

DIARY OF A FALLEN PSYCHOANALYST

THE WORK BOOKS OF MASUD KHAN
1967-1972

Edited by Linda Hopkins and
Steven Kuchuck



CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
FOREWORD <i>by Professor Brett Kahr</i>	vii
PREFACE <i>by Linda Hopkins and Steven Kuchuck</i>	xiii
NOTE TO THE READER	xx

THE WORK BOOKS

I	<i>14 August 1967 — 20 August 1968</i>	1
II	<i>20 August 1968 — 10 April 1969</i>	15
III	<i>12 April 1969 — 29 June 1969</i>	43
IV	<i>1 July 1969 — 17 August 1969</i>	67
V	<i>17 August 1969 — 13 October 1969</i>	89
VI	<i>15 October 1969 — 23 February 1970</i>	111
VII	<i>23 February 1970 — 15 April 1970</i>	139
VIII	<i>15 April 1970 — 15 August 1970</i>	163
IX	<i>15 August 1970 — 26 October 1970</i>	199
X	<i>27 October 1970 — 26 December 1970</i>	225
XI	<i>26 December 1970 — 7 March 1971</i>	249
XII	<i>7 March 1971 — 5 May 1971</i>	275
XIII	<i>6 May 1971 — 25 July 1971</i>	305
XIV	<i>25 July 1971 — 26 January 1972</i>	329

INDEX	361
-------	-----

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Most importantly, we thank Sybil Stoller (d. 2019), who gave her permission to publish the complete copy of the Work Books that Masud Khan had entrusted to her and to her husband Dr. Robert Stoller (d. 1991). Robert and Sybil's ownership was passed on to their son Jonathan Stoller, who continued the permission and provided valuable support and assistance in many additional ways, along with his late husband, Dr. J. Herbert Hamsher (d. 2016).

The current publication was made possible by Dr. Virginia Ungar, President of the International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA). We are deeply grateful to her and the IPA Board of Representatives for granting us a licence to publish the Work Books as well as to IPA Executive Director, Paul Crake, for his patience, support, goodwill and skill in working out the often-complex details on the long road to licensing. We have gratitude and great respect for the three readers who very generously agreed to read 4000 pages of the Work Books to ensure that there was no violation of patient rights to confidentiality: Professor Jorge Canestri (d. 2021), Dr. Glen Gabbard and Dr. Juan Carlos Weissmann.

We thank Professor Brett Kahr for being an enthusiastic supporter of the project throughout our many years of work – most recently, in his capacity as Advisory Editor-in-Chief at Confer and Karnac Books. We are most fortunate to have worked with other members of the excellent Confer and Karnac team as well, especially the ever present, seemingly tireless and supportive Publishing Director, Christina Wipf Perry. We are grateful for her steady presence, warmth and good humour. We also appreciate the guidance, wisdom and support of Consultant Executive Director, Dr Kathy Rooney, a constant and valuable resource. Our thanks, too, to Managing Editor, Liz Wilson and Publishing Assistant, Emily Wootton for their ongoing and excellent work on behalf of this

Acknowledgements

book and Caroline McPherson for her patience and thorough touch while copyediting.

Thank you, too, Marsha Havens, — your expert eye and great patience in the initial copy-editing phase made you indispensable to us and this project.

Linda has been stimulated and supported by Jill and David Scharff and her colleagues at IPI (International Psychotherapy Institute) and IIPT (International Institute for Psychoanalytic Training) and she especially thanks her friends Jane Widseth, Michelle Kwinter, Caroline Sehon, Lynda Scalf-McIver, Anne Taylor, Colleen Sandor, Monica Valencica, Sue Cebulko and Karen Mohatt.

Steven thanks valued colleagues and dear friends Dr. Galit Atlas, Sharyn Leff, Hillary Grill and Caryn Sherman Meyer for their consistent support of this project as well as other personal and professional ventures, and his friends and colleagues on the Board of the National Institute for the Psychotherapies (NIP) and at New York University Postdoctoral Program in Psychotherapy and Psychoanalysis — especially on the Independent Track. NIP and NYU Postdoc continue to be nurturing, supportive and generative professional homes. Steven is grateful, too, to colleagues and friends on the Executive Committee and Board of the Stephen Mitchell Relational Study Center and IARPP, the International Association for Relational Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy.

Last but very far from least, our most important, heartfelt thanks and love to Larry Levner and David Flohr, who have been at the centre of Linda's and Steven's lives respectively during the many years we kept company with Khan and his Work Books.

FOREWORD

by Professor Brett Kahr

*'Some rise by sinne, and some by vertue fall:
Some run from brakes of Ice, and anfwere none,
And some condemned for a fault alone.'*

'Ejcalus', in William Shakespeare, *Measvre, for Measure*,
c. 1603–1604. First Folio Edition, *Actus Secundus, Scoena Prima*, 41–43

Many decades ago, as a young student of psychology, I happened to stumble upon a particular psychoanalytical periodical, which I had not encountered previously, namely, the *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*, first published in 1937, while browsing through the dusty and much neglected shelves of my university library. As I scanned some of the little-known and seemingly out-of-date essays contained therein, many quite dry in tone, I soon found myself rather gripped by a powerfully titled article in volume 27 of that journal, published in 1963, namely, "Silence as Communication", written by a man whose name I had not previously encountered, M. Masud R. Khan (1963).

I immediately became extremely entranced by the originality, the sensitivity, and the paradoxicality of this clinical report, in which the author argued that silence among psychoanalytical patients need not be dismissed merely as a retreat or as a defence against the verbalisation so necessary for the free-associative process but, rather, that silence might well provide the astute mental health practitioner with a great deal of data about the internal world of the quiet patient, who still has the capacity to communicate, in spite of not speaking in the traditional fashion.

Intrigued by this rather idiosyncratic essay – somewhat different in style and tone to the many sombre and stolid clinical papers that I had already read – I then searched the library catalogue and discovered that M. Masud R. Khan (1974) – a psychoanalyst based in London – had actually

written an entire book, *The Privacy of the Self*, which sounded most interesting. Back then, we had no access to swift Amazon deliveries or to on-line downloads on Kindle; hence, I searched the shelves yet again until I found a seemingly unread copy of this volume, and then reached into my pocket for my plastic student library card and presented it to the front desk assistant, who permitted me to borrow Khan's book for a period of four weeks. I must confess that I found this text so gripping that I read the entire publication from cover to cover within a mere matter of days, utterly enthralled by the intelligence and by the sensitivity of this intriguing clinical psychoanalyst, whose work I had not previously encountered.

Sometime thereafter, while pursuing my postgraduate training, I became increasingly impassioned not only by the clinical theory and practice of psychoanalysis and psychotherapy but, also, by the history of this profession, and, thus, keen to learn more about the pioneering days, I decided that I would attempt to interview as many of the elderly British psychoanalysts as possible, eager to hear about their early reminiscences, not least as most of these seniors had spent so much time with such icons as Anna Freud, Melanie Klein, Donald Winnicott, and John Bowlby – the great heroes and heroines of our field. Already highly entranced by psychoanalytical history, I conducted many in-depth, face-to-face conversations over the coming years; and, through this process, I enjoyed the tremendous privilege of meeting quite a number of these very venerable colleagues who had worked not only with Miss Freud and Dr. Winnicott, but, also, with the aforementioned Masud Khan, whose paper on 'Silence as Communication' and whose book on *The Privacy of the Self* had remained firmly in my mind.

As I became more ensconced in the mental health community, I had the opportunity to develop warm friendships and collegial relationships with quite a number of men and women who had actually undergone their very own personal psychoanalyses on Masud Khan's couch. Although most, if not all of them, described Khan as a larger-than-life figure who, as a wealthy, Indian-born aristocrat, stood out as somewhat unusual within the almost exclusively Caucasian, middle-class, English-based British Psycho-Analytical Society of the post-World War II era, each of these analysands reminisced about Khan most warmly. One ex-patient even told me that Khan had prevented this person from committing suicide. Of those former Khan analysands whom I came to know, I held each in great affection, impressed by his or her sturdiness, creativity, and kindness.

Thus, I had every reason to believe Masud Khan to be a great person, indeed, a true superstar among Freudian psychoanalysts.

One can only imagine my shock and horror when, in 1988, Khan (1988) published his final book, *When Spring Comes: Awakenings in Clinical Psychoanalysis*, in which he wrote at length about a Jewish patient, 'Mr Luis,' in the most disgusting, anti-Semitic, even Nazi-like manner. As Khan (1988, pp. 92–93) revealed: 'I warned Mr Luis: "One more personal remark about me, my wife, my staff or my things, and I will throw you out, you accursed nobody Jew. Find your own people then. Shoals of them drift around, just like you. Yes, I am anti-Semitic. You know why, Mr Luis? Because I am an Aryan and had thought all of you Jews had perished when Jesus, from sheer dismay – and he was one of you – had flown up to Heaven, leaving you in the scorching care of Hitler, Himmler and the crematoriums. Don't fret, Mr Luis; like the rest of your species, you will survive and continue to harass others, and lament, and bewail yourselves. Remarkable how Yiddish/Jewish you are. Vintage quality, too. Only you have gathered too much moss on your arse [...]"'.

Utterly speechless, not only that an eminent psychoanalyst could communicate with a patient in this fashion, but staggered, moreover, that Chatto & Windus, one of the most respected of British publishers, could release such a book, I reached out to some older colleagues, asking for clarification. How could the great Masud Khan have dared to insult one of his patients in such a Hitlerian fashion, and how could a grown-up, venerated press have possibly supported such a project?

One old-time psychoanalyst explained that Masud Khan had, in recent years, undergone many painful medical treatments for his fast-metastasising cancer and that one could therefore forgive a dying man for ranting in this seemingly insane manner. Another elderly psychoanalyst explained that Khan had always suffered from an underlying sadism and that this venomous, anti-Semitic attack on one of his analysands hardly came as a surprise.

This infamous event certainly provoked a bloody explosion, and, in consequence, the British Psycho-Analytical Society expelled Masud Khan from its membership roster. And, not long thereafter, on 7th June, 1989, Khan died at the relatively young age of sixty-four years, in complete disgrace.

But the drama did not end at that point and, some years later, one of Khan's analysands, a noted academic, Wynne Godley, revealed many

additional stories of great concern about Khan's unprofessional, unethical behaviours in such extremely accessible sources as the *London Review of Books* (Godley, 2001a), *The Times* newspaper (Godley, 2001b), and, even, in *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis* (Godley, 2004).

In response to this public shaming of Khan and of psychoanalysis more generally, at least one British psychoanalyst instigated a formal posthumous inquiry (Sandler, 2004).

By that point in time, Masud Khan had become, in the eyes of many, the Benito Mussolini of the mental health community and had subjected our profession to global shame and disrepute. Tragically, although Khan had enjoyed a warm reputation for much of the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s as a famous, influential psychoanalyst, by the 1980s and thereafter, he became known, not as a fine clinician, but, rather, in the words of one of my colleagues, an 'unethical lunatic'.

William Shakespeare had certainly anticipated a phenomenon of this nature when, in his play *Measure for Measure*, the character 'Escalus' spoke of those who 'rise by sin'. Certainly, by the early 2000s, everyone seemed to have forgotten Khan's long-standing brilliance, and the whole community focused, instead, on his multitudinous misbehaviours.

Although I experienced much hurt and much shock at having read Masud Khan's offensive book and, then, at having come to learn of his unprofessional activities (which included sexual affairs with patients and with the spouse of at least one trainee psychoanalyst), I continued to hold in mind the touching man whose paper on 'Silence as Communication' and whose other writings had impressed me as a young student, and I still recalled the fond reminiscences of several of Khan's one-time analysands who had spoken of him with such affection.

So, how on earth can one process all of this unbelievably contradictory information? Certainly, although most human beings can be regarded as complex and multi-layered, I had never before encountered someone so inspiring *and* so horrifying at the very same time.

Fortunately, as the years have unfolded, several gifted scholars have helped us to maintain a more comprehensive and nuanced approach to Khan. For instance, in 1993, some four years after his death, the British psychotherapist Judy Cooper (1993), one of his former analysands, published a short but beautifully written and highly engaging book, *Speak of Me as I Am: The Life and Work of Masud Khan*, elucidating the complexities of Khan's intimate character. And then, more than a decade later,

a British clinical psychologist, Roger Willoughby (2005), produced a well-researched study, *Masud Khan: The Myth and the Reality*. Finally, in 2006, the American psychologist and psychoanalyst, Dr. Linda Hopkins, broke new ground with the completion of her remarkable biography, *False Self: The Life of Masud Khan*, which, in my estimation, remains the best psychoanalytical life history ever published. Collectively, these deeply important contributions to Khanian scholarship have helped us to reconsider this brilliant, but damaged, man in a much more thorough and comprehensive manner.

In many ways, the late, great Pearl King, a former President of the British Psycho-Analytical Society and a venerable historian of our field, who had trained alongside Khan back in the late 1940s and early 1950s, encapsulated the complexities of this unusual man most succinctly. In one of my interviews with Miss King, she underscored, ‘Of course he was good’ (quoted in Kahr, 2005); but, in a further discussion, some days thereafter, she revealed, ‘There’s more than one Masud’ (King, 2005).

Of all of the members of the psychoanalytical community from Professor Sigmund Freud to the present day, I cannot think of anyone more ‘filmic’ than Masud Khan. He led such a rich and full and volcanic life that his biography could well form the basis of a remarkable series on Netflix. Undoubtedly, part of our ongoing interest in Khan stems from our voyeuristic preoccupation with such a theatrical character who remains a fantastic source of gossip and titillation and, also, potential shame to those who worked by his side. As mental health practitioners, we have an obligation not only to learn about the origins of our profession, but we must also acquire a better understanding of how and why one of our most esteemed and best-trained predecessors could have become so unwell, so criminal, and so violent, while also maintaining his profound insight and, at times, his deep creativity.

Thankfully, due to the hard work and vigilance of Khan’s biographer, the psychoanalyst Dr. Linda Hopkins, and her colleague, Dr. Steven Kuchuck (2021), a leading theorist and practitioner of relational psychoanalysis, we now have an opportunity to learn even more about the private world of Masud Khan than ever before. Over many years, Hopkins and Kuchuck have toiled devotedly to prepare Khan’s multiple Work Books for publication. These texts – private diaries, in fact – contain virtually nothing about his ventures as a day-to-day clinical psychoanalyst, and they certainly violate no privacies or confidentialities with patients;

instead, the Work Books reveal an enormous amount about the personal life of Khan and about both the robustness and, also, the fragility of his inner world. These beautifully edited diaries, crisply contained in one engagingly readable volume, offer us a deeply privileged insight into the mind of a highly challenging, hugely complex, tremendously worrying but, also, immensely inspiring individual.

If ever we needed a manual to help us understand the complexities of human psychology, I can think of no project more gripping and more revealing than the Work Books of Masud Khan, and I extend my warmest thanks to both Dr. Hopkins and Dr. Kuchuck for bringing these important historical documents to life in such a thoughtful and generous and scholarly fashion.

References

- Cooper, Judy (1993). *Speak of Me as I Am: The Life and Work of Masud Khan*. London: H. Karnac (Books).
- Godley, Wynne (2001a). Saving Masud Khan. *London Review of Books*. 22nd February, pp. 3, 5–7.
- Godley, Wynne (2001b). My Lost Hours on the Couch. *The Times*. Section 2. 23rd February, pp. 2–5.
- Godley, Wynne (2004). Commentary. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 85, 42–43.
- Hopkins, Linda (2006). *False Self: The Life of Masud Khan*. New York: Other Press.
- Kahr, Brett (2005). Interview with Pearl King. 20th October.
- Khan, M. Masud R. (1963). Silence as Communication. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*, 27, 300–313.
- Khan, M. Masud R. (1974). *The Privacy of the Self*. London: Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis.
- Khan, M. Masud R. (1988). *When Spring Comes: Awakenings in Clinical Psychoanalysis*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- King, Pearl (2005). Personal Communication to the Author. 29th October.
- Kuchuck, Steven (2021). *The Relational Revolution in Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy*. London: Confer Books.
- Sandler, Anne-Marie (2004). Institutional Responses to Boundary Violations: The Case of Masud Khan. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 85, 27–42.
- Willoughby, Roger (2005). *Masud Khan: The Myth and the Reality*. London: Free Association Books.

PREFACE

by Linda Hopkins and Steven Kuchuck

'The Work Books are the most exciting writings being produced by any psychoanalyst, and whatever can be published some day will be mined for years after, because of the ideas you have so easily dropped in. Every time I pick them up, I grab at them greedily, unwilling to stop reading. They are really marvelous.'

(Letter, Robert Stoller to Masud Khan, 8 January 1973)

These Work Books are an extraordinary gift to the analytic world, crown jewels from Masud Khan (1924–1989). Four thousand pages in 39 volumes, written in the years 1967–1980, they are his attempt at ‘a generalized knowing of myself and others’ (1) – where the ‘others’ are the central figures of the international world of psychoanalysis and the arts. Although both personal and professional, this is not a clinical diary – the Work Books (as Khan called his diaries) were meant for posthumous publication, and Khan as an experienced editor knew the limitations on publishing patient information. Instead, Khan turns his brilliance and caustic wit to an account of how he experienced his world and self as he moved regularly between London, Paris and California. We also witness the development of his theoretical formulations and writing process as he shares experiences of labouring over what would become some of his best-known papers, chapters and books. He freely shares his struggles with theoretical and other politics of the British, French and international psychoanalytic societies and with the Freud family.

A Muslim man without a country (born in Northern India, Khan left before it became Pakistan for a life in the UK, where he never became a citizen), Khan writes in clear, beautiful English, his fifth language, describing the innermost circles of his world with the mind

Preface

and perspective of an outsider who dares to think and say anything. Khan writes for an invisible audience – only Robert and Sybil Stoller witness the copy as it is written – and it seems to us that he writes without attempting to impress or fool people, all the while telling his private truth.

Masud Khan is remembered in mostly negative ways these days, despite his major contributions to the analytic world. He is (especially in his later years) summarized as a braggart, a liar, an analyst who slept with his patients, a bigot, an anti-Semite – and, in his last five years specifically, a ‘mad’ alcoholic who destroyed his accomplishments. But even his critics acknowledge his brilliance as a writer and thinker. As Eric Rayner said to Linda Hopkins, ‘Masud’s soul came from the Devil and his writing came from the Gods.’ (2) Rayner’s words capture Khan as a true paradox in the Winnicottian sense, where paradox, not conflict, is the essence of human life. (3) He was a wonderful-terrible, magnificent-disgusting man who influenced people in different and major ways. He was a devoted and beloved friend and analyst to quite a few people at the same time as he was deeply flawed and, in later years, caused great harm to his patients and others. In the first years of these Work Books, the ones that are published here, he was at the centre of international psychoanalysis and perhaps the most popular writer and speaker in that world.

The Work Books contain new information about important people. For psychoanalysts, the most treasured content concerns Donald Winnicott, significant peers in England (Anna Freud, Charles Rycroft, Joe Sandler, Wilfred Bion, Pearl King and many more) and major friends in Paris (Wladimir Granoff, J.-B. Pontalis, André Green, Victor Smirnoff and others). As a participant in the world of the arts, Khan tells us about the ballet world of his wife, prima ballerina Svetlana Beriosova, and also gives personal accounts of Michael Redgrave and his family, Julie Andrews and her first husband Tony Walton, Mike Nichols, Rudolph Nureyev and Henri Cartier-Bresson, among others. Throughout the Work Books, we hear about Robert and Sybil Stoller, the dear California friends (Robert also a central figure in psychoanalysis) who were always present for him with love and support.

It is something of a miracle that the Work Books can be published now. In the 33 years since Khan’s death, they have been neglected, rescued, blocked, had their copyright probed by lawyers and, in the end, approved for publication while, at about the same time, the original copy was deliberately destroyed. Publication should have been easy. The Stollers had been given a carbon of the complete Work Books, along with

Preface

instructions that they should arrange for disposition and publication if Khan died before they did. He also gave them a copyright. When he died, however, it was discovered that he had left his entire estate to a Pakistani relative who did not care about the papers, and the legal copyright given to the Stollers had somehow become lost. Khan's literary estate, which included the original set of Work Books, various correspondences and unpublished writing, ended up being housed at the International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA). This was the only place that could be found to accept these documents quickly, although scholars were not allowed access to the archive. Robert Stoller died in 1992, leaving his wife Sybil as the sole inheritor of the Stoller (carbon) copy of the Work Books.

The story of the current publication of the Work Books begins with Sybil Stoller giving me (Linda Hopkins/LH), in 1998, the legal right to make scholarly use of her complete copy. She had come to trust me after several years of interviews for my biography of Khan. (4) I discovered that the IPA had also been given a copyright by Khan's lawyer when the papers were deposited there; and it took several years of negotiation and legal consultation before they agreed that they would not claim copyright privileges for the Stoller copy. After the biography was published, I asked Steven Kuchuck, a relational analyst, writer and book series editor in New York City, to help me edit the Work Books and prepare them for publication. We secured a publishing contract and then worked hard at editing down. This task was challenging enough, but soon it became even more onerous.

Pressured by an influential British trained analyst, Mr X, who claimed falsely that we were publishing patient information, our publishing contract was put on hold and then cancelled. Under the same pressure, the IPA decided that it would no longer honour its earlier agreement with LH that it did not claim control of the Stoller copy. We objected to their change in policy and, after a lengthy period of negotiation, the IPA President and Board agreed to give us a licence for publication with one condition: three IPA-member analysts of their choosing would read the 4000 edited pages and they would have to agree that no confidential patient information was being published. Over a period of five months, the three readers gave generously of their time and unanimously agreed that the IPA condition had been met.

In the spring of 2021, more than two decades after the first attempt to publish these Work Books as per Khan's original intention, the IPA granted us a licence. (5) We found a new home for this work at the

wonderful Karnac Books. But the story doesn't end there. In true Khan style, there had been a dramatic, even appalling, ending to the rest of his archive two years earlier. Due to a change in British law, the IPA had decided they were no longer comfortable and/or legally entitled to continue holding the Khan papers and so they attempted to give them back to Khan's original lawyer, who refused to take them. At the lawyer's request and tragically for historians of psychoanalysis, the entire Khan archive – the original set of Work Books, his correspondence and other historically important papers – was destroyed in the spring of 2019. The end of this long story is that we now have possession of the only full version of Khan's Work Books, (6) and it is a copy that we have legal permission to publish.

Even after being cut by 75 per cent, the Work Books are the equivalent of three lengthy books. This current publication is an abbreviated version of Volumes 1–14; we hope to publish the remaining 25 at a future date. These first 14 volumes cover the years 1967 to 1972, and the reader can experience Khan still in good mental and physical health, living a rich and full life. After a long absence from his homeland, he starts returning to his estate in Pakistan and has a lot to say about East–West differences. One of the major problems he faces during this period is the increasing alcoholism of his wife, and her resistance to psychotherapy or psychoanalysis.

Volume 14 ends in 1972, just after what Khan calls “the terrible year” (1971), a year that included three major losses: the death of his beloved analyst, mentor and friend Winnicott; the death of Khan's mother in Pakistan; and the dissolution of his marriage. Of these, he writes most about the loss of Winnicott. In later volumes, he continues to write about this treasured relationship, but there is also much more about French and German collegial connections and psychoanalytic politics, and those Work Books include more information about his private, non-professional life. What follows now is a concise guide to key biographical milestones, educational and professional accomplishments, as well as a historical timeline in order to provide relevant context for and orientation to the Work Books.

A Brief Overview of the life of Mohammed Masud Raza Khan (1924–89)

Khan was born in the Punjab area of pre-partition British India, now Pakistan, to a wealthy military family. The second of three children born to his Muslim father's fourth wife, he had an older brother and eight older

half-brothers (his mother had a son from her first marriage, in which she was widowed), but was sole heir to his father's large estate, which Khan managed throughout his years of living in London. In British India, Khan received an MA in Literature at the University of the Punjab in Lahore, where he wrote his thesis on James Joyce. In 1946, he moved to London in order to pursue a doctorate in literature at Oxford, but also to enter psychoanalysis. John Bowlby misinterpreted his letter inquiring about how to begin treatment with Edward Glover, thinking it was an application for training, and he approved Khan for the British analytic programme. Since Glover was no longer a member of the British Society, Bowlby referred him to Ella Freeman Sharpe. Khan favourably considered Bowlby's offer and decided to begin psychoanalysis with Sharpe and enroll in the training programme, dropping out of the graduate programme in literature.

Khan's emigration to the West occurred one year prior to the violent partition of India into the primarily Hindu nation of India and Muslim Pakistan. For personal and professional reasons, Khan stayed in London for the remainder of his life, although he made extended visits to his estate in Pakistan. He started his analytic training at the very young age of 22, qualified as associate member of the British Psychoanalytic Association in 1950 at age 26, as a child analyst two years later, and as a training and supervising analyst in 1959, at age 35. Khan's first two analysts, Ella Freeman Sharpe and John Rickman, both died of heart attacks while he was in treatment in 1946–47 and 1947–51, respectively. Khan then went to D. W. Winnicott, who also had heart problems and also eventually died of a heart attack, although after Khan's 15-year treatment with him (a combination of a few years of formal analysis and then 'therapeutic coverage' from 1951 to 1966) (7) had formally ended. Khan got the very best training experience one could find; his supervisors included Clifford Scott, Marion Milner, Melanie Klein, Anna Freud (who eventually became his analyst for a short period of time near the end of his life) and Winnicott (for child analysis). Although the 'therapeutic coverage' with Winnicott ended in 1966, the two continued a very close relationship and editorial collaboration up until Winnicott's death in 1971.

Khan was Winnicott's 'principal disciple' (8) and in addition to being Winnicott's editor, the theoretical collaboration is clear in reading both men's work. He was known not only for his keen intellect and theoretical prowess, but also for his skill as a writer. '... Khan's writings ... convey far more of the living reality of psychoanalytic therapy (and of psychoanalysis) than do nearly all the descriptions of interviews

Preface

that one ordinarily encounters' (Searles, 1982–83, p. 475). (9) He was a sought-after presenter, an influential editor of the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, and a highly regarded book and book series editor. In 1975, Erik Erikson noted that 'The next decade in psychoanalysis belongs to Khan' (see M. Khan, Work Books, 28 July 1975).

Khan married Svetlana Beriosova, a leading ballerina with the Royal Ballet, in 1959. Beriosova and Khan never had children and divorced in 1974. They remained close and Khan willingly helped to support her for the rest of his life. Neither remarried.

Khan's physical and mental health and life circumstances rapidly deteriorated following Winnicott's death. A lifelong smoker, in 1976 he was diagnosed with terminal lung cancer, with a prognosis for survival of 3–6 months. Surprisingly, he lived for 13 more years, despite a recurrence of the cancer following an earlier remission. The cause of his eventual death was more directly related to alcoholism than to cancer. Khan also suffered from likely bipolar disorder with clearly documented symptoms of depression, mania and extremely severe insomnia.

As mentioned, Khan's later career was marred by pathological boundary violations that included socializing with patients as well as sexual relationships with several of them, and anti-Semitism. In the late 1970s, his training analyst privileges were revoked and then, just prior to his death, he was expelled from the British Psycho-Analytic Society, which meant that he was also automatically removed from the International Psychoanalytical Association as well.

Khan's lasting reputation is ensured by numerous articles, book chapters and introductions, and four books, three of them highly regarded and the last one scandalous for its blatant anti-Semitic and rambling text: *The Privacy of the Self* (1974), *Alienation in Perversions* (1979), *Hidden Selves* (1983) and *When Spring Comes: Awakenings in Clinical Psychoanalysis* (1988; published in the United States as *The Long Wait*).

It remains to be seen whether or not Khan's negative reputation will be altered by the publication of these Work Books. Regardless, in the pages that follow, we believe that he reveals himself to be brilliant, insightful, charming, repulsive and, perhaps more than anything, profoundly human. He himself thinks the writing is good: 'Of all my efforts at the notation of my self-experience, these [Work Books] satisfy me the most' (M. Khan, Work Books, 13 March 1970).

Preface

Notes to the Preface

- (1) M. Khan, Work Book, 23 February 1970.
- (2) Private communication of Eric Rayner to Linda Hopkins.
- (3) 'As I see it, the characteristic feature of DWW's theorizing is that whereas Freud saw conflict as the central issue of human experience, DWW considers paradox as the essential human reality. For Freud, resolution of conflict constituted the aim of therapeutic effort, and for DWW it is the realization of paradox without its resolution that constitutes psychic health and creativity.'
(M. Khan, Work Book, 16 July 1970.)
- (4) Hopkins, L. *False Self: The Life of Masud Khan*. London: Karnac, 2008 and New York: Other Press, 2006.
- (5) We are grateful to Virginia Ungar, President of the IPA, to the IPA Board of Representatives, to Paul Crake, IPA Executive Director and to the three IPA members who generously volunteered their time to read the long copy of the Work Books.
- (6) A therapist in London, Judy Cooper, was the first biographer of Khan (Cooper, J. 1993. *Think of Me as I Am: The Life and Work of Masud Khan*. London: Karnac), and she has a copy of the first few volumes of the Work Books, carbon copies given to her by Khan – but she does not have the right to publish them. Khan originally made three carbons – the original typed Work Books were bound, the first carbon copy was for his own use, the second carbon went to the Stollers and the third partial set to Cooper. After the gift to Cooper, however, Khan noticed that the text was reproducing poorly, and he started making only two carbon copies – one for his private use, and one for the Stollers.
- (7) Khan said that his analysis lasted 15 years, but it is likely that it was much shorter, even as short as one year with the rest of the time being in Winnicott's 'coverage' (seen as needed) until 1966 when the therapeutic relationship ended.
- (8) John Sutherland referred to Khan as 'Winnicott's principal disciple'. See J. Scharff, *The Autonomous Self: The Work of John D. Sutherland*. Northvale, New Jersey: Aronson, 1994.
- (9) Searles, H. (1982–83). The Analyst as Manager of the Patient's Daily Life: Transference and Countertransference Dimensions of this Relationship. *International Journal of Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy* 9, 475–486.

Guide to names

Khan refers to many distinguished people in the Work Books and also many who will likely be unfamiliar to the reader. We have chosen to reproduce the Work Books with minimal explanation of who these people are. However, it is important to know the following: 'Pnin', referred to throughout, is Victor Smirnoff, a French analyst and a very close friend to Khan. 'Wova' is Wladimir Granoff, also a French analyst and close friend. Finally, there are several pseudonyms noted that refer to people who chose these pseudonyms for Hopkin's book *False Self*.

NOTE TO THE READER

Masud Khan generates very strong reactions of all types, and so it is perhaps not surprising that the publication of the Work Books has been experienced as provocative by some, even prior to their having been read. At the same time that we have received significant support, we have also endured criticisms and serious attempts to block publication. Two areas of concern have been expressed. The first is that the Work Books contain private details about the analysis of patients; the second is that we might damage Donald Winnicott's reputation.

With regard to Khan's patients and their treatments, these are not part of the published Work Books. The unedited version has a very small amount of patient information, mostly with pseudonyms and with no treatment details. It was very easy to remove this in its entirety. Khan had a separate book where he apparently did write about them, but he did not share this with others and it was destroyed, either at his death, or in the destruction of the complete Khan archives in 2019. The International Psychoanalytical Association required three readers of their choice to read the complete, unedited Work Books (more than 4000 pages) in order to ensure that patient privacy was not being violated before they granted us a licence to publish. All three readers agreed that patient confidentiality had absolutely been maintained.

With regard to Donald Winnicott's reputation, we believe it is of scholarly importance to tell the story of his actual relationship with Masud Khan, albeit as perceived and recorded by Khan. This narrative reveals Winnicott to be less of an idealized, mythical figure and rather – like all of us – a more complex, sometimes inconsistent and certainly three-dimensional human being. They were very close, and in addition to having his own brilliant and creative mind, Khan was a disruptive and eventually a very disturbed person. While readers must come to their own conclusions, perhaps as in a psychoanalysis, we can't always know which of Khan's responses to Winnicott are transference-based, and which are 'real'.

Some have claimed that Linda Hopkins has perpetuated a false and damaging belief that the Khan–Winnicott analysis lasted 15 years. It is true that Hopkins did originally believe that, because in the first biography of Khan, Judy Cooper states: 'Khan's formal analysis with Winnicott lasted for 15 years' (*Speak of Me as I Am*, London: Karnac, 1993, p. 20). But for more than two decades, Hopkins has been aware that the analysis was probably much shorter, with 1–5 years of formal work followed by what Winnicott called 'coverage', in which Khan occasionally went for therapy sessions with Winnicott. In public talks and writings about Khan for more than two decades, Hopkins has made it explicitly clear that the formal analysis was probably much less than 15 years.

Khan's story is fascinating, and it is far from simple. With the publication of these Work Books, readers can finally decide for themselves what they think and feel about him, based on his own words. We hope that they are a stimulus for thought or even compassion for this gifted, but troubled man, even though we can imagine that they might also generate upset and outrage. At a minimum, we expect they will stir intellectual excitement and insight into a fervent mind and era.

I

WORK BOOK

14 August 1967 — 20 August 1968



For Bob and Sybil, on Sybil's birthday, with much love.

Masud & Svetlana, 11 July 1969, London

Footnote: These Work Books are the Stoller copy of Khan's Work Books. The original was destroyed in 2019, but this is an exact copy, given to Linda Hopkins for scholarly use by Sybil Stoller in 1998.

WORK BOOK I

'Is there any cause in Nature that makes these hard hearts?'

(King Lear)

[Note: Shakespeare's *King Lear* and Dostoevsky's *The Idiot* were the two works that had the deepest and longest impact on MK. He reported that he saw 27 performances of *King Lear* in London in the first autumn after he arrived there – see LH, *False Self*, p. 25.]

14 August 1967

3 Hans Crescent, London

The central theme of Camus' *La Chute* is: *The scream of primary helplessness which cannot be expressed without a facilitating environment and hence cannot be heard.* This, in fact, is the basic private predicament of Camus, deriving from the symbiotic meconnaissance of his relation to his mother [in English, failure to recognize, important in Lacan's theory].

18 August 1967

The negation of vulnerability of self eliminates growth.

My experiments with the analytic technique are towards a *contest* with the true self of the patient. My stance is at variance with DWW's induction of *redemptive* dependence through regressions.

The last sentence of Dostoyevsky's *The Idiot*: 'And all this, and all this abroad, it's all just an illusion!' How true of my own experience.

This ghastly negative will of the Christian faith. It has tainted me too: through my mother at first, then during the past 20 years of living here. I still retain at the darkest hours and in my deepest moods of despair a sense of colour and joyous faith in the livingness of all life. Yet my machinery of concern certainly derives from this negative will and virtue.

Post-war generation produced three intellectuals in British Society: Charles [Rycroft], R. D. Laing, Khan. Khan was politely sacked today by Jock [Sutherland] from *IJPA* [*International Journal of Psychoanalysis*] after 10 years of service.