

- Can we show that these concepts are grounded in rigorous forms of observation?
- How do these methods compare with standardized and other research methods?
- How can we best return the findings to the psychoanalytic community for expert validation and public assessment?

Evidently Working Parties are not exclusively research projects. There is, firstly, the experience of the participants and, secondly, the ongoing project. As David Tuckett put it: “Taking part is so incredibly useful when you get back home to your analyst’s chair!” Regarding the research aspect Working Parties differ in aim and methodology. One cannot say that one method is inherently superior to any other. But every Working Party should make propositions and give reasons and evidence for them. Then the propositions should be made available to the psychoanalytic community by means of public presentations and papers. Public debating and discussing of findings are essential although they seem to be relatively new for psychoanalysis.

The final discussion with the floor mainly centred on the question of whether candidates could or should be included in the activity of the Working Parties. Unanimously all the discussants confirmed their encouraging experience with actively participating candidates. Candidates seemed to be especially sensitive to the potential of new developments inherent in the Working Parties. Working Parties offer a challenging opportunity for participating in genuinely psychoanalytic research and developing new perspectives and frames of thought in psychoanalysis. This panel convincingly demonstrated that there is still enough space in psychoanalysis to look for new horizons. Working Parties play a major role and are a powerful driving force in developing and revitalizing psychoanalysis.

**The Prague Psychoanalytic Study Group 1933–1938: Frances Deri, Annie Reich, Theodor Dosůžkov, and Heinrich Löwenfeld, and their contributions to psychoanalysis<sup>16</sup>**

Susanne Kitlitschko, Reporter

This panel ranked among the “most appropriate” ones of the congress, as Peter Loewenberg said in his introduction, since it was to highlight a “brief and brilliant moment” in psychoanalytic history that had taken place in Prague from 1933–1938. However, instead of rewriting the history of Czechoslovakian psychoanalysis, which has been well examined, the panel’s aim, according to Ludger M. Hermanns, the brain and organizer behind it, was to explore four prominent members of the Prague Study Group. Hermanns described how Prague at that time – like Paris – had turned into a central “hub” for refugees from German Nazi persecution, who either stayed or, after a while, re-emigrated to other places. Prague was considered a rather secure location, furnished with a liberal and democratic political system and, furthermore, with a large group of German-speaking inhabitants, making it seem very suitable for fleeing Jewish and leftist analysts. Before he gave his portrayal of the first leader of the group – Frances Deri – Hermanns commemorated those colleagues who had not been able to leave Prague safely before the German invasion: Marie and Otto Brief were murdered in Buchenwald. Therese and Hugo Bondy were killed in Auschwitz together with their son – Hermanns displayed for the first time a 1931 photograph of Therese given to him by her Argentinian niece. Gottfried R. Bloch (1914–2008), who was joining the Prague group after the war, survived Auschwitz and published his experience in America (Bloch, 1999). Finally, Stefanie (Steff) Bornstein died from illness in Prague in July 1939.

The Viennese psychologist Frances Deri (1881–1971) was the first to emigrate to Prague in 1933. She had just concluded her training in Berlin where she had lived and worked since the early 1920s. As a recently qualified analyst, she assumed responsibility for building up a new working group in Prague in a leading role. Hermanns cited from her letters to former Berlin colleague Max Eitingon, who was head of the IPA training commission at that time. The state of analytic work she found among Prague colleagues seemed “mortifying”. Her reports reveal how she tried to keep in close contact with her own tradition of profound training, while she felt a pressure to provide “fast-track courses” which she resisted. However, she had to compromise with some guidelines, due to a lack of qualified staff. With the support of Annie Reich and Steff Bornstein, who had arrived from Berlin, Deri succeeded in forming a group within two years; in her last report when she was about to leave for Los Angeles in 1935, she said of the group: “if it can develop without interruption, [it] will not put the IPA to shame”. Meanwhile, the group had been acknowledged as a “Study Group” by the IPA at the 1934 Lucerne Congress, and Deri handed the leadership over to Otto Fenichel who arrived from Norway. Deri became a very popular lecturer

<sup>16</sup>Moderator: Peter Loewenberg (USA). Panellists: Ludger M. Hermanns (Germany), Nellie L. Thompson (USA), Thomas Müller (Germany), Eugenia Fischer (Germany).

and training analyst in California over the following decades. Like most other members of the former Prague Study Group, she somehow kept attached to her old allies no matter how “spread around the globe” they were. Furthermore, she cared for European colleagues, taking on not less than 31 affidavits personally.

Nellie L. Thompson’s paper focused on how the Prague group engaged and influenced the writings of Annie Reich (1902–1971), both socially and professionally, through vivid exchange, even in her later years. Thompson extrapolated her impression from reports on the Prague group for the Bulletin of *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis* and Reich’s correspondence that the emigrants were well aware of their precarious and provisional situation. She underlined in her thesis that the Prague group members concentrated on developing their analytic identity in order to cope with this insecurity. Annie Reich had been trained in Vienna until 1928, came to Berlin with her husband Wilhelm where they divorced in 1933 and fled Nazism separately. She started to “articulate her own voice as a psychoanalyst” in Prague, where she stayed with her two daughters. Child analysis, a big topic in the Prague group, and a derived extension of analytic techniques, both shine through Reich’s thinking of the 1930s as it is condensed in her 1936 paper describing her treatment of a schizophrenic patient. Reich continued her thinking about pathological object relations after she had left for New York, where she arrived in July 1938, quickly joining the teaching staff of the New York Psychoanalytic Society and gaining some reputation. Reich, too, cared for the well-being of the remaining European colleagues and participated at the “Otto Fenichel Foundation for Czechoslovakia” until she had to close it down in 1953 because their support failed to reach their addressees. Thompson explored how Reich’s work further developed and found, by means of the “distinguished notes” of her 1952 paper’s scientific discussion by Ph. Greenacre, E. Jacobson and E. Kris, how “fluid and dynamic” ego psychology was at that time. This is where she traces the “vibrant legacy” of the 1920s and 1930s to which the Prague Psychoanalytic Study Group had eminently contributed.

Heinrich Julius Löwenfeld (1900–1985) began his analytic training in Berlin while working as a senior physician at the Lankwitz Clinic, whose payroll – as the audience could see from Thomas Müller’s photograph – read surprisingly like the Who’s Who of second generation analysts, among them Karen Horney and Moshe Wulff. Müller indicated that the image of a “marginalized psychoanalysis” being rejected by contemporary academic medicine” proved to be “a myth”, at least “by example of Lankwitz”. Löwenfeld, being a politically alert German Jew from a rich cultural background, emigrated with his wife Yela and their son immediately after the Nazis had seized power. In Prague, they joined the Study Group, and Henry continued analytic training and graduated in 1937. He additionally wrote political articles under a pseudonym; he explored “the psychology of [German] fascism” as early as 1935. Thus, Löwenfeld both contributed and profited from the Prague group of colleagues that began to fall apart in 1938. Yela and Henry Lowenfeld (they had changed their names) fled to New York where they overcame administrative barriers quite easily and opened a private practice, but struggled with severe living conditions. Lowenfeld’s friendship with Annie Reich remained close: at times they led the New York Psychoanalytic Society together (with him as vice-president). Alexander Mitscherlich invited him to head the new Frankfurt Institute, however, he declined. Despite the fact that Lowenfeld had not published widely, his impact on the next generation of New York analysts was immense. Müller made clear that the wide significance of teaching staff in psychoanalytic institutes is still much unappreciated because history is paying too much attention to publications.

The Russian emigrant Theodor (Bohodar) Dosužkov (1899–1982) was the only qualified member of the Study Group who could stay in Prague, survived the Nazi occupation and became a crucial figure for the continuity of the further development of Czech psychoanalysis. His daughter Eugenia Fischer, who had emigrated to Germany after the Russian invasion in the CSSR and had become an analyst, particularized how Dosužkov maintained psychoanalytic work under the Nazis and entered his long-term struggle with the Communist regime. Together with Ladislav Haas and Otakar Kučera, whom he had trained predominantly when, in 1945–1948, psychoanalysis had gained attention and popularity and who had become direct IPA members and training analysts, Dosužkov offered psychoanalytic training illegally from the 1950s until his death. This meant, for example, that he used his family flat for meetings and analyses risking prosecution and fines. He maintained contact with the IPA: when he was not allowed to travel to the 27th IPA Congress in Vienna in 1971, a group of participants conversely travelled to him in order to exchange views. With her speech, Fischer allowed Dosužkov to take an appropriate place in the history of Czech psychoanalysis, which was all the more important as his name had remained unmentioned in the opening ceremony of the Prague Congress the night before.

The discussion showed that the audience had been deeply moved by the panellists’ contributions and had to cope with the multifaceted affects that had been provoked by the material presented which had consisted in large parts of intense life stories and the depiction of a dense and fateful commitment to psychoanalysis. Michael Windholz (USA) threw in relevant atmospheric additions and anecdotes he had been told by his father, Emmanuel Windholz (1903–1986), who had been trained in Prague before he emigrated to San Francisco. Martin Mahler, the current President of the Czech Psychoanalytic Society, expressed his gratitude to the panel: he had never before conceived Czech psychoanalysis so clearly and

cohesively. “We are all analytic children from Dosužkov without knowing it”, he said. As he had learned from the panel, the current Czech generation of analysts was to be considered “family number three” – and, in this way, direct descendants from, for example, Annie Reich and Otto Fenichel. Furthermore, Mahler pointed to an actual problem of the Society generating from this heritage with its breaks and ruptures, namely the lack of integration. This had also been reflected in the congress programme, where relevant historical topics had not been well co-ordinated but took place extremely disparately. In the further course of the discussion, the observation was brought up that the Prague Study Group consisted mostly of German or Russian emigrants. It was presumed that this gap could be one of the roots for the current problem of lack of integration within the Czech Psychoanalytic Society. But why was there a gap? Why could the group not have also appealed to the Czechs? These questions will remain for further studies.

### Reference

Bloch GR (1999). *Unfree associations. A psychoanalyst recollects the holocaust*. Los Angeles: Red Hen press.

### Reflections on the gender of violence<sup>17</sup>

Angela Mauss-Hanke, Reporter

This COWAP panel chaired by Frances Thomson-Salo (Melbourne) explored reflections on the gender of violence and degrees of facing pain when trust is killed. It included papers given by Carine Minne (London) on infanticide by a 19 year-old mother, by Timothy Keogh (Sydney) on perverse sexual behaviour of a male patient and by Gertraud Schlesinger-Kipp (Kassel) on processing World War II childhood trauma by female German analysts. The papers were presented to a small but very attentive audience.

In her paper *Infanticide, matricide, suicide: Toward a psychoanalytic understanding of a murder*, Minne presented the long psychoanalytic treatment of a very disturbed young woman who killed her baby by feeding her with the medicine that she, the mother, had been supposed to take. Minne emphasized the two-stage [*zweizeitig*] traumatic background of disturbed perpetrators like her patient who have been seriously violent: the first is of course the often heavily traumatizing milieu in which they grew up as children with all the destructive consequences upon their lives and minds. In the second stage we find the offences they have committed as they come to grasp what they have done which can also include becoming distressed by their gradual discovery, through treatment, of having a mental disorder.

Minne illustrated how these insights may lead to the development of symptomatology reminiscent of a Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder during the course of treatment. In the case she presented her patient was furthermore sometimes overwhelmed by the care she received during her psychiatric admission and the reliable attention she got from her therapist. This was something this young woman had never experienced before and, by becoming aware of this, she also had to realize the awful conditions in which she had existed throughout her life. Furthermore the patient had to realize that, besides her uncontrollable guilt feelings for having killed her baby (which was also seen by Minne also as a shift and substitute for killing herself, her mother and of having been mentally and emotionally killed by her mother), she had paradoxically also tried to rescue her baby. Becoming aware of this libidinal, loving side in her was one of the most painful experiences for the patient.

In her report Minne allowed the audience to ‘participate’ in her reflections on this woman’s nine years of psychoanalytic psychotherapy, through two sessions weekly, how the treatment progressed and regressed. She emphasized that only with the help and containing function of her regular supervision had she been able to remain present as a non-retaliatory and non-abandoning object. This was perhaps the most important experience for her patient – something she had never had nor experienced before.

In his paper *Facing the pain when trust is killed*, Timothy Keogh discussed the resistance to facing psychic pain in male patients with perverse sexual behaviour. Keogh examined how, in the case of certain sexual perversions in men, anger and violence towards the maternal object appear to coexist with a highly vulnerable and poorly developed sense of self for whom the use of compulsive sexual behaviour is a means of holding this self together when it feels at risk of falling apart. These psychodynamics appear to be linked with a regression point at the level of autistic–contiguous anxieties and are expressed in an apparently non-

<sup>17</sup>Moderator: Frances Thomson-Salo (Australia). Panellists: Carine Minne (UK), Timothy Keogh (Australia), Gertraud Schlesinger-Kipp (Germany).