

PSYCHOANALYSIS GLOBALLY NETWORKED

The Origins of the
International Federation
of Psychoanalytic Societies

Andrea Huppke

Translated by Robin Verner

IFPS
INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF
PSYCHOANALYTIC SOCIETIES


KARNAC
firing the mind

Contents

Acknowledgements	vii
About the author	ix
Preface	xi
<i>by Marco Conci, Christer Sjödin, and Grigoris Maniadakis</i>	
Introduction	xix

Part I **The early years**

1. The prehistory of the International Federation of Psychoanalytic Societies (IFPS)	3
2. The origins and expansion of the IFPS	27
3. Forums and workshops in the 1960s and 1970s	63
4. Developments through the 1970s and 1980s	103

Part II
Psychoanalytic dissidents

5. Liberal, orthodox, and dissident psychoanalysis	141
6. Conceptualising the IFPS	167
Conclusion	183
References	195
Appendix	209
Index	215

Acknowledgements

Many colleagues and friends have contributed to this monograph. Some have made documents available to me, others have provided valuable information, and many have encouraged and supported me. First and foremost, I would like to thank the IFPS Archive Commission for their painstaking work in researching the relevant documents. Professor Michael Ermann, Professor Klaus Hoffmann, Dr Marco Conci, Dr Rainer Funk, and Dr Edith Frank-Rieser have researched documents both in the archives of the psychoanalytic institutes and in their own archives. Their evaluation makes the history of the IFPS replicable. Until 2019 the IFPS archive was located at the Centre for Psychiatry Reichenau (Professor Klaus Hoffmann) and can now be found at the Archive on the History of Psychoanalysis at the Federal Archives (Berlin/Koblenz). All my sources are from the IFPS archive unless otherwise noted. I am greatly indebted to all the persons mentioned. Without their groundwork and individual support, I would not have been able to complete this project. Edith Frank-Rieser and Rainer Funk made additional material available to me and thus helped to answer important questions. Professor Klaus Hoffmann and Professor Thomas Müller supervised the work, helped me give it form, and improved it

with many important suggestions; Marco Conci explained Harry Stack Sullivan's approach to me as well as his influence on the IFPS. I would also like to thank the Berlin Forum for the History of Psychoanalysis; specifically, Regine Locket, Ulrike May, Ludger Hermanns, and Michael Schröter, for their dedicated interest in the IFPS, which has unfortunately received little historical attention. Regine Locket generously made her earlier work on the IFPS and many documents from her personal archive available to me. All four colleagues have also given me so much valuable feedback. Ludger Hermanns, as chairman of the Association Archive for the History of Psychoanalysis, gave me access to materials in the Federal Archives in Koblenz. Jakov Katwan as former general secretary of the IFPS, Elisabeth von Strachwitz as an early and committed participant in IFPS meetings, and Michael Ermann as a long-time DPG¹ delegate to the IFPS have all shared their experiences with the IFPS with me in interviews. The emeritus professor of sociology, Ute Gerhardt, has assisted in clarifying the institutional background of the IFPS. Many friends have accompanied me in the various phases of development of the work. I would like to mention just a few of them here and thank Robin Verner, László Kruppa, Vera Kattermann, Carolin Keller, Norbert Somnitz, and Elisabeth Fink for their patience and interest.

¹German Psychoanalytical Society (DPG). For the history of the DPG see Part I, Chapter 2.

About the author

Andrea Huppke is psychoanalyst, group analyst, supervisor, and training analyst in Berlin, Germany. She has written several publications in the field of the history of psychoanalysis, most of them published in *Luzifer-Amor: Journal for the History of Psychoanalysis*. She wrote her dissertation about the first twenty years of the IFPS; it was published in German in 2021.

Preface

*Marco Conci, Christer Sjödin, and Grigoris Maniadakis—
August 2022*

On July 30, 1962, in Amsterdam, the representatives of the German Psychoanalytical Society (Werner Schwidder and Franz Heigl), of the Mexican Psychoanalytic Society (Erich Fromm and Jorge Silva García), and of the Wiener Arbeitskreis für Tiefenpsychologie (Igor Caruso and Raoul Schindler) signed the foundation agreement of the International Federation of Psychoanalytic Societies (IFPS)—at the time called simply *Internationale Psychoanalytische Organisation*, German being its first official language. On October 19–22, 2022, the IFPS met in Madrid for its XXII. International Forum organised by the Executive Committee chaired by Juan Flores (Santiago de Chile), and by the Centro Psicoanalítico de Madrid with Miguel Angel Gonzalez Torres as chair of the Organizing Committee, and celebrated the sixtieth anniversary of the Federation. The English edition of this unique book (originally published in German in 2021) marks this important occasion and also inaugurates a new IFPS book series, published by Karnac and coordinated by Marco Conci. Andrea Huppke's book is the first historical account not only of the complex events which made the foundation of the IFPS possible, but also of the first twenty formative years—ending with the emergence of English as the official language of the Federation.

First, let us say a few words about how the IFPS was founded, before dealing with the vital role it can still play in the evolution and promotion of psychoanalysis as a science and as a profession.

When the International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA) reconvened in Zurich in the summer of 1949 for its XVI. Congress, chaired by Ernest Jones (1879–1958), the German Psychoanalytical Society (DPG) was represented by two men who had been members of the Society during the Nazi Regime (1933–1945). Carl Müller-Braunschweig (1881–1958) seemed more aware than Harald Schultz-Hencke (1892–1953) of what had been going on in their country under Hitler’s dictatorship. Schultz-Hencke was not only undiplomatic in this regard in Zurich, but was also guilty of having been critical of Freud’s libido theory since the 1930s. The IPA business meeting decided to readmit the German Society into the IPA only under the condition that Schultz-Hencke resign from the DPG. He did not and the German Psychoanalytical Society was not readmitted. Carl Müller-Braunschweig founded an alternative German group, the German Psychoanalytical Association (DPV), which became an IPA member society in 1951. Left without the international network guaranteed by the IPA, the DPG was eager and ready to contribute to the foundation of the IFPS and became the most active group for the next twenty years and more.

In the important, rich, and detailed paper, “The Exclusion of Erich Fromm from the IPA” (2001), Paul Roazen (1936–2005)—the North American pioneer of the establishment of the history of psychoanalysis as an autonomous interdisciplinary field—was able to demonstrate how Fromm was dropped from the roster of the IPA, without his knowing about it, for having been at odds with the basic principles of Freudian psychoanalysis. Born in Frankfurt, and trained as a sociologist, Erich Fromm (1900–1980), contributed to founding the second German psychoanalytic training institute in Frankfurt, before he started his work intent on placing psychoanalysis at the heart of a new “science of man”. From a certain perspective, it is true that he deviated from Freud’s original concepts, but starting with his 1941 book, *Escape from Freedom*, Fromm wrote a whole series of bestsellers familiarising the lay reader with psychoanalysis more than any other psychoanalyst after Freud. He not only made a substantial contribution to the foundation of the

IFPS in 1962, but also inspired and motivated a whole series of colleagues (from Mexico to Italy) to become active in the Federation.

Igor Caruso (1914–1981), a psychologist with an Italian and Russian background, after his studies at the University of Louvain (Belgium) arrived in Vienna in 1942. After completing his training analysis, probably with Viktor Emil Freiherr von Gebattel (1883–1976), he was courageous enough to found a psychoanalytic institute in Vienna in 1947, the Wiener Arbeitskreis für Tiefenpsychologie, conceived as an open and autonomous scientific community rejecting any form of strict orthodoxy. The philosophically and socially informed psychoanalysis he created in the following years contributed to make psychoanalysis known in Austria beyond Vienna, allowing him to create a whole network of institutes (Arbeitskreise) in Innsbruck, Salzburg, Linz, and Graz, all of which still exist today and participate in the life of the IFPS—except for the Wiener Arbeitskreis, which joined the IPA in 2001. The author of *Die Trennung der Liebenden (Love and Separation)* (1967), Caruso spent the last ten years of his life teaching psychology at the University of Salzburg, where he inspired the creativity of a whole generation of young students. Given the nature and very high standards of the IPA, psychoanalysis had barely existed outside the major European capitals. Bringing psychoanalysis to the periphery—as Caruso did not only in Austria, but also with the institutes he founded in South America in the 1960s—represents one of the priorities distinguishing the IFPS from the IPA.

It is no wonder that the William Alanson White Institute—founded by Harry Stack Sullivan (1892–1949), Erich Fromm, Frieda Fromm-Reichmann (1889–1957), Clara Thompson (1893–1958), and Jane and David Rioch in 1943—joined the IFPS shortly after its foundation in 1960, on the initiative of Gerard Chrzawnoski (1913–2000), who became a most active member over many years. In the reconstruction of the biography of Sullivan (Conci, 2010), it becomes evident that given his stature and charisma he was not dropped from the list of the members of the American Psychoanalytic Association (APsaA) and of the IPA. However, after his death in 1949 the W. A. White Society chaired by Clara Thompson never became a member society of the APsaA—withdrawing its application in the mid-1950s and contributing to the

founding of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis (1956) instead. Sullivan was not only the founder of interpersonal psychiatry and interpersonal psychoanalysis, but also one of the most important pioneers of contemporary psychoanalysis (see also Greenberg & Mitchell, 1983), as far as the “interpersonal field concept” is concerned, and through it the development and evolution of our contemporary concept of Self. Furthermore, as a major source of inspiration for Stephen Mitchell’s (1946–2000) formulation of “relational psychoanalysis” (see Mitchell, 1988), and for the revolutionary work done by Daniel Stern (1934–2012) in terms of the “interpersonal development of the infant” (see Stern, 1985), Sullivan’s legacy still lacks the recognition it deserves.

The scientific and professional background behind the foundation of the Milan Associazione di Studi Psicoanalitici (ASP)—which became a member society of IFPS at the VIII. Forum held in Rio de Janeiro in October 1989—was quite similar. This was also the first IFPS event in which Marco Conci participated, while still a candidate—not missing any IFPS event ever since. Gaetano Benedetti (1920–2013), who had trained in the 1950s with the Swiss Psychoanalytic Society and was a pioneer in the field of the analytic psychotherapy of schizophrenia, was not allowed to teach his method to the Swiss candidates, because at the time such a way of working was not considered “genuinely psychoanalytic”—as he himself reported in his 1994 autobiography (see Benedetti, 1994). This is why, together with the German IPA training analyst Johannes Cremerius (1918–2002), at the invitation of their first group of trainees, they founded the Milan institute where Marco Conci trained at the end of the 1980s.

We add this information—going beyond the time window of Andrea Huppke’s historical reconstruction—to demonstrate the common denominators of the societies founding and later joining the IFPS. As the reader can see, we discuss the IPA not only in terms of its mission to determine which form of psychoanalysis is genuinely Freudian or not, but we also underline the fact that the Federation was much more interested in psychoanalytic psychotherapy—as opposed to classical psychoanalysis—than the IPA. Not only the treatment of adult neurotic patients, but also the treatment of patients affected by personality disorders and by schizophrenia, have always found a place within the IFPS—and only later within the IPA. We are not referring only to the

above-mentioned case of Gaetano Benedetti, but also to the pioneering contributions made by Harry Stack Sullivan and Frieda Fromm-Reichmann in the 1920s–1930s (see Fromm-Reichmann, 1939; Sullivan, 1924). No wonder that the pioneering work done by Sándor Ferenczi (1873–1933) in the same field was not seriously taken into consideration within the IPA till the end of the 1980s (see Aron & Harris, 1993; Bonomi, 1999; Ferenczi, 1988).

The same is true for the field of epidemiological and empirical research, originally cultivated by the German Psychoanalytical Society in such a creative and convincing way that, since 1967, Germany's national health insurance covers access to analytic psychotherapy. In fact, German patients have the right to treatment three times a week on the couch, a frequency recognised only in 2017 by the executive board of the IPA (with Stefano Bolognini as its president) as analytically appropriate. Meanwhile, thrice weekly sessions represent the frequency the IFPS stood for from the very beginning, together with the recognition of the benefits of a pluralistic orientation.

Being bound to more rigid and hierarchical standards—the benefits of which we do not at all wish to minimise—it took many years before the IPA could arrive at an explicit formulation of a pluralistic point of view, as was formalised by the then IPA president Robert Wallerstein (1921–2014) in his famous paper, “One Psychoanalysis or Many?” (1988a). As a consequence of the new and creative climate within the IPA, the German Psychoanalytical Society found its way back into the IPA, becoming a member society in 2009 at the 46th IPA Congress held in Chicago. Of course, it was a long and interesting journey—in which one of us (MC) had the chance to participate—very well described not only by Ingo Focke (2010), but also by Anne-Marie Sandler (1925–2018) (see 2015). The Swedish Psychoanalytic Association (upon the initiative of Arne Jemstedt), the Vienna Association (chaired by August Ruhs), and the W. A. White Psychoanalytic Society also took advantage of the opportunity to join the IPA—the latter becoming a member society in 2015 at the 49th IPA Congress held in Boston. Such a haemorrhage of members endangered the life of the IFPS, but—surprisingly for many of us—the Federation was able to survive. In August 2020 Andrea Huppke found more than thirty member societies on the IFPS web-page, <https://ifps.info>.

A final significant difference between the IFPS and the IPA is represented by the fact that the IFPS is a federation of societies, whereas the IPA admits only the single psychoanalyst as a member—each trained within their own national society. If this allows the IPA to guarantee stricter and higher standards of training and competence, and makes it more attractive and prestigious, it does not necessarily mean that IPA members participate actively in the international exchange the IPA stands for. Only 30 per cent of the 12,000 IPA members took part in the last elections of the Executive Committee. As we know, analytic training (in the IPA and in the IFPS) often has little influence—unfortunately—on the sense of social responsibility of our profession.

The change in IPA policy, turning towards pluralism, was not the only cause of the identity crisis of the IFPS which Andrea Huppke describes at the end of her book—having dealt with the complex vicissitudes, dynamics, and events through which the Federation kept growing to the point of representing a kind of “second force” (after the IPA) in the international psychoanalytic landscape. It was also caused, paradoxically, by the most successful event ever organised by the IFPS, the VI. IFPS Forum in Berlin in the summer of 1977, with more than 900 participants and almost 200 papers. It ended up confronting the Federation with the following question: should the IFPS strive to become a large, well-structured, and complex organisation like the IPA, or should it remain a loose international network cultivating the international scientific and professional exchange needed to work in our field? The author reconstructs this crucial phase for the first time, and she does it very accurately, based on the IFPS archives put at her disposal by the IFPS Archive Commission (originally founded by Carlo Bonomi) chaired by Klaus Hoffmann—and cited throughout the book.

Andrea Huppke, a very experienced individual and group psychoanalyst, lives and works in Berlin and is also an associate editor of the IFPS journal, the *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*. Well-equipped as she was to author this book, it is nonetheless an endeavour of love. We will not go into any more detail, hoping with our Preface to have sparked as much curiosity and interest as this book of hers deserves. Of course, we do wish that every member of the IFPS will—through reading her book—eventually become as familiar as possible with its complex and adventurous history. To help the reader in this

regard, we refer to the extensive and detailed review mentioned in the References (see Conci, 2021).

It is also a pleasure to have the chance to report to the reader our own experience with the IFPS, particularly regarding our work as editors of the *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*. The foundation of the *IFP* journal, with Jan Stensson (Stockholm) as a founding editor and first editor-in-chief, with Volume 1 appearing in 1992 published by the Scandinavian University Press, was an important factor in the resolution of the above-mentioned identity crisis of the early 1980s. Christer Sjödin worked with Stensson from the very beginning, Marco Conci became a member of the editorial board in 1994, and Grigoris Maniadakis joined in 2009. Jan Stensson edited the journal until 2004, with Christer Sjödin working beside him as a co-editor-in-chief since 1999, and then alone until June 2007, when Marco Conci joined him as a co-editor-in-chief. Christer Sjödin gave up his position in September 2014, and Grigoris Maniadakis took his place and has been working with Marco Conci ever since. At the beginning of the 2000s Taylor and Francis bought the journal and since 2004 all volumes have been included in the PEP (Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing) collection. In 2021 Issue 4 of Volume 30 was dedicated to the celebration of the first thirty years of the journal (see Conci and Maniadakis, 2021; Sjödin 2021). Impressively, in the last three years (2019–2021), the *International Forum of Psychoanalysis* had more than 20,000 downloads of papers a year. Last but not least, since the VI. IFPS Scientific Conference held in Stockholm in August 1991, the journal has published the major papers of all IFPS events in a series of monographic issues—including a report on the single events.

What we want to communicate with this positive data is evidence of the following: Jan Stensson created and transmitted such a positive and productive working environment for us that it was not so difficult to maintain the continuity just described—just four co-editors-in-chief in the thirty years of the journal's existence. He transformed our editorial work into such a great opportunity for scientific and professional growth, not only for members of the board, but also for many of our authors, that the work has been a joy. This includes daily contact among the co-editors-in-chief and at least two meetings of the editorial board a year—with the financial, professional, and scientific support of the

IFPS. We were able to create the best possible international workgroup striving to successfully promote the kind of international psychoanalytic exchange and dialogue we need, if we want to keep psychoanalysis alive and well. And, from our point of view, we did the work not only to promote IFPS psychoanalysis, but to promote psychoanalytic discourse as a whole, alongside the work done by the IPA and its journals.

In other words, we believe that for psychoanalysis as a form of science, not just content is essential, but, even more, the maintenance of an international character with a containing and linking function is of pivotal importance (see also Conci, 2019). Freud himself had been able to come so far, having found his own creative synthesis of what he had learned from the Vienna Medical School, the French psychological tradition, and English empiricism. During the First World War, psychoanalysis was the only scientific discipline whose representatives in countries at war had been able to stay in touch. With the journal we intend to maintain international communication and to continue in this direction—together with the IFPS—hopefully for many years to come. We need to keep cultivating an international psychoanalysis, and this can be done in parallel—and in cooperation, as far as our journal is concerned—with each other, by both the IFPS and the IPA.

Introduction

The history of the founding of the International Federation of Psychoanalytic Societies (IFPS) and the story of its development in the first twenty years has not yet been described comprehensively or in depth. The third general secretary of the IFPS, Jakov Katwan, wrote to his colleague Wolfgang Zander in December 1978:

About two years ago I too had already asked Caruso, Chrzanowski, Fromm and Heigl for an account of the history of the IFPS [...]. Fromm and Caruso did not reply or wrote meaningless letters. From Heigl and Chrzanowski I received more detailed accounts, but they contradicted each other so much that I preferred to dispense with the historical outline of the Federation altogether.²

On the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding, at a meeting of the IFPS in Mexico City in 2012, some long-standing members of

²Letter from Katwan to Zander, December 12, 1978.

the IFPS picked out single chapters and aspects of the history and thus presented a first brief historical account of the IFPS.³

Klaus Hoffmann highlighted the influence of the Swiss Daseinsanalytische Institute with its emphasis on a philosophical approach working with severely disturbed and psychotic patients.⁴ The Swiss Daseinsanalytische Gruppe, led by Gion Condrau, hosted IFPS meetings in 1965, 1974, and 1985, making it one of the first and most important groups.

In Marco Conci's contribution, Gaetano Benedetti and Johannes Cremerius were introduced as the founders of the Milan Associazione di Studi Psicoanalitici with its special approach to training and work with psychotic patients, which deviated from "orthodox" psychoanalysis.⁵ The institute became a member of the IFPS in 1989.

Rainer Funk, the executor of Erich Fromm's estate,⁶ described the conflicts Fromm faced as a non-physician and Freud critic within the US psychoanalytic societies, and explained how Fromm founded the IFPS with other psychoanalysts so that those psychoanalytic societies which had developed a new understanding of psychoanalysis or did not want to submit to the training standards of the International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA) had the opportunity for international exchange.^{7,8}

In her research, Edith Frank-Rieser summarised the baselines of the psychoanalytic teaching of Igor Caruso, one of the founders of the IFPS in 1962.⁹ At the time of its foundation, Caruso emphasised the influence of the psychosocial situation of the patient and the personality and

³See *International Forum of Psychoanalysis. 50 Years of the IFPS—Past, Present, Future*. Volume 23 (2), 2014.

⁴Hoffmann (2014).

⁵Conci (2014).

⁶For Erich Fromm's biography, see Section 2.1.3.

⁷The IPA was founded in 1910 by Sigmund Freud as the Internationale Psychoanalytische Vereinigung (IPV) and later renamed itself the International Psychoanalytical Association IPA in English-speaking countries. It is still the most influential international psychoanalytical association and, among other functions, sets the standards of training for its member societies. Today it has about 11,000 members in thirty-three countries. For the history of the IPA, see Loewenberg and Thompson (2011).

⁸Funk (2014).

⁹Frank-Rieser (2014). For Caruso and his work, see Section 2.1.2.

history of the psychoanalyst on the therapeutic process and so saw himself in accordance with other IFPS founding societies. Caruso's influence on the Brazilian psychoanalytic societies and their path into the IFPS was described in the work of Eliana Rodrigues Pereira Mendes.¹⁰

The former general secretary of the IFPS (2000–2008), Sonia Gojman de Millán, traced the often conflictual emergence of Latin American psychoanalytic societies and their relationship within the IFPS.¹¹ All these societies had markedly tense relationships with the IPA and much preferred the free discussion of psychoanalytic issues and a deregulation of training and therapy.

A team of authors around Kari Holm¹² described the founding history of the Norwegian psychoanalytic institute, Institutt for Psykoterapi, which was particularly influenced by interpersonal psychoanalysis (Sullivan, Fromm-Reichmann, Fromm, Horney). In 1977, the institute became a member of the IFPS, and between 2008 and 2012, institute member Agnar Berle was general secretary of the IFPS.

Konstantinos Talfanidis and Grigoris Maniadakis¹³ reported on the difficult path psychoanalysis had in Greece until the Hellenic Society of Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy could be established. In 1996 the institute became a member of the IFPS.

Christer Sjödin described the founding and development of the *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, the journal of the IFPS.¹⁴ Established in 1992 under the leadership of Jan Stensson and colleagues from the Swedish Society for Holistic Psychotherapy and Psychoanalysis, they then formed an international editorial board in 1998 and went online in 2008. Today it is one of many international psychoanalytic journals accessible on Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing (PEP).

Jan Stensson, the long-time editor-in-chief of the journal, expressed his gratitude to the IFPS with the words: “Looking back today, fifty years later, I still find the founding of the IFPS to be an achievement of historic significance. [...] I still think that the IFPS broadens the space for

¹⁰ Mendes (2014).

¹¹ Gojman de Millán (2014).

¹² Holm et al. (2014).

¹³ Talfanidis & Maniadakis (2014).

¹⁴ Sjödin (2014).

thinking and feeling on basic human conditions.”¹⁵ He greatly regretted the change of allegiance of his society from the IFPS to the IPA. Gerard Chrzanowski,¹⁶ Rainer Funk,¹⁷ Sonia Gojman de Millán,¹⁸ Javert Rodrigues,¹⁹ and Jan Stensson²⁰ have all examined individual episodes of the history of the IFPS. The studies are usually a few pages long and only look at specific situations. Michael Ermann contributed a lecture to a conference on the fiftieth anniversary of the IFPS, which dealt with the changes in the psychoanalytic landscape during the past thirty to forty years, and intending to refocus the concerns of the IFPS.²¹

A few years ago, the IFPS²² commissioned an archive and all available documents were collected and secured in one place, so now the historical background of the foundation and first two decades of development can be researched in far greater detail and depth than had previously been the case. For example, it becomes clear that in its first years, despite an interest in international orientation, German was the language of communication; that the IFPS originated in a dispute between the American Academy of Psychoanalysis and the Europeans; that from the very beginning it had a unique structure which has endured to this day, fundamentally distinguishing it from the International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA). In terms of content, the IFPS leaned more towards what will be called “liberal psychoanalysis” below, as opposed to what has been described as “orthodox”, often closer to the IPA. With these attributions of “liberal” and “orthodox”, usage befitting the epoch of 1950–1970, we find ourselves in the midst of the discussions about “classical psychoanalysis” and “deviant, dissident psychoanalysis”. This discussion is still virulent today, often erupting among the various psychoanalytic groups when questions of the distribution of influence and power are at stake. Back then, these terms were honed and used as

¹⁵ Stensson (2014, p. 116).

¹⁶ Chrzanowski (1993). For Gerard Chrzanowski as a person, see Section 2.2.

¹⁷ Funk (2000).

¹⁸ Gojman de Millán (2009).

¹⁹ Rodrigues (1999).

²⁰ Stensson (2007).

²¹ Ermann (2014).

²² The IFPS Archive Commission includes Michael Ermann, Klaus Hoffmann, Marco Conci, Rainer Funk, and Edith Frank-Rieser.

ammunition in the fight to distinguish themselves, to disparage each other and even, in some cases, as a means of exclusion. The dynamic was complex with conscious and unconscious, socio-professional and personal aspects all playing a role. The processes during this time, especially in the USA, have since been documented and analysed.²³ One can therefore garner a well-informed idea of the psychoanalytical-historical background to the founding of the IFPS.

The history of the IFPS examined here is seen largely from the perspective of the German Psychoanalytical Society (DPG). The reason for this lies in the fact that during the first twenty-one years the first three general secretaries of the IFPS were DPG members and that until around 1985 the DPG was the largest and most influential member society of the IFPS, alongside the New York William Alanson White Institute²⁴ (WAWI). The archive of the IFPS is now located in Germany, and the IFPS Archive Commission is currently German speaking.

For about thirteen years, the language of this international association was German: Germans wrote in German to their foreign colleagues and received either German or English replies. Almost all the protagonists of the first years were either Germans (Werner Schwidder,²⁵

²³ See, for example, Bergmann (1993); Eisold (1998); Ermann (2012); Hale (1995).

²⁴ For the history of the WAWI, see Section 2.2.

²⁵ Werner Schwidder (1917–1970) was chairman of the DPG between 1959 and 1970. He studied medicine in Leipzig and Berlin and began his psychoanalytic training in 1941 at the German Institute for Psychological Research and Psychotherapy. The institute was also called the Göring Institute, after the director of the institute, Matthias Heinrich Göring, a cousin of the commander-in-chief of the German Air Force, Hermann Göring. Schwidder became one of Schultz-Hencke's most important students, with whom he also did his training analysis. From 1951 he helped to establish the psychoanalytically influenced Tiefenbrunn State Hospital near Göttingen and directed it from 1965 to 1970. From 1968 he was a professor at Göttingen University Hospital. Together with Annemarie Dührssen and Felix Boehm, he edited the *Journal of Psycho-Somatic Medicine* from 1953. In the 1960s, his professional political commitment contributed to the health insurance companies covering the costs of psychoanalytic psychotherapy. He died of a heart attack in September 1970 during the II. Workshop of the IFPS in Madrid.

Franz Heigl,²⁶ Anton Schelkopf,²⁷ Helmut Bach²⁸), or German-speaking Jewish emigrants²⁹ (Jakov Katwan,³⁰ Erich Fromm, Gerard Chrzanowski, Leon Salzman, Marianne Horney Eckardt, Frederick Weiss) or had received their psychoanalytic training in German-speaking countries (Margit Norell (Sweden), Martti Siirala (Finland), Jeronimo Molina Nunez (Spain), Igor Caruso (Austria)). Anton J. Westerman Holstijn³¹ (Netherlands), who was instrumental in

²⁶ Franz Heigl (1920–2001) was the first secretary general of the IFPS between 1962 and 1972. He did his psychoanalytic training in Munich and Berlin and founded the Institute for Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy in Göttingen together with Schwidder and Gottfried Kühnel in 1954. After Schwidder's death, he took over the medical direction of the Tiefenbrunn State Hospital in 1971 and led it until 1985. With his wife Annelise Heigl-Evers, he developed psychoanalytic-interactional group therapy.

²⁷ Anton Schelkopf (1914–1975) was a controversial figure in the Munich psychoanalytical society. He was a member of the NSDAP and the SS from 1933 to 1945 and worked as a war correspondent during the National Socialist period. He had studied art history, psychology, and theatre studies in the 1930s and became assistant director at the Bavarian State Theatre. After the war he was producer and director of several entertainment films and documentaries on psychological-medical themes and then became a functionary in the German film industry. In 1958 he began psychoanalytic training at the Munich Institute (now the Munich Academy for Psychoanalysis), where he ran for president in 1968. Lotte Köhler then made his National Socialist past public, which after long discussions led to Schelkopf withdrawing his candidacy. The conflict led to Köhler's expulsion and her resignation from the Institute. Schelkopf was secretary general of the IFPS from 1972 until his death in 1975. (See Brundke, 2008a, 2008b. Also Köhler, 1998). For Schelkopf's biography, see the Wikipedia entry on "Toni Schelkopf", accessed November 18, 2020.

²⁸ Helmut Bach (1922–2002) was a physician, psychoanalyst, and professor at the Free University of Berlin. He did his psychoanalytic training at the Institute for Psychotherapy (IfP, DPG) in Berlin, which he directed from 1972 to 1982.

²⁹ For the following persons, except for Jakov Katwan, see the footnotes in Chapter 1.

³⁰ Jakov Katwan (born 1933) is a Jewish psychoanalyst in Berlin. He was born in Romania, experienced confinement in the Jewish ghetto in Czernowitz and emigrated to Israel via Cyprus. From 1959 he studied psychology and trained as a psychoanalyst with the DPG in Berlin. He was general secretary of the IFPS between 1977 and 1983 and organised the VI. Forum of the IFPS in Berlin.

³¹ Westerman Holstijn was significant in the prehistory of the IFPS, but never became a member. (For the following remarks on A. J. Westerman Holstijn I thank Michael Schröter for his translation from Stroeken (1997), *Freud in Nederland*, and Stroeken (2014), *Een Ontwikkelingsgeschiedenis van de Psychoanalyse*). A. J. Westerman Holstijn

preparing the founding but then never became a member, also corresponded in German. After 1975, communication switched entirely to English. The original version of the first statutes in 1974 was still in German, the second version in 1980 was only in English. By 1977, three of the eleven international meetings of the IFPS societies had taken place in Germany (1961 in Düsseldorf, 1968 in Göttingen, 1977 in Berlin), two more in German-speaking Zurich (1965 and 1974).

Due to the rupture in civil society, the heinous National Socialist dictatorship, and the expulsion and murder of the Jewish population, German scientists were cut off from international scientific events for several years during and after the Second World War. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, many German scientists (re)turned to their foreign colleagues and joined existing international societies or formed new associations together.³² The second German psychoanalytic professional society, the Deutsche Psychoanalytische Vereinigung³³ (DPV), for a long time in fierce competition with the DPG, had already been admitted to the IPA in 1951: “The view that after the war all ‘contact

(1891–1980), the son of a Mennonite priest in the Netherlands, studied medicine and received his doctorate in 1929 under the aegis of the psychiatrist and neurologist G. Jelgersma (1859–1942). He did his teaching analyses with J. H. W. van Ophuijsen and Theodor Reik and became a private lecturer at the University of Amsterdam in 1934. He resigned from the Dutch Psychoanalytic Association and thus also from the IPA in 1936 because of disagreements. Westerman Holstijn, a stubborn, self-confident organiser who networked in many groups and associations, refused to be dictated to by the IPA regarding the training of psychoanalysts. He was also an advocate of national autonomy. In 1941, under German occupation, he refused to sign a so-called Aryan declaration and was therefore removed from his post as a private lecturer. He founded the Nederlands Psychoanalytisch Genootschap (Dutch Psychoanalytic Society) in 1947 and became a lecturer at the University of Amsterdam again in 1952. His association was clearly against lay analysis and advocated the integration of psychoanalysis and psychotherapy. He was a board member of the Dutch Association for Psychiatry and Neurology for twenty-four years, and its chairman in 1960.

³² Schröter (1999).

³³ The German Psychoanalytical Association (DPV) was founded in 1950 by Carl Müller-Braunschweig and five other former members of the DPG after the IPA refused to admit the DPG at the Zurich IPA Congress in 1949 as long as H. Schultz-Hencke was a member of the DPG. Most DPG members rejected Schultz-Hencke’s expulsion. See also Section 2.1.1.

with international development was lost', that there was 'too much psychoanalytic knowledge to catch up on', is part of the core of the DPV's collective identity."³⁴ Supported by scholarships arranged by Alexander Mitscherlich³⁵ for his DPV colleagues, some members of the DPV travelled to America, England, the Netherlands, or Switzerland in the 1960s to do training analyses or attend seminars. In the 1950s and 1960s Mitscherlich also invited many lecturers from abroad to Heidelberg and later to Frankfurt for supervision and seminars.

The DPG was denied membership in the IPA until 2001. Werner Schwidder was elected chairman of the DPG in January 1961 and promptly sought contact with other psychoanalytic groups that were also not members of the IPA: Erich Fromm, the Horney circle³⁶ in New York, and the French group among others.³⁷ Before that, Westerman Holstijn of the Dutch Psychoanalytic Society had approached the DPG and invited it to an international congress in Amsterdam in 1960. After an inaugural period of two years, the IFPS was then officially founded in 1962.

Although the DPG was the largest and most influential founding society alongside the William Alanson White Institute (WAWI), only some of DPG members became interested and active in the IFPS. Most sustained their desire for IPA membership and appear to have considered the IFPS as a purely temporary solution.

The first part of this book describes the history of the founding of the IFPS and the story of its development over the first twenty years. It has been divided into two parts and six chapters for the sake of clarity.

The first chapter explains the prehistory of the IFPS, during which Werner Schwidder of the DPG, A. J. Westerman Holstijn of the Dutch Psychoanalytic Association, and Erich Fromm agreed on mutual theoretical positions and wishes regarding future exchange, and then

³⁴ Schröter (1999, p. 101).

³⁵ Alexander Mitscherlich (1908–1982) was an observer of the Nazi doctors' trials in 1946 and wrote the book *Medicine without Humanity* together with Fred Mielke. He was editor of the psychoanalytic journal *PSYCHE*, the author of many psychoanalytic texts, and founded and directed the Sigmund Freud Institute in Frankfurt. He was a member of the DPV.

³⁶ On the person and work of Karen Horney, see Section 5.2.

³⁷ Minutes of the General Assembly of the DPG, January 4, 1959.

arranged the first international psychoanalytic non-IPA meeting in Amsterdam in 1960. It is interesting that already at this early stage Westerman Holstijn was able to so comprehensively outline the concept for the new international association that it remains valid to this day: no interference in the educational issues of the member societies and in their internal affairs, interdisciplinarity with other humanities and natural sciences, no IPA opposition but rather a cooperation between “orthodox” and “liberal” factions; no “balking” at the revision of theories and perspectives or methodological procedures. Members of the IPA reacted negatively to the potential establishment of a new association. Willi Hoffer³⁸ explicitly declared the participation in the next international congress of non-IPA psychoanalysts in Düsseldorf in 1961 a disloyalty to the IPA. This demonstrates something of the climate of mistrust and devaluation within the psychoanalytic movement in the 1950s and 1960s. The 1961 congress in Düsseldorf was entitled “New Findings in Psychoanalysis”. The next congress in 1962 in Amsterdam was entitled “New Directions in Psychoanalytic Theory and Therapy”. The Americans were impressed by the positive development of psychoanalysis in Germany. Before the coalition of the DPG, the Vienna Arbeitskreis for Depth Psychology, and Erich Fromm’s Mexican Psychoanalytic Society into the Internationale Arbeitsgemeinschaft psychoanalytischer Gesellschaften (“International Collaboration of Psychoanalytic Societies”), as the IFPS was initially called, the conflict between the Europeans and the American Academy of Psychoanalysis concluded in the withdrawal of the American Academy. However, they remained in contact with the newly founded international association. Franz Heigl of the DPG became the first general secretary of the IFPS.

The second chapter of Part I of this investigation presents the three founding member groups, their history, and theoretical orientation. For the DPG, the focus centres on the person of Werner Schwidder and his lecture at the Amsterdam Congress in 1962. Further, Igor Caruso as the founder of the Vienna Arbeitskreis for Depth Psychology, his biography, his lecture at the Amsterdam Congress, and Erich Fromm’s lecture

³⁸ Willi Hoffer (1897–1967) was honorary vice-president of the IPA at the time. He was the sole editor of the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* from 1949 to 1959 and president of the British Psychoanalytical Society from 1959 to 1962.

in 1969 at the III. Forum are described in respect of their importance for the IFPS. This circle of people represents the first triumvirate of the IFPS. One year later, the WAWI joined the new international association with Gerard Chrzanowski. He is introduced in terms of both institutional history (WAWI) and personal biography; his lecture at the 1961 Congress in Düsseldorf is also discussed. Despite the enthusiasm for the newly founded association, there was also quite a bit of scepticism. The DPG and the Caruso group eyed each other suspiciously and asked themselves if the positions of the other group deserved to be called psychoanalysis. Fromm and Chrzanowski also had a long-standing, unresolved conflict that was to intensify over the years. After the description of this conflict, the first joint projects, the planning for the next congress in Zurich in 1965, the publication of the lectures held thus far, and the interest of other psychoanalytic societies in the new International Arbeitsgemeinschaft (Collaboration) and the criteria the IFPS introduced for the new admissions are described and discussed.

The third chapter deals with the first congress organised by the new International Arbeitsgemeinschaft held in Zurich in 1965. In the official count of the Forums this is the II. Forum, but in fact it is the first for the IFPS. The congress theme was: "Psychoanalysis and Psychosomatic Medicine. New Findings and the Current State of Research". Since the next congress had to be postponed by a year and could not take place until 1969 in Mexico, the DPG agreed to hold a smaller international conference a year earlier, in Göttingen in 1968. In Göttingen, discussions were held on short-term psychoanalytic therapy, child and adolescent therapy, group therapy, and psychosomatic medicine. In 1968 and 1969, four new psychoanalytic groups were admitted to the IFPS: from Prague, Madrid, Rio de Janeiro, and Stockholm. The III. Forum of the IFPS in Mexico dealt with the topics "Indication and Catamnestic Assessment of Success in Psychoanalysis" and "Psychoanalytic Treatment Technique and Dream Interpretation". Following the III. Forum, Chrzanowski and two of his New York colleagues were interested in the historical and theoretical background of the German contributions, as they had been impressed by their quality. They interviewed about forty psychoanalysts who had remained in German-speaking countries during the National Socialist dictatorship. This interesting project, however, was never brought to a satisfactory conclusion. In 1970, a smaller

international meeting of the IFPS took place in Madrid, during which Werner Schwidder unexpectedly died of a heart attack. This heavy loss for the young association was commemorated by the introduction of a Werner Schwidder Award, honouring contributions to psychoanalytic research and support for the goals of the IFPS. “The Irrational in Psychoanalysis. Theoretical and Clinical Aspects” headlined the IV. Forum held in New York in 1972. In New York, Heigl resigned as general secretary and Anton Schelkopf also from the DPG assumed the office and function. In his opening speech, Chrzanowski called for closer cooperation between the societies and a more coherent form of organisation, because without some form of stability and continuity he believed the IFPS could not survive.

In the fourth chapter of Part I, the review of this development continues and describes how in 1974, under the general secretary Schelkopf, the first statutes of the IFPS were decided upon and the institutionalisation of this heretofore unstructured collaboration, with a loose organisational framework in which everyone was known to each other, began. After other societies joined, this relaxed framework could no longer be maintained. Chrzanowski called for an Organising Committee and at the end of 1974 the first statutes of the IFPS were published. The statutes emphasised “the full scientific and organisational independence of the member societies” as a prerequisite for cooperation. The minimum requirement for admission to the IFPS was a degree in medicine or psychology and at least three years of psychoanalytic instruction including a training analysis. The Swiss Society for Daseinsanalysis around Gion Condrau, accepted as a member society after the IV. Forum, organised the V. Forum in Zurich and chose as the theme “Individual—Family—Society drawn between Coercion and Freedom”.

Before the VI. Forum planned for Munich in 1976, Schelkopf died unexpectedly, thwarting headway within the IFPS that could only be resolved by postponing the Forum for a year, then planned for 1977 and in Berlin. DPG member Jakov Katwan was asked to organise this Forum. With a great deal of personal commitment, travelling to the USA seven times in order to recruit speakers among other purposes, he successfully coordinated a huge event in the Berlin Congress Hall with almost 200 lectures and 900 guests under the title “Psychoanalysis and Human Relations”. Katwan was then elected general secretary

during this Berlin Forum. His commitment to the Forum even provoked renewed protest from the IPA, discouraging participation as a danger and risk to the standards of psychoanalytic training. After the Forum, criticism also came from unexpected quarters, as some IFPS members complained that the size of the event had been at the expense of quality and intimacy. Katwan's ambitious plans saw the IFPS as a globally important and answerable organisation cooperating with the WHO or UNESCO, for example. He called on the IFPS to position itself publicly and self-confidently and to develop into an independent alternative to the IPA. Projects of this kind did not find much of an echo within the IFPS and so Katwan had to react: he reformulated the statutes and expanded them fourfold. For example, he added minimum requirements for the admission of new societies and made the statutes much more binding and stricter than had been the case in early formulations. They were adopted at a rather small meeting in Finland in 1980. However, after the Berlin Forum, the IFPS found itself in a crisis of identity and purpose that lasted for years, partly induced by Katwan insofar as he confronted the IFPS very directly with its unclear identity. The next Forum took place in 1985. The DPG withdrew further and further from the IFPS and over the following years developed contact with the IPA, being admitted in 2001. When Katwan gave up the position of general secretary to the American Ann Ruth Turkel in 1983, the DPG increasingly lost influence in the IFPS and other groups became more important. Through the commitment of the Swedish group, a quarterly journal began publication in 1992, contributing to the increasing self-confidence of the organisation. The editor-in-chief of the journal, Jan StenSSon, expressed his hope that through progressive research the "heroic Freud" would gradually become a "historical Freud". In his view, this would enable the maturation of the psychoanalytic community.

The first, more narrowly historical, section of the book referencing the chronological development of the IFPS concludes with an outlook on the following years.

The second part of the book deals with the problem of "dissidents" in psychoanalysis and their connection with the IFPS. Psychoanalysts who have moved outside the theoretical and methodological framework as defined by the IPA have been called "dissidents". The history of these

dissenters is long and goes back to the early years of the psychoanalytic movement when Alfred Adler and Carl Gustav Jung left the group.

The first chapter of the second part of the thesis (Chapter 5) deals with this history and looks at individual dissenters who were important for the IFPS. Subsequently, the debate about the difference between psychoanalysis and psychotherapy in the USA in the 1950s illustrates the intellectual context in which the founding of the IFPS took place. The chapter concludes with the presentation of the so-called Menninger Study from the 1950s to the 1980s, which examined the differences between the therapeutic outcomes of psychoanalysis and other psychotherapies. All the psychoanalysts involved had expected that the detective and interpretive technique of psychoanalysis would present better and more lasting results than the supportive and ego-strengthening techniques of psychotherapy. Thus, it was also expected that psychoanalysis would be clearly distinguishable from psychotherapy. The surprising result of the study, namely that both techniques showed good results and could not be so clearly distinguished from each other in terms of process analysis and that in some cases the psychotherapeutic processes were even more effective, was, interestingly, not given much international attention.

The second chapter of the second part (Chapter 6) delves into the theoretical and practical self-understanding of the IFPS members and in so doing examines the content of fourteen lectures presented at IFPS congresses between 1962 and 1974 and later published in six volumes. The criterion for the selection of the texts was a broad illustration expressing something about the common self-understanding of the IFPS societies. The evaluation and summary close with the fundamental agreements and common ground among members already mentioned above: a scepticism regarding the drive theory, an opening of treatment technique for new methods adapted to the needs of the patients, a desire for the scientific substantiation of findings in studies, a greater receptiveness for new, even idiosyncratic concepts, and a desire for exchange with other scientific disciplines. Another important conviction that has informed the theories of IFPS members from the beginning is a pronounced interest in the interpersonal, that is, familial, social, and political influences on personality development.

Part I

The early years

CHAPTER 1

The prehistory of the International Federation of Psychoanalytic Societies (IFPS)*

1.1 The inception of the International Federation of Psychoanalytic Societies (IFPS)

In 1959 the German Psychoanalytical Society (DPG) had twenty-one members in associated groups from Berlin, Göttingen, and Munich (Lockot, 2010). At the meeting of its general assembly on January 4, 1959, the then chairman Franz Baumeyer announced the society had led “a rather quiet life recently” and in an attempt to activate the DPG, suggested planning a conference in Göttingen for the following year. Several international colleagues from Belgium, the Netherlands, and France were suggested for invitation: psychoanalysts from Karen Horney’s New York circle, Erich Fromm and Herbert Binswanger³⁹ too. The topics

*Chapter 1 was originally published as: Huppke, A. (2021). The inception of the International Federation of Psychoanalytic Societies (IFPS). *International Forum of Psychoanalysis* 30(40): 212–222, copyright © 2022 The International Federation of Psychoanalytic Societies, reprinted by permission of Taylor & Francis Ltd, <http://www.tandfonline.com> on behalf of The International Federation of Psychoanalytic Societies.

³⁹Herbert Binswanger (1900–1970) was a psychiatrist in Switzerland and was the author of many psychiatric textbooks. He was the half-brother of Otto Binswanger, Ludwig Binswanger, and Robert Binswanger.