

2023 Convergence Congress

**Reflecting on the subjects that should be included
in a course of studies of Psychoanalysis according to Freud**

Graziella Baravalle

In *Die Frage der Laienanalyse* (1926), translated as *The Question of Lay Analysis*, Freud settles the score with medicine and affirms the autonomous value of psychoanalysis and its independence from the medical field. Freud is forced to declare, he says, that physicians not trained to practice analysis are even more dangerous than non-medical psychoanalysts. Medical training should not be mixed up with psychoanalytical training. In the 1927 Appendix, he writes that the essential is that the psychoanalyst has already acquired the special training required by Psychoanalysis; he deems that psychoanalyst studies would be so vast that going through six years of medical studies would be time lost; and he further adds that the course of studies for psychoanalysts is yet to be organized. Undoubtedly, the study should comprise topics in the Sciences of the Spirit, Psychology, History of Culture, as well as Biology, Anatomy, Genetics..."It's about an ideal, but it may, and it must, be reached". Of course, today we would add Metapsychology, Linguistics, Mathematics, and I take for granted that in this ideal University, History of Psychoanalysis would be studied along with its main theoreticians, the works of Freud and Lacan, Clinical

Psychoanalysis, etc. Another reason, in Freud's words, not to waste 5 years in a course of Psychology oriented towards behaviorism.

Pierre Bruno, in his book *Une psychanalyse: du rébus au rebut* (literally, "A Psychoanalysis: from rebus to waste), shows the series of defining moments when both Freud and Lacan distanced themselves from Psychology; he also quotes an intellectual from Damascus (Fayssal Abdallah), a scholar on Mesopotamic writing systems, who says: "After writing, psychoanalysis is the second best invention of mankind". Perhaps this may be deemed an exaggerated judgment (he does not mention the printing press), but we psychoanalysts and our institutions should at least demand some consideration from the merchants in power, in line with the significance of this new science.

Obviously, at this rate, the result in Spain will reach the point of absurdity with young psychoanalysts receiving a training far removed from the one advocated by Freud, whose works, by the way, are not much studied, and otherwise unsystematically, within Psychoanalytical Societies and Schools; in the ones having Lacanian orientation, Freud is only read when quoted by Lacan.

When Jacques Lacan created his School, he opened it up to all who wished to participate, coming from sundry disciplines. Which extraordinarily enriched discussions, cartels, publications, research, and the relationship of psychoanalysis with the other disciplines. Besides, this

attitude by Lacan was determining for achieving prestige as well as for the development of psychoanalysis in France and internationally, also bringing excellence into the works of his disciples. Lacan combated psychoanalysis segregation, he opened up the School doors to scholars of other sciences. For the sake of the above, both in his Writings and in his seminars, he engaged in dialogue with linguists, mathematicians, topologists, anthropologists, philosophers, as well as with physicians and psychiatrists. But Lacan always kept his distance from psychology and the “psychologization of psychoanalysis” because he thought that the task of seeking the real facing psychoanalysis through psychological means “constitutes a radical deviation”. And he sharply added: “It is denial of psychoanalysis”.

It is astonishing that in Spain (and I do refer to Spain), psychoanalytical institutions which bear weight numerically have accepted the idea that psychoanalysts be trained as psychologists and then take a master’s degree in “Psychoanalytical Psychotherapy”, with no public criticism whatsoever for fear of emptying public healthcare of psychoanalysts. It is hard to challenge this line of approach.

This time the ghost haunting Europe is not revolution, but the one in Bologna and its value units, under the assumption of homogeneous university training.

I have commented these ideas with some Spanish colleagues, who share them, and also with some Argentine colleagues, who are finding that this trend is beginning to prevail there as well –paradoxically in a country like Argentina where the Schools of Psychology of Rosario, Buenos Aires, and Tucumán are virtually oriented psychoanalytically.

In this Convergence I believe we share Lacan’s subversive position that psychoanalysts are authorized by themselves (which does not mean that anyone may declare themselves a psychoanalyst); we know that Lacan added: And by some others. Among these others, we are responsible for psychoanalysis.

However, until now, in Spain most of the psychoanalytical associations have fallen into this Master’s degree trap to have access to the Federation of psychotherapists, much in the same way as we have surrendered to the mirage of screens after the pandemic.

Against this resistance to psychoanalysis, no attempt has been made – and I am not talking of opposition here, just critical reflection - except for a few conferences sponsored by UMBRAL, a “psy” care network, and P&S (Psychoanalysis and Society), a space coordinated by psychoanalyst Rithée Cevasco; we invited Pierre Bruno to present on the topic to bring on discussion.

With some exceptions, Spain has eliminated psychoanalysts from sanitary institutions and Mental Health Centers, (other than those masked with the

degree of psychologist), where DSM psychiatry prevails in association to behavioral psychology.

Spanish baccalaureat is a cultural desert ever more oriented to training for the sake of subjecting students to employment for a salary; in order to channel them in that direction, private schools and universities are already in place. According to Spain Autonomous Communities, Philosophy is an optional subject in Secondary School - and it used to be the only subject where a few scholarly professors gave notions of psychoanalysis. Only the Schools of Humanities or Sciences of the Spirit, such as they were dubbed by Dilthey, still teach that someone called Sigmund Freud once existed.

However, a large part of civil society, citizens who need to cope with the growing malaise and alienation of these times, refuse to be “users” of medicamental psychiatry and the psychology of behavioral counselling, and they seek relief in seeing analysts. This is why we need to know on what discourse of the Other this society is seated in order to know what its effects are on the subject’s word. A significant current example of the above is whatever relates to transgender ideology and irreversible surgeries.

Under no circumstances would the idea be to replace specific training given by psychoanalytical associations with university training. As Freud once wrote, this so- called School of psychoanalysis is an ideal, one

which in Spain has been difficult to attain for the time being. Rather, the idea would mean that these associations should defend psychoanalysis autonomy and not just have graduate courses calling it “psychoanalytical psychotherapy”; besides, they should advocate, as Freud and Lacan did, that the candidate to analyst does not need to be a physician or a psychologist. If this was so,

the presence of analysts coming to an association from different disciplines would constitute an enriching collective of sundry interests. Otherwise, the association’s cultural impoverishment, resulting from the members having been exclusively granted psychologist degrees, will have psychologizing effects on said associations, that is, they will turn into the denial of psychoanalysis, denying in turn the possibility of subversion which it brings about.

I would like to conclude with a quote from the amazing book by Moustapha Safouan, *La Psychanalyse, Science, Thérapie-et Cause*, taken from its Conclusions: “L’avenir de la psychanalyse ne tient qu’à sa capacité de contribuer à l’intelligence de notre époque, et aux métamorphoses de l’Éros, autrement qu’en poussant des cris d’alarme. Car l’analyste ne s’autorise que de lui même... jusque dans sa propre formation”.

“The future of psychoanalysis only depends on its ability to contribute to the knowledge of our time, and on the metamorphoses of Eros, rather

than on throwing out cries of alarm. Because psychoanalysts only authorize themselves ...even in their own training”

Graziella Baravalle 2023.