Lucio had given me two names as prospective analysts - Mauricio Abadi and Juan Carlos Bisi, the latter being his own son in-law. I did not like them and opted for asking Pichon and Krapf for help. E. Eduardo Krapf was a senior analyst, a well known psychiatrist, and the head of the Mental Health Division in the World Health Organization. Lucio had made the point that I should go to a non-training analyst so that I would not use the defense of wanting to be an analyst in a future analysis. Lucio analyzed me very well in some areas. Perhaps the main point he dealt with was that I had always been the top pupil in the class. I had always got, from primary school through medical school, the gold medal for academic achievement. He thought that this ambition of mine, of wanting to be the best, was the strongest resistance in my analysis. I think that at that early stage of my development he was completely right. Nevertheless, I think this should have been a matter for the ongoing analysis and not a matter for which he should reject me as a patient. One could say, to put it in another way, that Lucio resorted to an active technique, forcing a change of analyst to overcome my resistance.

I met Racker initially as a lecturer at the Copernico Clinic. Copernico is a very posh district in Buenos Aires where Pichon had his Clinic and I attended classes there. My teachers were people like Arnaldo Rascovsky, Angel Garma, Leon Grinberg, David Liberman, Rebe Alvarez de Toledo, Teo Schlossberg, Alberto Tallaferrero who was my first supervisor, the Barangers, Jorge Mom and many others.

Di Donna- La créma de la créma!!

Etchegoyen - Yes, the cream of the cream. There was also 'La Negra' - Arminda Aberastury. She was Pichon's wife and was known as La Negra as she was a dark skinned beautiful woman. Elena Evelson, who became a very distinguished Kleinian child analyst and who was at that time Pichon's secretary at the Clinic, was to become a close colleague and friend of mine in future years.

Di Donna - I understand that 'La Negra' was the first child analyst to introduce Melanie Klein to Latin America. Was Maria Langer already there?

Etchegoyen - Yes, she was. 'Mimi' Langer, as we all called her, had arrived to the country in 1942, some months prior to the foundation of the Argentine Psychoanalytic Association. Racker arrived from exile some time later. I listened to Racker in clinical discussions and I felt that he was a very good person, and a very good analyst. I decided to approach him for analysis on a therapeutic basis. In our first meeting Racker told me that he would accept me but that he thought it advisable to mention that he would soon become a training analyst and wondered if this could be problematic for me. "The unconscious," he said, "is very tricky." I distinctly remember his words and his smile at that moment. I then told him "Well, I asked you for a therapeutic analysis. If you become a training analyst it is up to you to analyse the problem that may emerge in this situation." And Racker accepted.

My experience with Racker lasted for seven years (1950-1957) up to the moment at which I was appointed Professor of Psychiatry at the National University of Cuyo in Mendoza. After this move I planned to continue to have short periods of analysis with Racker when I travelled to Buenos Aires (1100 km, one and a half hours flight away). During the second trip Racker thought I was ready to finish and we agreed to end the analysis not too long afterwards. Later on I learned from Mimi that Racker was seriously ill. He died of cancer in January 1961.

My first year of analysis with Racker was a momentous time in my life because I could not believe how gentle, cordial, and at the same time how firm he was. I am reminded of an anecdote at the very beginning of my treatment. In those days everybody smoked during their analytic sessions. Racker had two bronze ashtrays on his desk. After a while, lying on the couch, I wanted to smoke and wondered about an ashtray. Racker mentioned that there was one on the desk. I complained that I felt inhibited and that it was difficult for me to get up from the couch to fetch it. Racker stood up and handed it to me. The following day the same situation arose. Needless to say Racker did not stand up for me this time and only analyzed my manic defenses! I myself stood up and went for it. Dani, Heinrich's second son, many years later, gave me those two ashtrays as a present. I have still got them.

Di Donna - Do any other anecdotes come to mind that could give us more of the flavor of Racker as a man and analyst?

Etchegoyen - Yes, quite a few. For example when we discussed the fee. Racker asked me "How much did Lucio charge you?" and I said "Thirty pesos". He then asked me if I

had been able to pay that fee. I replied that it had been too much for me. Racker said "Well, but I cannot charge you less than that." When he said that my nose got stuffed up. I hesitated a little since I clearly thought that Racker had made a mistake and I was uncertain as to whether I should tell him so. At the same time I felt that my analysis was at stake over that minor incident. If I was not able to speak my mind and say what I thought or felt I feared this new analysis would not develop well. I then told Racker "My nose is blocked because of what you said. You should have asked if I could pay you that or more than that, instead." Racker agreed "Yes, I think you are right. I made a mistake. I asked you the wrong question. I should have really asked you if you can pay me a thirty pesos fee or more instead of the way I put it to you." My nose unplugged immediately and I thought that I was in front of an analyst. Of course, he charged me the 30 pesos. It was not the matter of the money as such but the way in which he had presented it.

Daniel Benveniste - That's a nice story because it shows both Racker's personality and his way of working. Do you recall any other anecdotes?

Etchegoyen - I remember many. It now comes to mind a beautiful episode in the analysis of José Remus Araico, a pioneer of Mexican psychoanalysis, who was at the time in analysis with Heinrich. It so happened that many analysts used to have a week-end house in Escobar, a place not too far from the Capital. On one occasion Racker's children had found a partridge in the countryside and decided to bring it back home to Buenos Aires. 'Pepe' Remus was in the middle of his Monday session when he saw, in the middle of a bookcase shelf in Racker's consulting room, which was at the foot of the couch, a live partridge. 'Pepe' Remus became paralysed and speechless. Racker realised what was happening and said "Allow me to eliminate the hallucination." He got up and removed the partridge from the room.

Benveniste - Racker seems to have had an internal freedom, a good sense of humor and also a graceful way of dealing with an unexpected situation.

Etchegoyen - Yes, he did. In those years, the 1950s, Racker was building up the theory of the countertransference and I noticed during my analysis the way in which he dealt with my fantasies about his countertransference. He never rejected my thoughts when I made some comment or even an interpretation of what I thought was his countertransference. He never confirmed them either. He only analyzed my thoughts and feelings about it and I felt free to say what I thought.

Benveniste - I understand that following your years in Mendoza you went to London. How did this come about?

Etchegoyen - That's right. After my stay in Mendoza, where I was Professor of Psychiatry and started what is now the Mendoza Psychoanalytic Society, I went to London on a fellowship of the World Health Organization. This was in 1966. The World Health Organization appreciated very much my work as a teacher in Psychiatry and they wanted to have my chair as a model for all Latin America. I had had difficulties with the establishment at the Mendoza Medical School, which was actually very religious and reactionary. My liberal position and being an analyst were anathema for the Cuyo National University establishment. At that juncture my contract appointment with the

Mendoza University was coming to an end. The chair was advertised and I won tenure by unanimity. However, the University Board did not confirm the appointment for political reasons. The W.H.O. stepped in and offered me the chance for further research and psychoanalytic education. So I went to London and there I had a good experience with the Kleinian group, with Betty Joseph, Hannah Segal, Herbert Rosenfeld, and especially Roger Money-Kyrle who I consider to be one of the most influential people in my life.

Benveniste - Were you directly associated with Melanie Klein?

Etchegoyen - No, she had already died. I arrived in London in 1966 and she died in 1960. The most serious shortcomings of my life are that I didn't meet Melanie Klein or Carlos Gardel! (laughter)

[Carlos Gardel was the greatest Argentinian Tango singer!]

Benveniste - Which one would you have rather met?!

Etchegoyen - CARLOS GARDEL!! (laughter)

Benveniste- I knew it! (laughter)

Etchegoyen - So, Elida and I went to London with our two youngest children: Laura and Alberto. They studied English and even worked to have pocket money. This came in handy as the bursary (fellowship money) from the W.H.O. was hardly enough to pay the rent of the Hampstead flat we lived in! Our eldest daughter, Alicia, was already advanced in her medical studies and remained in South America with her grandparents.

At that time I had a short but very intensive and very productive analysis with Donald Meltzer which changed me a lot. His influence was very strong on me as was Betty Joseph's and Esther Bick's who were my supervisors then. With the passage of time, however I have realized that my core psychoanalytic experience was my analysis with Racker. Nowadays I tend to see my work, or would hope to see my work, as a continuation of his.

Di Donna - So you followed in the footsteps of Racker, who was interested in technique and it seems then, that from Racker you developed your interest in the technical aspects of psychoanalysis.

Etchegoyen - Yes, I think it was this way. The other influence from Racker was how to integrate in the psychoanalytic work the countertransference as one of the main instruments for understanding the patient but not as the basis for an interchange with the him. Racker never confessed his countertransference.

Di Donna - In the United States, there is now a trend among some analysts to reveal their countertransference in the analysis. What do you think about this technique?

Etchegoyen - I think it is a big mistake. Because in that way we change the necessary asymmetric positions between psychoanalyst and patient. In the same way, I would

consider it a big mistake if a father were to tell his son, when he was approached to discuss, say, the son's sexual difficulties with women, that he himself has had similar problems with his wife, (the son's mother) etc. This is not good. Such a father would be stepping out of his role. His role as a father is to listen to his son's problems or anxieties. He could say something like "Any young man can have problems. Don't worry. You can manage it." But he must never tell him his own problems. It would only burden the son and not help him at all. I think it is just the same in psychoanalysis. You may recall that Jung used to proceed in a similar fashion with his patients, by telling them his dreams and his problems.

Benveniste - Last month I was at a party at the home of Dra. Adriana Prengler, an analyst in Caracas, Venezuela. At that party I met Dr. Mauricio Goldenberg, the legendary psychiatrist who introduced psychoanalytic concepts into psychiatric hospitals in Argentina. What can you tell us about your association with him?

Etchegoyen - I had met Mauricio Goldenberg when I had my training as a psychoanalyst in Buenos Aires and I worked as a psychiatrist in the Melchor Romero mental hospital in La Plata. In those years Mauricio started the first psychiatric service in a general hospital in a suburb of Buenos Aires which is called Lanus.

Mauricio developed the best psychiatric center for training, assistance, and research in Latin America, or even in the world. He had a lot of very able pupils who studied communication, group interaction, psychoanalysis, social (field) community psychiatry, psychopharmacology and research. He managed to guide his pupils in a wonderful way to do psychodynamic psychiatry and psychotherapy. He was in close contact with important psychoanalysts like Celes Ernesto Cárcamo, Mimi Langer and, of course, Pichon-Rivière. We, the younger generation then, were all pupils of both Enrique Pichon and Mauricio Goldenberg.

Mauricio represented and stood as a model for all of us and was, because of his outlook and merits, the main figure that opposed the traditional and old fashioned psychiatric establishment at the time. A contemporary of his was also instrumental in the momentous changes that were taking place in public health then. This was Professor Florencio Escardo, a pediatrician. He was implementing revolutionary measures in the care of children in the public hospitals. In the same way that Mauricio had brought psychiatry to the General Hospital, away from the asylums, Florencio, with a psychoanalytic outlook, decided to involve the mothers of the children in their care. He was one of the most important pediatricians in the country, and a writer too. He wrote many good books for instance "Buenos Aires Geography." He also wrote a series of short articles under the pen-name of Piolín de Macramé (The Thread of the Macramé - used for crochet knitting). They were called "Oh" - "Oh the Psychoanalysis," "Oh the Marriage," "Oh the Woman," They were very intelligent and humorous short pieces.

Now, just as I was moving up from being a professor on a contract basis to a full Professor of Psychiatry (and Psychological Medicine) in Mendoza, it so happened that the Chair of Psychiatry at the Buenos Aires Medical School became vacant. This most important and prestigious position was advertised and a panel had to be designated to evaluate the candidates for the job. At that time Florencio Escardo was the Vice-Rector

of the University of Buenos Aires and he decided to appoint me to the panel to select the Chair of Psychiatry. I accepted with some reluctance. I told Florencio, "Florencio, I don't have enough stature to be in such an important position." He then replied: "No, you are wrong. Mauricio and yourself are the best psychiatrists in this country so you have to be on the panel to appoint the next Chair of Psychiatry." But it turned out that in the end the gang that dominated in the mental hospital in Buenos Aires, who were very reactionary people, not very good psychiatrists and quite against psychoanalysis and social psychiatry, etc., managed to make an alliance with the equivalent group in Mendoza and got me out of my Professorship of Psychiatry, just to get me off of the appointments panel in Buenos Aires. It was in some ways a Mafia-like operation.

Benveniste - What do you mean when you say "Mafia?"

Etchegoyen - It wasn't really the Italian Mafia, as it is known here, but it was an organized corrupt organization. They couldn't ask me directly to enter the organization but they let me know that if I resigned from my position on the Buenos Aires appointments panel they envisaged that I would have no problems to be confirmed as Professor in Mendoza. But, of course, that was not acceptable. And that was when I went to London.

Benveniste - In your book The Fundamentals of Psychoanalytic Technique you cite the work of many San Francisco Bay Area analysts such as Siegfried Bernfeld (in San Francisco from 1937-1953), Robert Wallerstein, L. Bryce Boyer, Merton Gill (in San Francisco from 1953-1963), Norman Reider, and Ed Weinshel. But there are only three very short references to the work of Erik Erikson. He lived in the Bay Area for 27 years (1939-'51; 1964-'65; 1973-'87) and is considered one of the most famous analysts in the world. Why does Erikson get so little attention in your comprehensive book?

Etchegoyen - I value Erikson to a great extent but I don't think he made a lot of contributions to psychoanalytic technique. Bob Wallerstein, who was very generous in the foreword that he wrote for the English translation of my book, showed me the omission of Erikson's contributions in my book. I asked him which work (paper, book, article) I could cite from Erikson regarding technique but he could not think of anything specific. Yesterday I asked the same question to Tom Ogden and Bryce Boyer. They both told me that Erikson was an admirable analyst. Boyer said that Erikson's book (Childhood and Society) had a huge influence in his life because it shows the relationship between the libido theory and the social environment. As you know this has been a widely read and successful book. I intend to re-read Erikson's work to see if something escaped me and please, do tell me if you think there is something I need to include for the second edition of my book.

Benveniste - Stephen Schlein, is now doing research on Erikson's clinical technique and he suggests Erikson's The Dream Specimen of Psychoanalysis (1954) and chapters two and five in Insight and Responsibility (1964) as prime references illuminating Erikson's clinical technique with adults. But I have another question now, what about Anna Freud? Did you know her? or have any association with her?

Etchegoyen - I did meet her during my stay in London in 1966. At that time I had become good friends with two colleagues - Pere and Nuria Bofill. They were Catalans, from Barcelona. They were doing further analytic training in London with the Kleinian group. They were very generous in their friendship with me and my family. This was not only in a symbolic way, but very concretely since they helped us financially. The financial help was provided in a very dignified and noble way, "a la catalana." They asked my children, who were adolescents at that time, to teach and prepare their own children for the high school exams in Spain and they paid them a good fee for their efforts!

Nuria was also an excellent cook and we were often treated to delicious Catalan dishes with fresh seafood that Pere would bring by plane from his weekly trip to Barcelona to see his patients. While Nuria and the children lived in Hampstead, Pere commuted to Barcelona to work. In one of those marvelous lunches we came to know Humberto Nagera. He was a distinguished analyst, a Cuban man, who was at the time the right arm of Anna Freud. He invited me to go to the Anna Freud Center and, of course, I went with pleasure. He introduced me to Anna Freud. I attended the seminars but they were theoretical topics and not very interesting to me. I found them a little boring, and the seminars always finished with Anna Freud's speeches which, albeit excellent and decisive, gave one the feeling that all discussion was irrelevant and that Miss Freud always had and said the last word. After the second or third meeting that I attended, Anna Freud learned that I was in analysis with Meltzer and so I was told that she felt that I should not continue going to the Hampstead Clinic.

Benveniste - Oh no!

Etchegoyen - However, I also want to say, and it is painful to do so, that when I mentioned to the people from the Kleinian group, who had adopted me like a son, that I was going to the Anna Freud seminars, they didn't like that either. And one of the senior Kleinians said to me, "Well, I thought that you were committed to the Kleinian group." That was also wrong because I wanted to learn from Anna Freud too. Why should they ask me for a commitment to the Kleinian group? I think they should have said to me: "Look at both groups and then choose one." That would have been, to my mind, a healthy policy.

Di Donna - Do you think that things have changed in this respect since the 1960s?

Etchegoyen - Yes, I think so. In some ways. I understand there are now quite a lot of joint projects between Kleinians and other groups in the British Society, if only geographically. A Kleinian analyst training in child analysis can now see his or her child patient at the Hampstead Clinic, which is now called the Anna Freud Center. This rapprochement has probably come about through the Sandler's interest in object relations and Betty Joseph's work on acting-in in the transference, which emphasizes the defensive use of projective identification and her careful insistence of orienting oneself at the right level when talking to the analysand. This often implies dealing with subtle defensive measures first, and in that sense the old Freudian dictum of proceeding from the surface to deeper unconscious levels is also attended to by the contemporary Kleinians.

Di Donna - Could you comment on Hartmann, Kris and Loewenstein's influence on American Psychoanalysis?

Etchegoyen - Hartmann, Kris and Loewenstein had a big influence for many years in America and worldwide. They formed a monolithic group which wanted to include psychoanalysis in a general or academic psychology. This courageous attempt failed. I think that American psychoanalysis is, at the moment, freer and more able to look at perspectives that in one way or another involve object relations theories.

Benveniste - Could you speculate on what would have happened if Hartmann, Kris, and Loewenstein had emigrated to Buenos Aires?

Etchegoyen - That is an excellent question! I think they would have had a great influence, but I do not think they would have had such an influence in Latin-America as they had in the United States. I don't think that people like Angel Garma, Enrique Pichon, or Marie Langer would have followed them so strictly and I think that sooner or later they and the younger generations (Lieberman, Grinberg, Racker) from Buenos Aires would have eventually become acquainted with Melanie Klein's work. The Argentinian 'intelligentsia' have always been avid readers and with their eyes on Europe. Developments in the arts and in science are followed closely as we do not think we are the standard bearers for any particular discipline in the world. That is my opinion. Your question is an interesting question because it shows that what they could obtain in the United States, I am not so sure they could have obtained in Buenos Aires. I think that even somebody like Celes Ernesto Cárcamo, a man of high intellectual stature and with a capacity for freedom of thought, and who was a friend of Anna Freud's and the Spanish translator of The Ego and the Mechanisms of Defense, would not have given them uncritical acceptance.

Di Donna - Could you elaborate on your disagreement with the work of Donald Winnicott?

Etchegoyen - I consider Winnicott to be a great thinker and a great analyst but I do not agree at all with his idea that psychosis depends entirely on the mother - or the mother's failure. I think, as Melanie Klein does, that there are parts of the mother and parts of the child that have a role in the development of the child and eventually of his or her psychosis. The way in which Winnicott conceptualizes psychosis and early development, I think, is too environmental. In my view he is not unlike Kohut in this respect. For the second edition of my book on technique I have added a critical comment on Margaret Little's recently published book on her analysis with Winnicott. There I strongly criticize Winnicott's technique. I think that Winnicott's ideas about symbolism are a very valuable contribution, but his return to the theory of primary narcissism, and his disregard for the existence of schizoid mechanisms and envy, are a step backwards in psychoanalytic thinking. On the other hand, Winnicott's differentiation between un-integration and dis-integration in the child is very interesting. This is possibly a problem that Melanie Klein could never solve. In this sense, I would like to say that I value Winnicott more as a theoretician than as a contributor to psychoanalytic technique. Winnicott's concept of countertransference is completely Freudian - conservative. In the case of severely disturbed or regressed patients he thinks that there is

no a real interaction between patient and analyst because the analyst just manages the situation. In regressed patients, Winnicott says, "management is the whole thing." I do not agree with him there. I trust interpretation - not management.

Di Donna - Could you comment on Baranger and Baranger's interpretation of Melanie Klein?

Etchegoyen - Willy Baranger was one of the best theoreticians in Buenos Aires. His book Position and Object in Melanie Klein's Work, is a very valuable work indeed. He emphasized two aspects of Klein's work: object relations and the theory of the positions. He definitely says that they are not phases but they are dynamic positions in which there is a bigger interaction between patient and analyst. That is very valuable. I think he addresses some aspects of Melanie Klein's work and not others. In that sense, I have a wider view about Melanie Klein's work than what he proposes in his book. During the last years of his life Willy read a lot of Lacan and was able to teach his thinking to many psychoanalysts in Buenos Aires. He never became a 'Lacanian' but he did distance himself from Klein. I don't like his idea of "Campo dinamico" (dynamic field) in which the patient and analyst share an unconscious phantasy. This, in my opinion, does away with the necessary asymmetry for the analytic process to take place. I prefer José Bleger's concept of field. Bleger says that the analyst offers him/herself to let the patient configure a field. He is there offering himself but without mixing or confusing himself with the patient.

Di Donna - Could you tell us something about the differences between the Kleinians of Latin-America and the London Kleinians?

Etchegoyen - It is a good question, but a difficult one to answer. All Psychoanalysts that accept the theory of the schizo-paranoid and depressive positions, unconscious phantasy, internal objects, projective identification, primary (or endogenous) envy and, of course, that both the ego and the object are present from birth, are Kleinians. Furthermore, from the point of view of technique, Kleinian analysts do not wait to interpret and they interpret impartially both the positive and the negative transference. In this sense there is no difference between the London and Latin American Kleinians really. But there are differences in some details. To start with, the first generation of the London analysts were direct disciples of Klein and they were our teachers. There are now Kleinian analysts in many Latin-American countries. Naturally they are not all the same. Coming back to the question about London and Buenos Aires, I would say that the London Kleinians are more rigorous and militant. Buenos Aires Kleinians are perhaps more permeable to the thinking of other authors and they have, in my view, a more consistent theory of countertransference.

Benveniste - I have heard that psychoanalysis and the tango are both very important to the people of Argentina. What would you say are the differences and similarities between psychoanalysis and the tango?

Etchegoyen - That is hard to answer. The tango has had a big influence on me. I am a tango man. I always liked it. My eldest brother Pedro, who is my senior by 10 years and who was like a father to me since my father died when I was seven months old, was a

wonderful pianist and composer of tango. He was very shy and perhaps too proud to be commercially successful. My mother used to sing Pedro's tangos. She would have liked to have trained as a lyric singer in her youth but, of course, my grandmother responded to such crazy ideas with a slap on her face. So music had always been important in the family, and the tango particularly so. The tango had a big influence on me but I don't know how it might be related to psychoanalysis.

Di Donna - But what about the rhythm of the tango between the two, the back and forth between the transference and the countertransference.

Etchegoyen - Yes, one could say a session can be like a well danced tango. But there are also other issues. For example, the importance and idealization of "the mother" in the tango is very evident. "Madre hay una sola" (Mother, there is only one) says the tango. But the tango is also very 'machista'. In that sense, it would be more related to the Phallic Phase and Freud's monistic theory of sexuality. But if we link what Luca said with the idea of asymmetry in the tango dance, I think that we could see an interesting connection. Asymmetry and complementarity- I would say. There is an asymmetry in the tango because in that dance, the man directs and guides the woman and the virtue of the woman is to adapt to what the man wants. In psychoanalysis the analyst directs like the man in the tango but must also be as receptive and flexible as the woman.

Benveniste - Dr. Etchegoyen, your visit to the San Francisco Bay Area, including the lectures that you have delivered and the case conferences that you have led, has been a very important event for our local psychoanalytic community and for Luca and myself personally. So, on behalf of all of us, I thank you for your visit and for this interview.

Etchegoyen - The experience that Laura and I had here has been very positive and it has showed us that the people of San Francisco are very enthusiastic and mature with an ability to listen, learn, criticize and participate. Our stay in San Francisco has been very rewarding and we have enjoyed the visit. Thank you.

Daniel Benveniste, Ph.D., is a psychoanalytic psychotherapist in private practice in San Francisco. He is a Lecturer in the School of Social Welfare at the University of California at Berkeley and an Adjunct Faculty member at The Wright Institute and CSPP - Alameda.