

ANALYSTS OF THE ENGLISH SCHOOL AND THE END OF THEIR TREATMENTS

Vicente Palomera

Translated by Marc du Ry.

Under the heading English School we have gathered psychoanalysts of the 20s (James Strachey, Joan Riviere) Melanie Klein and some disciples, Anna Freud and some of hers, and two theoreticians of object relations who were preoccupied with the end of the treatment, Fairbairn and Guntrip. We found a correlation between what recent biographies of these authors have been able to teach us and the theoretical propositions of each.

James Strachey and Joan Riviere

James Strachey, younger brother of the writer Lytton, who was an eminent member of the Bloomsbury set, threw himself wholeheartedly into psychoanalysis after the First World War and, as soon as he could, asked for an analysis from Freud. Winnicott specifies¹ that the family consisted of ten brothers and sisters and was organised as if there were two generations; Lytton belonged to the older generation and James to the younger. Winnicott thinks one can isolate in this the trait which marked his subsequent relationship to Freud. We might note that these two sons, born into a distinguished and affluent family of Victorian society, had to resolve, each in his own way, the problem of a confrontation with the ideal of the great man. Lytton exposed its semblants in his biographies while James concocted an equally original solution. On the one hand, he devoted his life to the translation of the Standard Edition (Complete Works) of Freud, establishing the only integral critical edition in existence to this day. On the other hand, one can read between the lines of his homage to James Strachey that this latter had identified, up to the silhouette, with the master from Vienna. He was the figure of the great man who reconciled him to life. Photographs of him show to what extent he pushed the resemblance. The debt towards his brother, their relations of love found a new expression in his choice of wife. Alix entered into James' life as he left a reception at Cambridge where he found at last a woman he qualified in a letter to Lytton as absolute boy.² Their intellectual companionship was hence sealed and proved to be without cracks. He published The Nature of Therapeutic Action in Psychoanalysis³ and Introjection of the Superego of the Analyst,⁴ articles which were milestones in the psychoanalytic movement as far as the outcome of an analysis is concerned. Strachey draws on Freud's Group Psychology and Analysis of the Ego, a text begun in 1920, the very year he started analysis. He takes transference love to derive, in the final analysis, from the love of superego. Psychoanalytic therapy does not consist in suppressing this agency, but in the adoption, in its place, of a more supple and pragmatic superego: "the process of analysis can be considered, from this point of view, as an infiltration by the auxiliary superego of the rigid and inadaptable original superego, having greater contact with the ego and with reality."⁵ Interpretations would hence aim to "provoke the introjection of the analyst".

In the case of James Strachey, the solution elaborated in his own treatment and his conception of the end seem indissolubly linked. Let us now examine another great

figure of the same generation, Mrs Joan Riviere. We have at our disposal a collection of letters addressed to her first analyst, Ernest Jones, as well as recent testimonies in a collection other articles.⁶

She came to analysis via her neurosis which broke out after the death of her father in 1909 when she was 26. From her correspondence with Jones in 1918 we can suppose that she attempted suicide in 1910, following this death and the unhappy ending of a love affair. In 1916, she demanded an analysis of Jones which was to last four years, with an interruption in 1918, and was characterised by an intense transference passion and various threats of suicide which the analyst interpreted as so many repetitions. The interruption was due to various illnesses, including tuberculosis. Joan Riviere violently denounced the deception of transference love, "an object of torment". She accused the analyst of having seduced her and then marrying in order to flee from his (or her) love. She further accused him of inconsequentiality ("you cannot be condemned, my verdict is that one cannot take you seriously") as well as cowardice ("allow me to analyse you, I consider it beyond doubt that your wife is a substitute for me"). When the analysis resumed after the danger of tuberculosis had been removed, it soon became impossible to sustain for either. Which did not prevent Joan from setting herself up as an analyst and resolutely engaging in the practice. To unblock the situation the analyst and the analysand asked Freud to help. In 1921, Joan set off for Vienna, and Jones confessed to his master that she had been "his greatest failure as an analyst", and also that "she set about torturing him without respite and with considerable success".⁷ Joan began her analysis with Freud in 1922 which forced Jones at the same time to reserve a place for her on the International Journal of Psychoanalysis. She might have regretted, moreover, that Freud preferred her as a translator than as a patient.

According to her, Freud's chief interpretation bore on her very severe ego ideal.⁸ The outcome of the analysis allowed her claims towards Jones to take a more dialectical turn. In 1927, Jones wrote his first great article on the phallic stage in women. In it, he heralds the developments by means of which, ten years later, he would situate her between phobia and perversion.⁹ It is in response to this article of 1927 that Joan Riviere wrote Womanliness as a masquerade, her great article on femininity published in 1929, in which she wished to teach Jones something about the *semblant*. Her chief clinical example was the case of a young intellectual woman whose symptom was to seduce paternal substitutes after having demonstrated her talents in mastering a subject. Many traits of the case seem to resemble those of the author herself. Other writers had already pointed to the feminine masquerade but the main contribution of this article was the statement that there is no truth behind the mask, the mask is the truth itself, the presentation of a semblant, the secret very much on the surface of femininity. When Lacan traced the dialectic of having and being (the phallus), Joan Riviere's article, translated into French in 1957 in the journal *La Psychanalyse*, which Lacan himself animated, appeared in all its originality. The masquerade, beyond narcissism and identification, is a way of circumscribing the void, a supplement to the lack of a signifier capable of naming the *jouissance* of the woman in the Other.

By means of this decisive theoretical contribution of Joan Riviere, the issue of her relation to the severe ego ideal uncovered in analysis is solved. At the same time that she participated in the debate concerning crucial problems of psychoanalysis she also bore witness to her way out of analysis.

Melanie Klein and her pupils

Concerning the theory of end of the treatment and exit from analysis for Melanie Klein, we have available both precise texts¹⁰ and a detailed case history, Narrative of a Child Analysis, published in 1961. There Melanie Klein presents the transference emotions of her patient Richard in a perfectly regulated sequence.¹¹ In a first phase, Richard does everything to seduce his analyst - a state of love accompanied by feelings of rivalry towards another analysand, and more generally, jealousy of others of whom he had a phobic fear. Then, the transference "moved to the breast". We can check how the direction of a Kleinian treatment proceeds by the projection of bad internal objects onto the analyst. "It was a sign of considerable progress when the persecutory aspects of the relation to the idealised mother and the analyst came to the fore." Richard then goes through a small persecutory episode. Having passed this acute moment, the split between good and bad can come to a reconciliation around the third phase, characterised by the focussing on the "combined object" detached from daddy and mummy, an object which emerges during the session before the penultimate one.¹² M. Klein concludes: "with a better relation to his parents, his object relations in general improve."¹³

There we can grasp a Kleinian conjuncture of the end of analysis: idealisation of the analyst is no longer necessary for the subject in order to have good relations with the object. The primary good object is for M. Klein one of the names of the mother, and at the end of analysis a full and sure relation is established with her. "Richard's love for his mother and his confidence in her were already established. All the same, his persecutory anxiety and splitting mechanisms kept reinforcing his need to idealise. When his anxiety diminished, the relation to the primary good object - the mother - became much more stable. Furthermore, the child became capable of a greater love for his father, thanks to the analysis of his Oedipus complex in which the paranoid element was quite strong."¹⁴ In this way, Melanie Klein associates the father with the success of the treatment and indicates the role of a tempered use of separating rivalry, but the essential thing remains the securing of this experience of love of the mother reached in analysis by the gift of the combined object. Beyond the moment of paranoid transference, the end of the treatment confronts us with a relation to the object insofar as it does not fail the call. This end is conceived in terms, not of separation, but of reparation. One cannot pass over the concept of envy in the context of the end of analysis of a pupil of Melanie Klein, Paula Heimann.¹⁵ This concept is also justified by the ends of other didactic analyses, and not by the usual recourse of Melanie to child analysis. She evokes the case of a patient, probably Paula Heimann, who suffers from a particular type of depression marked by this new constitutive factor she calls envy. Paula Heimann, in her article on counter-transference, in 1949, defended various theses. First that "the emotional response of the analyst to the patient within the analytic situation constitutes the most important working tool(...). What distinguishes this relation (analytic) from others is not the presence of feelings in one of the partners, the patient, and their absence in the other, the analyst, but essentially the degree of feelings experienced and the use made of them."¹⁶ Then, she radically differentiates from this the communication of the analyst's feelings to the patient: "Such honesty is more in the nature of a confession, and constitutes a burden for the patient." Lastly, she concludes on the necessary humanity of the patient, "the change coming about in the ego of the patient reinforces his sense of reality, in such a way that he considers his analyst as a human being,

neither god nor devil, and that the 'human' relation in the analytic situation follows of itself, without the intervention of extra-analytic means."¹⁷ Melanie Klein never accepted this perspective, the errors of which she denounced publicly when they came from other proponents, Margaret Little for example. Countertransference manifestations seemed to her to call for one response only: more analysis. Paula Heimann represented for Melanie Klein an experience of such a nature that, after 18 years, she threw down the gauntlet and declared the analytic act impossible in her case. And, starting there, she located an object paradoxically considered as beyond reach in the framework of analysis.¹⁸

Some pupils of Melanie Klein: Roger Money-Kyrle and Wilfred R. Bion

Amongst the members of the association founded in February 1955 which had as its aim the teaching and research of analysis on the basis of Kleinian concepts there was Melanie Klein herself, Wilfred R. Bion, Roger Money-Kyrle and Paula Heimann. That year Melanie Klein presented Envy and Gratitude in its first form, marking the irrevocable split with Paula Heimann. Melanie Klein bequeathed her theoretical legacy to Bion and Money-Kyrle. Roger Money-Kyrle, who would compile the Complete Works of Melanie Klein, came to analysis via philosophy. To account for the end of analysis he started from a neopositivist position according to which to obtain a truth one ought first to examine if a problem has a logical sense, in which case verification by means of reality can be made. In his work on Psychoanalysis and Ethics¹⁹, he writes "Psychoanalysis is a rational process which operates only by exposing error and in substituting truth for it." Elsewhere, in The Aim of Psychoanalysis, he notes that the objective of psychoanalysis is to "help the patient to understand and overcome his emotional inhibitions so that he may discover what he already knows innately." The psychic apparatus and the unconscious are for Money-Kyrle objects of the "outside world", partaking of verification procedures. This conception is not without difficulties. He indicates one in 1955 in An Incomplete Contribution to the Theory of the Death Instinct, by pointing out that the representation of death is a nothing and yet a truth: "Freud as well as Jones had already maintained that one cannot fear what one cannot conceive, and that it is psychologically impossible to form a positive idea of something so negative that it is nothing. I was very impressed by this argument, which corresponded to my own epistemological system, but since then I have been led to think that there is a contradiction, for we certainly can form an idea of the experience of death and fear it." He admits in this way that psychoanalysis has to include unverifiable truths. In an article of 1977, On Being a Psychoanalyst, he generalises the objection: "Even if it seems to me that analysts know a lot of things concerning the unconscious, a large part of what they know is as through a glass, darkly." In other words, we are always on the expanding frontier of a dark continent which, as in physics, has no end. His idea of a without end of the knowledge of psychoanalysis cannot be separated from his testimony of the absence of "a normal end of his analysis with Melanie Klein".²⁰

In the The Aim of Psychoanalysis, he questions himself on the end of analysis in terms redolent of Platonism: the patient has to arrive at the recognition of certain innate ideas, which he knows without knowing that he knows. He shares Bion's conception. Psychoanalysis has to aim at converting a limited series of innate pre-concepts into "concepts", pre-concepts which refer to fundamental realities of psychoanalytic experience: the breast as supreme good object, the parental coitus as the supremely creative act, the inevitable character of time and death. When the

patient recognises these concepts, analysis has attained its objective. A remainder drops from this: “that inner voice acquired by those who have been analysed and which compels the continuation of analysis long after analysis has finished and its creators have died.”

Bion has an analogous conception of the end and conclusion of an analysis when he maintains that in analytic experience, adjectives like “completed” or “finished” have no place. In 1963, in Attention and Interpretation²¹ he writes: “The more profound the investigation, the more clear it is that an analysis, however prolonged it might be, is perhaps only the beginning of a research. It stimulates the growth of the domain it investigates.” From this experience he deduces the structure of knowledge in experience: “If it is true that the proportion of what is known to what is unknown is so weak at the end of analysis, it must be even more weak during analysis itself.” The important is the unknown, the obscure point to which the analyst must guide his attention, in so far as it is distinct from interpretation. This relation to the unknown is a relation to ultimate reality. In Elements of Psychoanalysis²² he makes of it absolute truth, divinity, and he names this ultimate point “0”. “0” cannot be known, but all knowledge is an elaboration of this point. Bion then proposes in a famous quotation an almost mystical practice of analysis in which, in order to aim for point “0”, “the analyst must come to be infinite, he must suspend memory, desire, understanding”.²³ In wanting to identify the desire of the analyst as an empty operator in the treatment, he points to an “analyst without quality”. Bion, in order to make his position understood, will be able to quote a letter of Freud to Lou Andreas-Salome: “I have to blind myself artificially in order to concentrate all light onto an obscure point.” Let us therefore call the conclusion of the treatment according to Bion the mystical conclusion.

Anna Freud and her pupils

Anna Freud does not really propose any theory of the end of analysis other than the development of the ego, obtained through the suppression of its defense mechanisms and hence through the analysis of resistances. E. Young-Bruehl²⁴ identifies Anna to the clinical case central to two articles of Freud, A Child is Being Beaten and The Economic Problem of Masochism. The biographer also reveals the autobiographical character of the paper which admitted Anna as member of the Analytical Society of Vienna.²⁵ Freud was worried about what was becoming of his daughter’s femininity and decided to analyse her, first from 1918 to 1920, putting her in contact with Lou Andreas-Salome to introduce a feminine note into her life; then a second time, between 1924 and 1925. During that time Anna became friendly with Dorothy Burlingham, whose two children would become her patients and would remain bound to her for the rest of her life. Between 1926 and 1930 Anna was in correspondence with M. Eitington, friend of the family and a pupil of Freud - in which she evokes what she could not tell her father. This correspondence was interrupted when Eitington put pressure on her to separate from her father. Between 1945 and 1946, Marie Bonaparte was her confidante. In the dreams she analysed with the latter, Anna always came up against the same point: whatever the libidinal outcome, there was always betrayal of the father and of her love for him. The place of the Other woman was incarnated during her life by a series of women, from Lou to Marie, who had in common having been marked by Freud’s desire. It was from them that Anna expected something different. Her most touching declaration on this point came on the death of Dorothy. She then repeated the words of Rostand’s *Cyrano de*

Bergerac: "She put a woman's touch into my life." She therewith testified to her loyalty to the libidinal solution which Freud had pointed out to her at the end of her first section of analysis. Whatever her interest for the question of femininity, we find above all in her theoretical outlook on analysis and in her practice, the place of the demanding schoolmistress, of the mother superior attentively supervising the development of the children.

As regards her pupils, we can mention the testimony of the American psychoanalyst Esther Menaker, who published the history of her training in Vienna between the years 1930 and 1935 and of her two analyses, first with Anna (two years) then with her pupil Willie Hoffer (one year).²⁶ Her analysis with Anna was conducted within a passionate transference. Esther complained of her "chronic feeling of being devalued", of her search for approval and recognition. Anna endeavoured to interpret her defenses but did not exit from the circle of complaint. At the end of the two years agreed upon, the analysand was pregnant and could no longer pay for her sessions. The pregnancy could not be recognised and ended in abortion. A year later she asked to go into analysis with Willie Hoffer²⁷ on Anna's advice. The outcome was very similar except that this time she gained access to maternity. More precisely, Hoffer succeeded in calming the "vociferous rebel" thanks to maternity and prudent advice. Menaker had the idea that her training analysis was "a ritual to be submitted to in order to survive the humiliations if one wants to be part of the institution". The masochistic tone of this declaration is striking. This was, moreover, the basic line she took in her contributions to psychoanalysis. Suffice it to give one title: The Masochistic Component in the Analytic Setting.

Two theoreticians of object relations: R. Fairbairn and H. Guntrip

During the controversies between Kleinians and Anna-Feudians in the British Society in London, the novelty of the Kleinian conception of libido, which linked the fantasy to an object representation, was brought into focus. In 1952, Fairbairn went one step further and considered libido no longer as a search for pleasure, but for an object.²⁸ The history of the subject then becomes that of the malfunctioning of the individual's relations to his objects which, originally, were one, the mother, both nourishing and frustrating.

This attempt was criticised by Lacan in 1955.²⁹ "This person Fairbairn lives in a perfectly stable and defined world with the objects destined for him (...), in no way does he introduce us to a subjective division which will have to be referred to repressed significations. In question is an organised ego, a libidinal ego orientated towards its objects." Fairbairn deduces the perturbing influence of the superego from the fact that the object of satisfaction is also a source of frustration, which he rejects. Thus is formed, through interiorisation, what Fairbairn calls "the internal saboteur". "Fairbairn does not seem to have found a satisfying English term to signify this perturbing, even demoniacal, function of the superego so he has invented one: internal saboteur." The position of the analyst as well as the end of the treatment can be logically deduced from this starting point: "It is a question of making him (the subject) find again the path of normal relations with objects (...); the original introjection of the *rejecting object* is corrected by the introjection of a correct ego, that of the analyst. The analyst who observes is also the one who has to intervene in the revelation of the function of the repressed object, correlative of the libidinal ego." It is doubtless the radical simplicity of Fairbairn's propositions which caught the attention

of the times. Of his analysis we know little. We can refer to his description of himself in his autobiography: "I think that the ambitions my mother had for me (which I have appropriated) provoked a reinforcement of my narcissism. They led me to feel that I was someone rather special, out of the ordinary, superior to my average middle class environment, someone with a destiny and a future. Nevertheless, I think I must have felt very guilty, because there was always, at bottom, the disapproval of my father. I must have felt very guilty in front of him of my aspirations which seemed to have run counter to his ideas on life."³⁰ Fairbairn himself must have had a precise idea of his internal saboteur if we believe what Winnicott writes to Guntrip, an ex-analysand of Fairbairn: "I invite you to look for what lies behind your relation to Freud; you can then have your own relation to Freud rather than Fairbairn's. He spoils what good he does in trying to shoot down Freud."³¹ One would have to read the detailed account of Guntrip's two analyses, with Fairbairn and with Winnicott, to grasp how the position of the analyst following object relations defines a clinical variety of the end of analysis.³² Guntrip first makes a demand for analysis to Fairbairn because of repeated fainting fits. The first loss of consciousness occurred at the sight of a dead brother when he was three. During his adolescence, his mother confessed that she had given him suck in order to avoid a new pregnancy. However, a year later, she had a second child who died when Guntrip was one and a half. The father then reproached the mother for refusing to give suck to the child, something that could have saved his life. From that moment on, the couple gave up all intimacy. The desire of the Other, put in question through the father's accusation, would be analysed in terms of a relation to the bad object and Guntrip stayed fixated on an imaginary dual relation which would be repeated in his two analyses. He described them thus: "Fairbairn, as a person, has built something on what my father had done for me, and, as analyst, he has allowed me to discover in detail how the battle I waged to become independent of my mother, from three and a half years on, has contributed to the formation of my personality (...). Winnicott, with a completely different personality, understood and filled the void left by my mother after three and a half years, right from the start of my life. I needed both of them and was extremely fortunate in finding both." This is a watered down formulation of the virulent reproach addressed to both during the analyses: you will never know to what extent my mother was bad, to what extent my only object relation was a relation to the absolutely bad object. The first analyst tried to displace the reproach towards the father in an Oedipal articulation. The second always insisted on the fact that the bad mother was necessarily preceded by the "good enough" one. The big difference between them is that Fairbairn, as Lacan indicated, stopped carrying the speech of the subject at some point whereas Winnicott carried it. In making himself cause of speech, he produced an unexpected transferential effect on this subject who fainted from his being. He sustained himself by means of a decision never to faint in dialogue. Never was he going to separate from his analyst and he was always going to have the last word. He found peace only through a liberating dream,³³ attained at last after Winnicott's death.

This article first appeared in Comment finissent les Analyses, Seuil 1994, under the aegis of the Association Mondiale de Psychanalyse.

ENDNOTES

-
- ¹ Winnicott (D.W.), 'James Strachey: Obituary', *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 50, 1969.
- ² Meisel (P.) and Kendrick W. (Ed.), *Bloomsbury Freud: James and Alix Strachey, Correspondence (1924-26)*, Paris, Puf, 1985.
- ³ Strachey (J.), 'La nature de l'action thérapeutique de la psychanalyse', *Revue française de psychanalyse*, 34, 1970, pp. 255-284.
- ⁴ Lacan (J.), *Écrits*, Paris, Editions de Seuil, 1966, p. 607.
- ⁵ Strachey (J.), *op. cit.*
- ⁶ Riviere (J.), *The Inner World and Joan Riviere. Collected Papers 1920-1958* (A. Hughes ed.), London/New York, Karnac Books, 1991.
- ⁷ Freud (S.) and Jones (E.), *The Complete Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Ernest Jones, 1908-1939* (R.A Paskauskas ed.), The Belknap Press, Harvard University Press, 1993.
- ⁸ Riviere (J.) *op.cit.*
- ⁹ Lacan (J.), *Écrits*, Paris, Editions due Seuil, 1966, note I, p.703.
- ¹⁰ Klein (M.), 'On the criteria for the determination of a psychoanalysis', *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 31, p.78, 1950; trad. Franc.: 'Sur Les critères de fin d'analyse', *Psychoanalyse à l'Université*, Décembre 1982, pp. 5-10.
- ¹¹ Laurent (E.), 'Trois guises de l'objet', *Ornicar ?*, 26/27, et 'Ce que savait Melanie', *Ornicar?*, 24.
- ¹² Klein (M.), *Psychoanalyse d'un enfant*, trad. de l'anglaise par Mireille Davidovici, Paris, Claude Tchou, 1973, p. 425.
- ¹³ Klein (M.), *op cit.*, p. 434.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁵ Grosskurth (P.), *Melanie Klein, son monde et son oeuvre*, Paris, PUF, 1990, pp.539-548.
- ¹⁶ Heimann (P.), 'A Propos du contre-transfert', *Le Contre-transfert*, Paris, Navarin, 1987, p.24.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 28.
- ¹⁸ Klein (M.), *Envie et Gratitude et autre essais*, trad. de l'anglais par Victor Smirnoff avec la coll. De S. Aghion et de M. Derrida, Paris, Gallimard, 1968.
- ¹⁹ Money-Kyrle (R.), *Psychoanalysis and Ethics, The Collected Papers of Roger Money-Kyrle* (D. Meltzer ed.), Clunie Press, Strath Tay, 1978.
- ²⁰ Money-Kyrle (R.), 'Autobiographical note', *op. cit.*
- ²¹ Bion (W.R.), *Attention and Interpretation*, London, Tavistock publications, 1970.
- ²² Bion (W.R.), *Eléments de psychanalyse*, Paris, PUF, 1979.
- ²³ Bion (W.R.), *Attention and Interpretation, op. cit.*
- ²⁴ Young-Bruehl (E.), *Anna Freud*, trad. de l'anglais par Jean-Pierre Ricard, Paris, Payot, 1991.
- ²⁵ Freud (A.), 'Schlagenphantasie und Tagtraum', *Die Schriften der Anna Freud, Band I*, Fischer Taschenbusch Verlag, 1922.
- ²⁶ Menaker (E.), *Cita in Viena*, Barcelona, Gedisa, 1990.
- ²⁷ J.Lacan was interested in Hoffer's ideas about the end of analysis and made reference to him in the text 'Variantes de la cure type', *Écrits*, Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1966, p.338.
- ²⁸ Fairbairn (R.), 'Psychoanalytic Studies of the Personality', London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1952.
- ²⁹ Lacan (J.), The following are extracted from the Seminar of 1st June 1955, *Le Seminaire II, Le Moi dans la théorie de Freud et dans la technique de la psychanalyse*, Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1978, p.290-300.
- ³⁰ Quoted by Sutherland (J.), *Fairbairn's Journey into the Interior*, London, Free Associatin Book, 1989.
- ³¹ Quoted by Guntrip (H.), 'My experience of analysis with Fairbairn and Winnicott', *International Review of Psychoanalysis*, Vol.2, 1975.
- ³² Guntrip (H.), 'Mon experience de l'analyse avec Fairbairn et Winnicott', *Nouvelle Revue de psychanalyse*, 15, Paris, 1977.
- ³³ Laurent (E.), *Conceptiones de la cura en psicoanalisis*, Manantial, Buenos Aires, 1984, p.46.