Psychoanalytic Psychology
2004, Vol. 21, No. 3, 339–352

0736-9735/04/$12.00 DOI: 10.1037/0736-9735.21.3.339

PSYCHOANALYSIS AND ITS DISCONTENTS

Douglas Kirsner, PhD
Deakin University

There are only 5,000 patients in psychoanalysis with members of the American Psychoanalytic Association (APsaA), and these analysts are often viewed as arrogant and insular. As a laboratory for psychoanalytic institutions the APsaA provides crucial lessons for the future across the field. What ingredients are needed for psychoanalysis to be a vibrant discipline? What factors have prevailed where psychoanalysis is successful? The author explores the cases of Argentina and France, where psychoanalysis is relatively popular, and then returns to the U.S. situation. Insular mind-sets led to many missed opportunities for cultural and academic engagement in the United States. As an example, the author explores responses to the making of John Huston's film *Freud: The Secret Passion.* To become revitalized, psychoanalysis needs to be a cultural asset. Psychoanalysts need to build bridges, engage in partnerships, and emphasize the exciting method of philosophical probing of the human mind and the nature of human nature.

As reported in *Time Magazine* (Grossman, 2003), there are currently only 5,000 patients in psychoanalysis in the United States. This means there are fewer than two analysands per member of the American Psychoanalytic Association (APsaA), a number that is declining in a professional organization in which the current mean age of members is 62 and rising. Similar figures apply to the British Psychoanalytic Society, where the average age of members is 66 and also increasing. Commissioned by the APsaA in 2000, the Strategic Marketing Initiative unearthed profound problems of perception and attitudes among psychoanalysts, mental health professionals, and patients who were surveyed with the aim of discovering better means of making psychoanalysis more successful in getting more patients.

An earlier version of this article was presented at the San Francisco Psychoanalytic Institute/Psychoanalytic Institute of Northern California, Berkeley, September 2003, and to the Psychoanalytic Center of California, Los Angeles, September 2003.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Douglas Kirsner, PhD, Faculty of Arts, Deakin University, 221 Burwood Highway, Burwood, Victoria 3125, Australia. E-mail: kirsner@deakin.edu.au

The issues highlighted by the marketing report can be divided into three types of related issues (Zacharias, 2002):

1. Arrogance, elitism, hauteur, a sense of esoteric knowledge, authoritarianism, internecine conflict, lack of openness, inability to listen, insularity, analysts keeping to themselves. The respondents liked psychoanalysis as a theory but did not like the psychoanalysts.
2. Closed approaches, belief in psychoanalysis based on faith instead of evidence. Psychoanalysis was seen to be not sufficiently intellectually challenging, and meetings were regarded as boring and uninspiring.
3. Treatment not effective in terms of the investment of time and money—especially as compared with other modalities.

When there are fewer than two cases per analyst, the irony is that analysts are now trained to do what they don't do much of the time. They are not trained to keep up with the kind of therapy that they mostly carry out in their practices. This does not increase confidence either within or outside the profession.

Such problems are by no means confined to the APsaA. In an important way, the APsaA is a laboratory for all psychoanalytic institutions and can provide important lessons for the future across the field. Problems of psychoanalytic education and organization, such as the anointment of training analysts or their equivalent or the paranoiagenic nature of psychoanalytic institutions, transcend school, location, professional background, or affiliation. I have presented my findings at many institutes not affiliated with the APsaA and around the world and am often asked the question "How did you know about what happens at *my* institute?" Lacanian and Jungian institutes around the world have similar problems, exemplifying how endemic they have been to most psychoanalytic institutions as such. Historically, the APsaA can help provide some insights into what went wrong in the broad psychoanalytic movement and how it might be prevented and changed. The issues with psychoanalytic institutes of all persuasions are not the major manifest differences they allege that divide them but their essential similarities in terms of both strengths and weaknesses. Other institutes can learn lessons from the story of the APsaA, including what is to be done and pitfalls to be avoided. As George Santayana put it in *The Life of Reason:* "Those who do not remember the past are condemned to repeat it." Or to quote William Faulkner: "The past is not dead. In fact, it's not even past." Why is such a good idea and useful tool, talk therapy that involves understanding unconscious motivations, now in such deep trouble?

At least until recently, the APsaA's sins have lain as much in omission, in its failure to act on vital issues, as in commission, on what it actually did. Its role was more the negative one of keeping things as they were than as an initiator of proposals, good or bad. For decades, it was generally more important in the actions it did not take or prevented happening than in what it actively did. Beyond the prevention issues that involve the APsaA circumscribing and limiting the local institutes rather than actively intervening in them, the central part of analysts' training, work, and allegiance is with their own institutes in their own cities. As with so many other institutions, in the APsaA there is much truth in the adage "all politics are local."

The title of Freud's book *Civilization and Its Discontents* is more properly translated as *The Unease* or *Malaise Inherent in Culture.* This applies to my explorations in which I have attempted to find the underlying intrinsic cause for the malaise of psychoanalysis (Kirsner, 2000, 2001). Any science that does not define its basic concepts univocally is in

big trouble systemically. The sequelae of such a lack of definition lie in either being open to critique and trying to define and refine concepts again or defending against doing so by politically authoritarian fiat. The advantage of taking the route into universities instead of staying the way psychoanalysis has adopted in freestanding institutes is that universities have, with their many faults, some institutionally structured tendencies toward the value of open critique, some ability to redress grievances, and public accountability. Although they may sometimes provide a base for creating hypotheses, they have almost universally failed the next step of testing them. Institutes have stymied open investigation often more than they have enabled it. They have helped cement identification far more than they have encouraged differentiation.

Kernberg's (1986) four models of institutes continue to be relevant. He argued that psychoanalytic institutes found themselves located somewhere between a monastery and a trade school, whereas they ought optimally to be found between a university and an art academy. Individual institutes often follow this order: seminary, trade school, art academy, and university. The structure of freestanding institutes is intrinsically internal and, structurally, they have an internal focus. The APsaA also has an internal focus to its organization. There is an odd religious element that suffuses psychoanalysis, even at scientific meetings, which so often have a sense of a religious observance as ritualistic types of presentation. The sense of binding, comfort, identification, and solidarity that comes with religion has both advantages and disadvantages. The regularity of the meetings themselves acts as a marker as well as a source of identification, for example, meeting annually at the Waldorf Astoria in New York. There is often an element of prayer, even incantation, at presentations, which can reinforce any inherent malaise and makes it more difficult to escape from it. Religious ceremonial has an important role in society but belongs in churches, synagogues, mosques, and family observances, not in psychoanalytic societies. However, insofar as religion may share with psychoanalysis an interest in inquiry into issues about the nature of human nature and human values, this needs to be candidly viewed as a different approach from a scientific one. I think part of Freud's disdain for religion is that he saw it as a competitor in its answers to the "big questions." Just because Freud vehemently opposed a view did not mean he totally disagreed with it. The stories of the dissidents from Adler and Jung to Ferenczi and Reich testify to Freud's stress on differences rather than to the clear commonalities that were undoubtedly present.

I have argued that one major reason for the malaise lies historically in the closed and seminarian approach in many psychoanalytic institutions. I suggest that this rests on the consequences of the large gap between the real knowledge base of the discipline on the one hand and the claimed knowledge that legitimates the qualification of psychoanalyst on the other. This gap is filled not by evidence but by the psychoanalytic equivalent of the "laying on of hands" by those with the right to train. The claimed or "pretend" knowledge is transmitted by anointment of analytic descendents via the training system, especially through the training analysis. Training for psychoanalytic qualifications often relies on mythological standards based more on the person doing the training than on the function of what is done. Person is valued over function, what is done, or what is achieved (Kirsner, 2000, 2001).

The difficult issue of secrecy has pervaded psychoanalytic history (Rustin, 1985). Much of the data on which theories are based derive from individual relationships between patient and analyst. Confidentiality and privacy are certainly important issues, but what happens to a science when few data are directly shared with others? A scientific community becomes more illusion than reality unless a considerable amount of significant data is shared, not just the conclusions. The training processes parallel such processes but

are still more problematic because so many unresolved and irresolvable transferences are central, with the hothouse atmosphere of a group that is closer than most others since it stays together from training through to retirement. This culture of anointment is counterproductive, because in addition to other professionals, insurance companies, and government, patients and consumers demand evidence of the efficacy of treatments and approaches. More important, psychoanalysis can achieve more credibility and vitality through not being just a clinical approach. It needs to become a cultural asset through emphasizing the method of philosophical probing of the human mind and the nature of human nature.

What ingredients are needed for psychoanalysis to be a vibrant discipline? There are clear conceptual and clinical requirements for a sound, publicly assessable, evidential base. However, here I want to consider this issue from another angle. What factors have prevailed where psychoanalysis is successful in a country? I refer to two cases where psychoanalysis is relatively popular, Argentina and France, which might point toward an answer. I then return to the situation in the United States. It is important to note that the definition of *psychoanalysis* in both of these countries is wider and far more inclusive than in the United States and the United Kingdom. It includes treatments that are closer to the concept of the talking cure, talk therapy, than the narrower three-to-five-times-a-week definition.

Argentina

Mariano Ben Plotkin's (2001) book on psychoanalysis in Argentina reflects its significant theme: the cultural success of psychoanalysis in Argentina. Buenos Aires has proportionately the largest number of analysts from a range of schools in the world. In 2000 there were 2,000 International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA) members and still more analysts outside the IPA in Argentina (Cesio, 2002, p. 35). There are four IPA-affiliated psychoanalytic societies with a density of 29 IPA analysts per million people. Buenos Aires vies with Paris for the greatest number of Lacanian analysts. One in 200 residents of Buenos Aires is a psychologist, very likely using psychoanalytic principles in treatment. As Ben Plotkin put it, "For broad sectors of Argentine society, psychoanalysis has become an interpretative system . . . used to understand various aspects of reality" (Ben Plotkin, 2001, p. 1).

Why did it succeed so well? Psychoanalysis is popular culturally; it is taught in universities in psychology, psychiatry, and the humanities. Psychoanalysis has had particular sway among clinical psychologists, who apparently also score the highest worldwide proportion in the population. They often work in public hospitals and clinics for lower fees than psychiatrists and more orthodox analysts and thus have a large number of patients. They use psychoanalytic approaches without being trained in IPA institutes. Psychoanalysts often write for or appear in the media, and there has been a general cultural assumption of the importance, if not the validity, of psychoanalytic approaches. True, there were particular Argentinean historical factors at play. There was the opportunity to respond to the crisis in the positivism enshrined in the hereditary degeneracy paradigm that prevailed in Argentine psychiatry in the late 1920s, lasting even into the 1940s. This theory held that mental and physical diseases were passed down in increasing doses from generation to generation. In this context, psychoanalysts could proffer a psychodynamic account of mental life that was not superficial but was dynamic and popularized and made sense to the upper classes and educational elites that were developing relatively late in the

process of modernization. However, psychiatry did not properly develop into acceptance as an important and legitimate medical specialty until as late as the 1940s, and some leading psychiatrists analyzed the arts. As Ben Plotkin (2001) put it, "Psychiatrists who taught psychology and wrote fiction coexisted with writers and politicians interested in problems related to mental illness" (p. 13). When the Argentine Psychoanalytic Association was established in 1942, psychoanalysis was already very much present in urban culture (Ben Plotkin, 2001, p. 13). The alliance of Freud with Marx appealed to the political left, while the right used psychoanalytic grounds to argue for the central importance of motherhood. Psychoanalysis existed throughout the military dictatorship and survived it. Europe, especially France, had a particular appeal to Argentine culture. In this situation, psychoanalysis became widely taught in psychology departments in universities, and clinical psychologists became major providers of psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic psychotherapy. Psychiatry departments excluded psychoanalysis and also fiercely opposed the developing psychological profession. This meant that psychologists constructed themselves as intellectuals, which melded with the nonmedical French model of psychoanalysis that stresses theory. This was in the face of the Argentine Psychoanalytic Association's strong opposition to nonmedical training, invoking a 1954 ministerial regulation limiting psychoanalytic and psychotherapeutic practice to doctors (Ben Plotkin, 2001, pp. 152–155).

The dissemination of psychoanalytic ideas through psychology departments in Argentina and other countries in South America, particularly Brazil, has been an important plus for psychoanalysis, not only in terms of practitioners but in terms of a greater pool of patients who are or were students and who take psychoanalysis seriously as a critical way of questioning their lives and the world. It has also meant that these clinical psychologists, who are psychoanalytically strongly influenced, treat large numbers of patients in the public domain. Moreover, in Argentina, there has been a nexus between intellectuals and psychoanalysis. In returning to the state of law after the military dictatorship, the arts and sciences once again came back. As one survey of Argentine psychoanalysis pointed out, intellectuals "return to continue inventing and reinventing. Psychoanalysis understands them, respects them and can and will help them to resist the worst moments. Culture and psychoanalysis in Argentina are intimately related" (Wender, Torres, & de Vidal, 1995, p. 22). I don't want to idealize intellectuals here—I only wish to highlight the importance given to the fact of a relationship between intellectuals and psychoanalysis in a country where psychoanalysis is a successful part of the culture. Also it is important to realize that the particular schools of psychoanalysis in Argentina are also common to other Latin American countries—there is much interest in Klein and Lacan.

France

Just as psychoanalysis centers on the major metropolitan center in Argentina, in France it also centers on the metropolis, where there is another success story of psychoanalysis in the public domain. Paris is of course where many Lacanian groups flourish and also where psychoanalysis is part of the culture that continues to be widely discussed, from television to universities to hospitals and clinics. However, like everywhere else, psychoanalysis has declined in status with the inroads of alternative treatment modalities and the decline in socioeconomic conditions of employment, income, and working conditions. There are about 5,000 French psychoanalysts across a wide range of schools and organizations, making the overall density of psychoanalysts at 86 per million. (There are about 15 IPA

analysts per million, half the Argentine numbers pro rata.) Even so, most patients attend treatment once or twice a week at most and often break off treatment when they see improvement and return to their analyst when new symptoms appear. As Roudinesco (2002) comments,

> analysis is a form of medicine. The classical or traditional analytic situation is rare. So the "armchair-and-couch" model . . . is becoming extinct or limited to special cases. For most young therapists, psychoanalysis is no longer a full time occupation: it has been supplemented or replaced by varieties of verbal psychotherapy. (p. 212)

Roudinesco observes that young Lacanian or non-Lacanian analysts in France are scarcely distinguishable, as they have had similar training in psychology. As in Argentina, psychology provides generally the access to being an analyst. Psychoanalysts generally have only between 4 and 10 private patients and work in other professions as well (Roudinesco, 2002, p. 212). Of course, the dissemination through departments of psychology and even departments of psychoanalysis in universities in France, together with the further diffusion through working in varied, often public environments such as hospitals and universities, considerably widens the influence of psychoanalytic ideas in the culture. Contrast this with the consequences over decades of American psychoanalysts seeing a small number of patients intensely and keeping their distance from allied professions. The final entry of the psychologists into the APsaA in 1988 despite the APsaA's entrenched opposition to the move provided it with a life raft, if only for a while.

In both countries, there clearly exist many of the trials and tribulations existing elsewhere. This discussion of psychoanalysis in Argentina and France is meant to be indicative only of a difference in approach and place within the culture. The interest in Lacan is an important indicator of an issue closely related but not discussed. Why is there as much interest in Lacan in so many places? Is it just that what he says is true? One problem with such an explanation is that Lacan is notoriously difficult to understand, and only the cognoscenti could know if this were true. A far wider range of people than those who could claim to really understand Lacan are drawn to his ideas. What seems to have drawn many people to Lacan is his focus on finding a new way of understanding the human subject in relation to language and to the social world. However, Lacanian groups are known for their superschismatic and cultist tendencies, for the critique of the "subject supposed to know" simultaneously with its enactment. Lacan is known for ununderstandable aphorisms, yet there remains an appeal.

The basis of this appeal involves a fresh philosophical approach to understanding the nature of human nature that is clearly beyond its being a technique. As a technique, psychoanalysis was the major alternative for cure for much of Freud's life. However, the last 50 years have thrown up many alternatives from other psychodynamic approaches through cognitive–behavioral to medications and neuropsychiatry. Psychoanalysis is not clearly the best available treatment as it was formerly. Then it was the clear leader in a contest with no serious rivals for relieving mental suffering. Decades of not examining the effectiveness or otherwise in outcomes in psychoanalysis have resulted in lack of credibility. The process that demands a considerable expenditure of time, energy, and money has not demonstrated clearly considerably better results than less costly and easier alternatives that can treat a far wider range of patients. Whatever their validity, the allure of Lacan's ideas, beyond the small group of those who have a right to claim to understand him, is significantly due to his generically different approach that harks back to the method as primary rather than the practice. It taps the excitement and intrinsic meaningfulness of philosophical inquiry into the detail of our individual roles in making our lives.

In a sense, it is applied philosophy that shines a light on our minds, taking its inspiration from the Delphic quest to know thyself. These were the words that John Huston, director of the 1962 film *Freud: The Secret Passion,* closed his film with 40 years ago. Huston added: "Two thousand years ago these words were carved on the Temple at Delphi: 'Know thyself.' They're the beginning of wisdom" (Huston, 1962).

This approach points to a coalescence of cultural interest with mental health issues at a time when no one owned psychoanalysis. It was part of a critical, social analysis as well as an individual one. Psychoanalysis was not entrenched in a particular niche, for example, as a finishing school for psychiatrists as it became in the United States in the 1950s.

Psychoanalysis worked best when it was not under the control of one particular group that excluded others from the field. When there were a number of competing groups within the field, there could be popular or less popular, orthodox or heterodox groups, but the difference was one of degree, not of kind. Psychoanalysis in these countries has some kind of "buzz" culturally because it is not excluded from university teaching, especially in psychology. It is a legitimate subject of debate as a generically different method from others that involves different philosophical principles and perspectives. The problem of relying on psychoanalysis mainly as a superior technique is that this is a purely empirical question as such and needs to be demonstrated clearly and publicly. There is no intrinsic reason that one approach is superior to another, especially given the number of psychodynamic therapies and other approaches, including biological ones. Freud himself considered that the therapeutic effects of psychoanalysis were not the important ones—the next century, he thought, might bring a pill to deal with many neurotic symptoms. Because it is fruitless to propose psychoanalysis as a superior therapy without supporting evidence, the reasons that people may choose psychoanalysis as a therapy can come from valuing the approach as such. And that comes about through wider education, research, and culture. Countries where psychoanalysis has entered the cultural arena are those in which psychoanalytic debate can flourish and is encouraged rather than discouraged. Analysts from many persuasions take part in the debates and discussions.

Yet this is precisely what has not happened in the United States. So much of the history of psychoanalysis in the United States, as well as in many other countries, is concerned with the preservation of the assumption of a "pure gold" psychoanalysis, the property of certain among those in the local institutes of the IPA. This is sharply differentiated from the "copper of psychotherapy," the alloyed kind that is practiced by everyone else, who are seen to be quacks or improperly trained people. So much energy is spent on the project of finding out who is a "real" psychoanalyst or not. This was well reflected in the way psychoanalysts kept others out for so long. When national boards were suggested, they were soundly defeated at the APsaA. This was not a necessary path but a political one. Anna Freud, for example, keenly rejected the idea of sharing psychoanalysis, except in some of its applied forms with work with children. Historically, in the name of preserving "standards," the APsaA has been a gatekeeper trying to keep everybody else out of the field and not cooperating with many others who wanted to be in the field.

Wallerstein (1998, pp. 25–26) rightly argued that the APsaA campaigned to capture psychiatry during the first part of the century. This they achieved when more than half of the chairs of psychiatry were analysts during the 1950s. Psychoanalysis was everywhere. The problem is: What did they then do with the prize?

The APsaA saw itself as an elite organization, a finishing school for psychiatrists who would be often infantilized in their post–psychiatric training as total neophytes who were lucky to sit at the feet of those who knew the truth. Exclusion instead of relationship with communities prevailed.

The APsaA has been essentially reactive rather than proactive. I can confirm this from research I carried out in 2003 at the APsaA Archives at Cornell University. I read the carefully kept minutes and papers of many meetings of the APsaA's Board on Professional Standards, its Executive Council, and its many subcommittees and ad hoc committees, from the 1950s through the 1980s. I realized the story was not in what was there in the minutes but in what was not! There was scarcely a typo to be found. There was minute detail about geographical analysts, whether certain people ought to be admitted, labyrinthine committees, issues of "standards" (even though they were not defined), and so forth. But relations with the outside world of universities, hospitals, society, or medicine were scarcely mentioned. Other mental health professions are mentioned only so as to be excluded. Instead of participating in national professional debates, for many years from the 1950s onward the APsaA spent much of its energies on relatively unimportant internal matters. The energies of often very intelligent and gifted men and women were devoted to administering an entity that worked as an unyielding gatekeeper whose main aim was to keep people out of the club. It is clear today how admirably they succeeded in this mission. Although the ship was being sailed competently enough, the issue should have been the course that was being steered. The major cost lay in the missed opportunities to become an essential long-term part of the culture. Just as Abba Eban famously said about the Arab League in relation to Israel, the APsaA "never missed an opportunity to miss an opportunity."

Missed opportunities were sometimes noted in the papers about the plans to set up a national board on psychoanalysis. But not having done so reveals not just the missed opportunity for a board but the insular attitude that valued keeping the world out as much as possible and cooperating with it as little as possible. This meant that the APsaA wasn't part of the discussion and debate. In consequence the field was left open for debate, with one side lacking some pretty formidable proponents. The rise to dominance by biological psychiatry and cognitive–behavioral therapy may have partly resulted from this lack of interaction with the outside world for so long, which has impacted back on the profession.

Such missed opportunities are central to a particularly counterproductive feature of institutes, their guild nature. I am referring here to the master-journeyman guilds of the Middle Ages that stalwartly preserved their status against everybody else. I will cite just one example from an experience just two months ago in New York. I meet many very talented and interesting analysts from a range of institutes in New York, all of whom lament the parlous state of psychoanalysis and the lack of intellectual and cultural interest in it. I suggested that New York would have to be the best city in the world for a critical number of gifted analysts to get together on a regular basis for intellectual stimulation and that maybe something further would develop from that. I could think easily of a group of some 20 analysts who could constitute a formidable think tank. The problem that was raised was an almost structurally insurmountable one—the members' own institutes would resent and oppose such a move. This is so anachronistic that it is akin to the situation before capitalism in the 18th century, where guilds had not yet been replaced by the far more rational trades. From all accounts, the Psychoanalytic Consortium has failed because of the way that the APsaA looked down on other institutions as having inadequate standards. Why did so many put up with so much for so long? Cooperation and building bridges seems rather difficult to achieve in such a situation.

If this is true at the local level, what about the national level? A variety of peak national organizations as different as the American Physical Association, the American Psychiatric Association, the American Society for Clinical Oncology, and the American Historical Association include professionals in the field under the same umbrella, even

though they come from different and varied institutions. The American Psychiatric Association consists of all psychiatrists, whatever their orientation. However, psychoanalytic institutions are clearly quite different. In addition to numerous freestanding institutes, there are a number of psychoanalytic organizations even at the national level. Consider Division 39, the American Academy of Psychoanalysis, the American Psychoanalytic Association, and the National Membership Committee on Psychoanalysis in Clinical Social Work. These organizations got together as the Psychoanalytic Consortium to combat another peak body, the National Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis, in its bid to be a national accrediting body for psychoanalysis, independent of the health professions. Coming together as part of a battle with other analysts, the consortium tried to settle on agreed upon standards and indeed came up with some. However, in my experience, if there is one issue psychoanalysts do not agree on, it is standards, even when they overtly say they do. This is with good reason, because so much of the grounding of standards is mythical.

The issue here is not about the Psychoanalytic Consortium but about a profession of psychoanalysts still divided into guilds on all levels from local to national. By the 19th century, corporate guilds were swept away by the emerging capitalist productive apparatus that rationalized production under a new division of labor where trades swept aside guilds and journeymen. To get to this point in psychoanalytic organizations would require major structural as well as mindset reforms. If psychoanalytic organizations were able to be united under one roof like so many other professional organizations, it would enhance essential cross-fertilization, intellectual, clinical, political, and cultural achievements. It would make for a more open and inclusive atmosphere rather than the profoundly insular attitudes of the guild. Most of all, it would pool the considerable resources of the profession instead of their being divided against each other.

Huston's *Freud: The Secret Passion*

One case that went beyond a missed opportunity to have quite possibly harmed the psychoanalytic cause significantly concerns psychoanalysis and film. The role of media in influencing and shaping culture is, of course, central. During the 1940s and 1950s at least, for a variety of reasons there was default sympathy for psychoanalytic approaches from the intelligentsia and media. Glen Gabbard has written about the changing face of the psychoanalyst on screen. Freud's own negativity toward spreading the word through the film medium was vividly illustrated by his out-of-hand rejection of Hollywood producer Samuel Goldwyn's offer of $100,000 to consult on a film in 1925. The *New York Times* headline read, "Freud rebuffs Goldwyn. Viennese Psychoanalyst Is Not Interested in Motion Picture Offer" (see Gabbard, 2001, pp. 1–2). Nonetheless, until 1962 Hollywood generally portrayed analysts in a very appealing and sympathetic light. The golden age of psychiatry in the cinema ended with the release of John Huston's film *Freud: The Secret Passion* (Huston, 1962), from which I quoted above on the Oracle of Delphi. Huston's impressive film was a finalist in the American Directors' Guild Awards for 1962. After this, Hollywood's approach changed markedly to the point where analysts could be shown to be most unappealing psychopaths, even killers, who used their analytic or psychiatric skills for evil ends, abusing the confidence of their trusting patients.

As Gabbard and Gabbard (1999) put it, "The swiftness and the vigor with which American movies turned against psychiatry is as remarkable as the staying power of the negative attitudes towards the profession, which have prevailed with few exceptions since

the Golden Age" (p. 107). Was this simply symptomatic of the changing socioeconomic and cultural climate where, for example, federal funding dried up for psychiatric research and education? This funding dried up slightly afterward, in the mid-1960s. From 1965, fewer medical students began to choose psychiatry as a specialty, something shown to have been influenced by negative media portrayals of psychiatrists (Gabbard & Gabbard, 1999, p. 188).

During a valuable conversation with Dr. Joseph Aguayo in Los Angeles in July 2003, I realized that there could well be an important link between the Hollywood transformation of the face of the analyst and the way psychoanalysts treated Hollywood. The quintessential pro-Freud film that ended the golden age had been the subject of vehement opposition from Anna Freud and the psychoanalytic establishment. On June 13, 1956, Ralph Greenson wrote Anna Freud that he had met with Charles Kaufman, one of the writers of the film, and told him

> in unmistakably clear terms that I would have nothing to do with the making of this picture, and furthermore, that I would speak to all the analysts in this area, asking them to refrain in any and every way from helping with this motion picture. He was quite shocked by my position but he did understand my point of view when I described to him your feelings in this matter.

Greenson said he was going to state his views to the Los Angeles Society but hesitated to do so at the Southern California Psychoanalytic Society (letter to A. Freud, June 13, 1956; Greenson Papers, Department of Special Collections, UCLA) because he thought "they may resent my being the spokesman for your views." Therefore he asked the president of the APsaA to send a letter explaining her views to the Southern California Society. Interestingly, Greenson also had written to Kurt Eissler on April 14, 1956 (Anna Freud Papers, Library of Congress), describing his respect for Kaufman and recognizing that the film proposal took psychoanalysis seriously. He could understand Kaufman's argument that "if they don't make the picture some cheap and sensational outfit will" (letter to K. Eissler, April 14, 1956). However, as he told Eissler in that letter, he would not support the film out of loyalty to Anna Freud. Two years later, Greenson was still implacably opposed to the film. In a letter to Anna Freud on March 4, 1958 (Greenson Papers, Department of Special Collections, UCLA), he thought it "important . . . to oppose him at this time since it may deter him from further developments . . . since they have not spent much money thus far, they might be more willing to renounce their future plans if we harass them sufficiently at this point." In a separate letter, Eissler's attorney concluded "that it was not possible to prevent a picture from being made on the life of Sigmund Freud. Consequently," the attorney sensibly added, "I still feel that it would be wiser to try to make arrangements which would give Anna Freud a voice in the content of the picture." Huston was "a very competent director"; it would be "better to cooperate" than "struggle with the problems that would arise if a cheaper group of people decided to make a sensational picture" (letter from Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton, & Garrison to K. Eissler, March 14, 1958; Greenson Papers, Department of Special Collections, UCLA). Undeterred, together with David Brunswick, and as chairman of the Committee on Public Relations of the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society, Greenson sought further legal opinion from Morris Cohn, who responded to Anna Freud's solicitors that they could institute a discovery process to prevent production. "The mere commencement of such a proceeding might be sufficient of itself to deter the companies from going forward with the intended production," they speculated (letter from M. E. Cohn to R. C. Bartlett & Co., September 3, 1958). Greenson had been further spurred to taking legal steps because he

read in *Time Magazine* that CBS was planning on making a television play on Freud's life (letter from R. Greenson to A. Freud, September 4, 1958; Greenson Papers, Department of Special Collections, UCLA).

John Huston had asked Marilyn Monroe to play the part of Cecily, a hysteric who was an amalgam of one of Freud and Breuer's cases in *Studies on Hysteria* and Freud's Dora case. (Susannah York was ultimately cast in the part.) In a letter I recently discovered at the Margaret Herrick Library at The Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences in Beverly Hills, Marilyn Monroe wrote to Huston from the Beverly Hills Hotel on November 5, 1960:

> I have it on good authority that the Freud family does not approve of anyone making a picture of the life of Freud—so I wouldn't want to be a part of it, first because of his great contribution to humanity and secondly my personal regard for his work.

Clearly, the "good authority" was Greenson. Her statement is also illogical—why, given Freud's great contribution and her high regard for it, wouldn't she do a movie to publicize his ideas? The answer is that her analyst was negative about it. Huston (1980) wrote that Monroe had been the first choice to play the hysteric but "her own analyst advised against it. Not out of concern for Marilyn; he didn't believe a picture about Freud should be made at all because Freud's daughter Anna opposed the project" (p. 301). The reasons Monroe gives make little sense, except as rationalizations for obeying Greenson—her two arguments for not making the film are in fact grounds for making it! We can only imagine the further impact on the world of Freud's ideas had Monroe accepted that leading role. Greenson later admitted to Huston that he had made a mistake. "If he had known the type of picture it was to be," Huston wrote, "he would have recommended that Marilyn do it" (Huston, 1980, p. 301).

In a letter on December 7, 1961, Anna Freud informed Masud Khan that

> there were several abortive attempts made by the Film Industry which we were lucky enough to discourage at an early date. Then in 1958 we heard that John Huston had the serious intention of doing a film of this kind. Following this information, three letters were sent to him: one by my solicitor protesting against such a plan in the name of the family; one by my brother Ernst's Solicitor protesting on behalf of the Sigmund Freud Copyright; and one by Mrs Katherine Jones' Solicitor protesting on behalf of the Jones Biography. Mr. Huston did not reply to these.

She added that she was sure Khan realized "that it is a serious situation not to be able to protect one's own father against becoming a film hero, and it seems almost incredible that the family should have no say in such a matter." Nonetheless, she correctly believed the legal position to be that the film company could do what they liked, provided they didn't portray living people or explicitly infringe copyright. Therefore she wanted to give the widest possible publicity to the fact that the film was unauthorized and made "against the wishes and energetic protest of the family" (letter from A. Freud to M. Khan, December 7, 1961). Anna Freud's solicitor's letter to Huston on March 13, 1961, emphasized again the strong protest against the film being made that had been conveyed in a previous letter three years earlier (see Young-Bruehl, 1988, pp. 336–338).

The Huston papers reveal that Huston was personally kept well abreast of all of the letters and that the studio was involved with detailed and ongoing legal counsel. Technical advice on *Freud* was given by psychiatrists Earl Loomis and David Stafford-Clark ("Marnie," Document No. 9403, January 30, 1963, Margaret Herrick Library), not by members of the IPA.

In a letter dated February 19, 1958, Ralph Greenson asked the APsaA to oppose the making of the film. Then president Rudolph Loewenstein replied that Anna Freud had recently approached him via Kurt Eissler for the APsaA to, as Loewenstein put it, "exert its influence to prevent such a film on Freud from being produced" (letter from R. Loewenstein to R. Greenson, March 4, 1958; Greenson Papers, Department of Special Collections, UCLA). Loewenstein refused to intervene, fearing it would do "more harm than good by stirring things up with any démarche on my part." Even telling the members of the APsaA not to participate in the film would breach the by-laws, he lamented—he could do nothing, to his "great regret" (letter from R. Loewenstein to K. Eissler, November 26, 1957; Greenson Papers, Department of Special Collections, UCLA).

If this series of events and attitudes did not sour the views of many in the film industry about psychoanalysis, at the very least, it did not help and was also a missed opportunity for partnership. It could have assisted the spread of psychoanalytic ideas considerably had the opportunity been seized instead of rejected. Of course, there were problems with the making of the film itself, especially with Montgomery Clift and Jean-Paul Sartre (Hoskyns, 1991, pp. 172–177), and there are other potential reasons for the remarkable transformation of the film industry's take on the figure of the analyst at that time.

Moreover, this should be seen in connection with another major event involving psychiatry and psychoanalysis that occurred in 1962—the suicide of Marilyn Monroe. She was very involved with her psychiatrist, Ralph Greenson, who was connected with the events surrounding her death. This was not a good advertisement for psychiatry or psychoanalysis. Whatever the truth about her suicide—some claim it was murder (Smith, 2003)—Greenson felt deeply about Monroe, who was his main patient, and was clearly very distraught for a long time after. "This has been a terrible blow in many ways. I cared about her and she was my patient. She was so pathetic and she had a terrible life. I had hopes for her and I thought we were making progress," he wrote to Anna Freud on August 20, 1962, two weeks after Monroe's death (Anna Freud Papers, Library of Congress).

Whatever the role of these issues in the approach toward psychoanalysis, it clearly reflects the result of an insular and condescending attitude.

I have been focusing here on the contribution of psychoanalysts themselves to the current troublesome situation of the field. Of course, this was an argument I developed in relation to particular institutes in *Unfree Associations* (Kirsner, 2000). However, I wanted to further explore the negative impact on the external world, and the loop back to the impact on the profession, of the avoidance of proactive involvement in other mental health professions and the external culture. I think it is crucial to its future that psychoanalysis be actively embedded in the wider culture and not be reclusive. The comparison with other countries where there is such involvement makes this point.

To this end, it is essential for psychoanalysts to build bridges, working together, not only with others in the same profession (outside as well as inside their own particular guilds) but also with other disciplines, other universities, business, government, and culture. Clearly, much more work needs to be done on the clarification and elaboration of concepts as well as testing them in an open and critical way. Psychoanalysis is an intrinsically interesting and intellectually stimulating approach and can promote enthusiasm among a wide range of people. The move from guilds to trade would be a beginning. Somehow psychoanalysis needs to be part of a culture—though it is certainly far too late for that, unless the psychoanalytic culture changes itself to be more inclusive of all of those in the psychoanalytic field and to work proactively with those outside rather than defensively exclude them. Psychoanalysis has survived over a hundred years, even be-

coming, at a time, in W. H. Auden's words, "a whole climate of opinion." That climate can be part of contemporary conversation only if there is a sea change.

I have focused on a number of ingredients that contribute to the success of psychoanalysis in the culture at large, elements that can impact back on the profession in a positive feedback system. One vital ingredient is a change in mind-set that sees psychoanalysis as a cultural asset owned by no one anointed group. Psychoanalysis is a field of inquiry and practice that has many contributors from many positions and trainings. If there is to be regulation, it ought to be run by the state, or at least accredited by it. If there were national boards with national criteria, examinations, and so forth, institutes would be able to help prepare candidates for the tests or licensing, which would be a market issue, not one of anointment. It is important to look at assessment in analytic training as involving only supervision and seminars—that is, only clearly assessable functions that reflect the level of actual knowledge in the discipline.

There is much discussion today about the extent of the decline of psychoanalysis and whether there is even the chance of damage control. Many analysts within the APsaA have been trying to change this counterproductive situation for decades. There are also those in that organization who, in the name of preservation of "standards," have been resisting substantial change and retain considerable influence on the major relevant educational bodies. Of course, each organization is different, but it would be mistaken to not heed the lessons of the laboratory of the APsaA in all its detail. It just reinforces a guild mentality to split off the APsaA as "dinosaurs," their lack of fortune only demonstrating by contrast how advanced one's own institute is. The problems are endemic to the field, to a greater or lesser extent.

However, I have been stressing the necessity of genuine, active engagement with other groups, disciplines, and perspectives for psychoanalysis to survive. I don't mean agreeing with others but rather involvement in genuine dialogue where people speak their minds. The results of the Strategic Marketing Survey of the APsaA clearly show that other mental health professionals like psychoanalysis as a method but not psychoanalysts themselves. I believe that it is valuable to have a structure that encourages working together instead of against others, both within and without. This is a case of a distinction made by the late Elliott Jaques between paranoiagenic organizations, which promote suspicion and mistrust, and philogenic organizations, which create confidence and mutual trust.

The recognition of the malaise inherent in the culture of psychoanalysis involves confronting the realities of and the reasons behind many missed opportunities for cultural leadership. Above all, this requires a change in psychoanalytic group mentality. It involves a concerted and genuine effort to work with others in the field as partners in a constructive way beyond the confines of a guild mentality into real engagement with the world.

References

Ben Plotkin, M. (2001). *Freud in the Pampas: The emergence and development of a psychoanalytic culture in Argentina.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Cesio, F. (2002). Argentina, and psychoanalysis. In E. Erwin (Ed.), *The Freud encyclopedia: Theory, therapy and culture* (pp. 34–35). New York: Routledge.

Gabbard, G. (2001). Introduction. In G. Gabbard (Ed.), *Psychoanalysis and film* (pp. 1–16). London: Karnac.

Gabbard, G., & Gabbard, K. (1999). *Psychiatry and the cinema* (2nd ed.). Washington DC: American Psychiatric Press.

Grossman, L. (2003, January 20). Can Freud get his job back? *Time Magazine,* 56–59.

Hoskyns, B. (1991). *Montgomery Clift: Beautiful loser.* London: Bloomsbury.

Huston, J. (Producer). (1962). *Freud: The secret passion* [Motion picture]. United States: John Huston Productions for Universal Studios.

Huston, J. (1980). *An open book.* New York: Knopf.

Kernberg, O. (1986). Institutional problems of psychoanalytic education. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 34,* 799–834.

Kirsner, D. (2000). *Unfree associations: Inside psychoanalytic institutes.* London: Process Press.

Kirsner, D. (2001). The future of psychoanalytic institutes. *Psychoanalytic Psychology, 18,* 195–212.

Roudinesco, F. (2002). France, and psychoanalysis. In E. Erwin (Ed.), *The Freud encyclopedia: Theory, therapy and culture* (pp. 208–212). New York: Routledge.

Rustin, M. (1985). The social organization of secrets: Towards a sociology of psycho-analysis. *International Review of Psycho-Analysis, 12,* 143–159.

Smith, M. (2003). *Victim: The secret tapes of Marilyn Monroe.* London: Century.

Wallerstein, R. (1998). *Lay analysis: Life inside the controversy.* Hillside: Analytic Press.

Wender, L., Torres, D., & de Vidal, I. (1995). Argentina. In P. Kutzer (Ed.), *Psychoanalysis international: A guide to psychoanalysis throughout the world* (Vol. 2, pp. 1–26). Frankfurt, Germany: Frommann-Holzberg.

Young-Bruehl, E. (1988). *Anna Freud: A biography.* New York: Summit.

Zacharias, B. L. (2002, August). *Strategic marketing initiative. American Psychoanalytic Association: Marketing research report.* Unpublished report, The Zacharias Group, New Gloucester, Maine.