

Original Italian edition: Bolko M. & Rothschild B., Una “pulce nell’orecchio”.
Cronaca del controcongresso dell’*International Psychoanalytic Association* di Roma del 1969.
Psicoterapia e Scienze Umane, 2006, Volume 40, issue no. 3, pp. 703-718.
<http://www.psicoterapiaescienzeumane.it/english.htm> – ISSN 0394-2864

Section “Traces” of the journal *Psicoterapia e Scienze Umane*

Edited by Pier Francesco Galli and Alberto Merini

In this section of the journal Psicoterapia e Scienze Umane we present previously published or unpublished material in an attempt to retrace a sort of history of psychology, psychiatry and psychotherapy, at times with the emotional power of anecdotes that usually do not appear in academic historiographies. The analysis is developed along three fronts. The first is an analysis of the various psychoanalytic stereotypes in their declinations and the manner in which theory of technique was passed down; the second is a reconstruction of parts of the history of our field in Italy, within the framework that has always characterized the group of Psicoterapia e Scienze Umane [“Psychotherapy, Humanities, and Social Sciences”]; the third is a reprint of “vintage” articles relevant to the current debate. At the web site <http://www.psicoterapiaescienzeumane.it/traces.htm> there is the list of all material published in this section.

A “flea in one’s ear”. An account of the Counter-Congress of the *International Psychoanalytic Association* of 1969 in Rome

*Marianna Bolko**, *Berthold Rothschild***

Foreword by Marianna Bolko

In October 1968, I left Bologna (where I had just finished my psychiatric residency in Mental and nervous diseases) for Zurich, and I was about to begin my analysis with Paul Parin: from a climate overcharged with much activity and contentiousness, I suddenly found myself in a mild and temperate environment.

Because of my interest in psychoanalysis, and various other cultural and personal events, I was aware of the situation of psychoanalysis in Italy. It seemed to me to be a somewhat poor and provincial state of affairs, with little tradition, due certainly to the well-known socio-cultural and political conditions and not to the quality of the people involved. What astounded me was the continuous infighting and lack of understanding between the directors of the three institutes of the Italian Psychoanalytic Society (SPI, *Società Psicoanalitica Italiana*) then in existence (Musatti in Milan, Perrotti and Servadio in Rome). In short, one did one’s training in a rather pestilential environment, which, as is well-known, lasted a long time. The situation in Italy had degenerated to such a state that the *International Psychoanalytic Association* (IPA) decided to intervene by setting up a commission composed of three Swiss analysts – Raymond De Saussure, Paul Parin, and Fritz Morgenthaler – with the task of examining all the members and candidates of the SPI (including the directors of the institutes) and of establishing rules of reference. This lasted from 1962-67 (*a posteriori*, Parin said this on the subject: “Even if new members assumed the reins of management, the old conflicts persevered and our recommendations after a few years were disregarded” [*personal communication*])

Many Italians in these years and already throughout the 1950s were going abroad for their psychoanalytic training: London, Switzerland, Paris, and the USA – a cultural migration that subsequently had quite an effect on the Italian situation becoming less provincial. As for me, since I was in search of a place more conducive to my needs, one that would allow me to undertake my psychoanalytic path within an environment of reliable credentials, I became attracted to the fame of the “Psychoanalytic Seminar Zurich” (PSZ), composed of a group of highly regarded analysts on an

* Via Garibaldi 3, I-40124 Bologna, Italy, Tel. +(39) 051-0338617, E-Mail <bolko@libero.it>.

** Rieterstrasse 53, CH-8002 Zurich, Tel. +(41) 01-2010036, E-Mail <bedold@hotmail.com>.

international level, belonging to the Swiss Psychoanalytic Society (SGP), people with unique and fascinating personal histories, original ideas, politically committed, and critical of the training criteria of the IPA, to which, however, they belonged. I also chose Zurich because of my family's central European culture, all the while maintaining contact, since 1966, with the "Milan Group for the Advancement of Psychotherapy" (*Gruppo Milanese per lo Sviluppo della Psicoterapia*), founded by Pier francesco Galli in 1960.

With my arrival in Zurich, and with my halting German, I began my analysis with Parin in his office in Utoquai 41, where Goldy Parin-Matthèy and Fritz Morgenthaler also worked. The following month I began to frequent the Psychoanalytic Seminar Zurich, whose headquarters was a modest apartment of three rooms in the historic centre of the city, more or less where the Limmat River flows into Lake Zurich. Even though I found myself in an unknown and unsettling environment, with everything to discover and examine, I felt as if I had undertaken the right path for me, taking comfort in the fact that Parin had been born in Slovenia, not far from Ljubljana, my birth-place.

At the Psychoanalytic Seminar Zurich I met a strange character, of certainly original and sometimes bizarre behaviour, and who, in his unique way, often made astute comments, which piqued my interest. We got to know each other. He explained to me that we had the same "uncle", that I could go with him to the *Burghölzli* Hospital (where I subsequently worked with Italian migrant workers), and he invited me to a study group which he himself, with Harold Linke and Ilka von Zeppelin, organized on the theme of "Psychoanalysis and society" at the Psychoanalytic Seminar Zurich. He was Berthold Rothschild.

Foreword by Berthold Rothschild

I was a humble doctor in the clinic of Prof. Manfred Bleuler, and after receiving my medical degree, I decided to specialize in psychiatry. As a junior doctor and later as an attending physician at the *Burghölzli* Hospital in Zurich, I became a worthy participant in that lengthy tradition in this Mecca of the soul, even if the shiny exterior of this occupation did not correspond to the internal poverty of the young and ambitious doctor that I was. More by chance than by choice, while en route though the manifold wealth of the Zurich psychology "of the depths" on offer, I found myself on the couch of Dr. Parin, who at the time was still totally unknown to me. Thus I became acquainted with the abyss of my psychopathology, but also of the complex paths of Freudian analysis. Subsequently I also became a pupil of the Psychoanalytic Seminar Zurich, a small group of likeable eccentrics, some of whom, in a slightly bohemian fashion, argued passionately. I enjoyed them and Freud became as important as Bleuler to me. One day in the autumn of 1968, in the cloakroom of the Psychoanalytic Seminar Zurich, I met a young and intrepid Italian psychiatrist, with the look of a young girl, who for reasons unfathomable to me, wished to train in Zurich. We quickly became friends and I made it possible for her to enter the *Burghölzli* Hospital as a junior, where she, in broken German, courageously participated in the discussions, as she did at the Psychoanalytic Seminar Zurich. She told me strange stories about psychoanalysis and the political situation in Italy. Her name was Marianna Bolko.

The Counter-Congress¹

During the encounters and discussions between participants of the Psychoanalytic Seminar Zurich, a more critical position was more and more clearly being identified, a position in terms of the role of psychoanalysts within the society of the time and the structure of the IPA, and with consequences that related to the training of psychoanalysts and to their critical conscience. When we received the program of the 26th International Congress of Psychoanalysis to be held in Rome in 1969 (see the Table of Contents of issue 1/1969 of the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* on the following page, with the pre-publication of the conference papers), contact was made with French colleagues, with a few Austrian and Italian ones, with the intention of somehow making our voice heard at the conference.

¹ We would like to thank Paul Parin, Pier Francesco Galli, Pedro Grosz, Judith Valk, Mauro Mancina, and Luigi Martelli, for their help in the (re)construction of the story.

The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis

Volume 50

1969

Part 1

26th International Psycho-Analytical Congress, Rome, 1969: Pre-Published Papers and Panel Introductions

Editorial		1
Introduction to The Scientific Programme of the 26th Congress of The International Psycho-Analytical Association, Rome		3
Original papers		
JACOB A. ARLOW and CHARLES BRENNER	The psychopathology of the psychoses: a proposed revision	5
ALAN J. EISNITZ	Narcissistic object choice, self representation	15
RALPH R. GREENSON and MILTON WEXLER	The non-transference relationship in the psycho-analytic situation	27
DOUGLAS C. LEVIN	The self: a contribution to its place in theory and technique	41
U. MOSER, I. V. ZEPPELIN and W. SCHNEIDER	Computer simulation of a model of neurotic defence processes	53
LEO RANGELL	The intrapsychic process and its analysis: a recent line of thought and its current implications	65
J. SANDLER and W. G. JOFFE	Towards a basic psychoanalytic model	79
Panel introductions		
ELISABETH R. GELEERD	Child psychoanalysis. (The separation-individuation phase: direct observations and reconstructions in analysis)	91
SEYMOUR L. LUSTMAN	The use of the economic viewpoint in clinical psycho-analysis	95
ALEXANDER MITSCHERLICH	Protest and revolution	103
FRITZ MORGENTHALER	Disturbances of male and female identity as met with in psychoanalytic practice	109
VICTOR H. ROSEN	Language and psychoanalysis	113
ROBERT S. WALLERSTEIN	Psychoanalysis and psychotherapy. (The relationship of psychoanalysis to psychotherapy: current issues)	117
Clinical essay prize: revised conditions		127

Published every three months

Annual subscription 84s.

Canada and U.S.A. \$9.50

World List of Abbreviations

Int. J. Psycho-Anal.

Printed in Great Britain by
The Whitefriars Press Ltd.
London and Tonbridge
Jan. 1969

Our Zurich group then consisted of us two, Pedro Grosz, Judith Valk, Ilka von Zeppelin, Lilian Simmons, Irene Brogle, Arno von Blarer, Martha Eicke, Alice Miller (the last three were members of the Swiss Psychoanalytic Society). The headquarters was the Psychoanalytic Seminar Zurich, and the *seniores* (Paul Parin, Fritz Morgenthaler, Harold Linke, Goldy Parin-Matthèy), even if they were not participating, were in agreement with our endeavour and did nothing to restrict us. Thus our group was transversal and non-generational. The meeting with the French candidates proved fruitful for the discussion on the two-faced nature of the psychoanalytic institutions (a scientific face and a power face), less fruitful on the course of action, because their plan for participating at the Rome congress was based on simple union demands in order to play a more important role as members internally within the IPA. With a forceful paper delivered by Marianna Bolko (subsequently read at the Rome IPA Congress and published in *Psicoterapia e Scienze Umane*, 4/1975, pp. 24-25), which was supported by Rothschild and welcomed by the entire Zurich group, it was decided to attack in depth the ideology of the psychoanalytic associations which demonstrated, in their hierarchical power structure, in their distancing from radical Freudian thought, in their research, and in their training, etc., their incompatibility with the idea of a psychoanalysis with subversive and revolutionary potential.

Elvio Fachinelli [1928-1989] came from Italy with two colleagues, and, subsequently, the Sommarugas, with whom we reached agreement, made contact with Berthold Rothschild. It was here, within this atmosphere, that the idea of a counter-congress, organized by the Italian group and the Zurich group, came into being. And the name *Platform* (*Plattform*, in German) was bestowed upon this fledgling grouping at this time. The meetings were moved to Milan, to the house of Mauro Mancina, where we met other interested parties, among whom Carlo Ravasini was very active.

The conference was fast approaching. It was the first time that Italy had had the privilege of organizing an international conference of psychoanalysis. The SPI, recently emerging from under the supervision of the Swiss commissioners, had finally achieved a position of prominence on the international psychoanalytic scene. A grandiose conference in the Hotel *Cavaliere Hilton* in Rome had been organized, within an opulent framework, with higher than ever organizational costs and prices for participation. The press prominently featured the event. We were there to pester – like a “flea in one’s ear”, according to an expression that then suggested itself to Rothschild (he expressed himself in German, using the term, an “ant in the ear”) – and the press would also have to deal with us, with much damage to the image of the psychoanalytic institution.

The conference of psychoanalytic associations was protected by a blanket of secrecy. The press was not allowed in and only regular and special members of the IPA could participate. The student-candidates, therefore, were also not admitted to the congress. In an article in the popular weekly magazine *l'Espresso*, issued at that time, we read:

«It is an old tradition within the International Psychoanalytic Association to shelter itself from the often distorting curiosity of the press”, explains Dr. Paolo Perrotti, member of the congress’s organizing committee, and holding the delicate responsibility of treasurer (Paolo Perrotti is the son of Nicola, one of the pioneers of Italian psychoanalysis). “Our caution”, continues Perrotti, “is often mistakenly interpreted. They accuse us of cliquishness, of freemasonry, even of egotism. Obviously we do not like this. But it is better to be misunderstood than to leave extremely dangerous weapons in the hands of the ignorant or worse the semi-experts. Ours is not a lockout but a necessary caution. We are available for any type of halfway meeting; nevertheless we cannot allow indiscriminate access, which would represent an unlawful abdication”. This speech, delivered in plain language, so that the reporter could understand and transcribe it in the newspaper, is the same one that, in scientific language, has been repeated for decades, with different emphases but in

substance the same, by Freud's successors, whether they are in opposition or they consider themselves the sole legitimate heirs to his teachings.

"This congress is indeed the most accessible one ever held", says another member of the organizing committee, Professor Arnaldo Novelletto, who, together with his colleague Sergio Bordi, was assigned to the Press Office. In essence, a news service is connecting a psychoanalytic congress to the outside world for the very first time» (G. Pecorini, *l'Espresso*, August 3, 1969, p. 17).

At the time, the fight against unlawful practices was an important activity of the Italian Psychoanalytic Society (SPI). Concerning "unauthorized psychoanalysts", in the same article of *l'Espresso* on August 3, 1969, we read:

«In Italy, the number of known practicing psychoanalysts is 80. Each one of these can have, on the average, over the course of their entire professional life, 100 clients. Thus only 8,000 Italians can hope to be treated by a licensed psychoanalyst. On the other hand, how many Italians actually practice psychoanalytic techniques? We lack accurate statistics, but plausible calculations allow us to assume that their number is ten times higher. Therefore nine out of ten patients of psychoanalysis are in the hands of unlicensed practitioners – unlicensed but not indictable, not necessarily incapable or harmful, but certainly unmonitored, and ultimately not responsible. "This", says Paolo Perrotti, "is one of the many reasons for the secrecy in which we wrap ourselves. Making our work and our debates public actually means widening the field to amateurism. They accuse us of cliquishness, of being aristocratic. Let us forget that our interests are at stake here: what is at stake is the health of the patient. If it were only a question of money or academic power or prestige, then, with our house in order, all we would need to do is open the doors of our offices and indiscriminately allow more clients in. On the contrary, the issue is to carry forward our research and educate qualified trainees"» (*ibidem*, p. 17).

At the time, in Italy it was common that those not admitted to the SPI, perhaps after years of analysis, would however practice the profession with secret couches, with a convertible type of arm chair, medical beds with cut off legs and other expedients. It was also the custom for Italian "candidates" to conduct analyses (before being authorized) beyond their two supervised cases, sometimes without telling their "teacher-supervisor". The secrecy was partially breached at the Rome congress in 1969 in the following two ways: 1) The institution of a press office linking the IPA congress to the outside world (the task was assigned to Arnaldo Novelletto and Sergio Bordi); 2) Permission to participate on the part of candidates-in-training to whom the educational council of their own country had given authorization (on an appropriately-designed form) to take part in workshops and be present at discussions without having the right to speak, therefore – as it happened according to official sources – playing "a passive role that would be gratifying in terms of a learning experience" (regular members had the right to give papers and input from the podium, special members to participation from the hall).

Thanks to this innovation we were able to register as regulars and organize the counter-congress from inside the IPA. For various reasons, we two were the only ones present in Rome from the Zurich group. We prepared leaflets to distribute to the participants; Mauro Mancina got Albe Steiner to make a beautiful poster; for the days of the Congress, we reserved the hall of the restaurant, "Carlino al Panorama", situated 400 yards from the Hotel *Cavalieri Hilton*, and it became the headquarters of the counter-congress. The poster was rather large, with the inscription: "26th INTERNATIONAL PSYCHOANALYTIC CONGRESS\$".

On the following page we have the photograph with the poster held up by Elvio Fachinelli, on the left, and Berthold Rothschild, on the right.



**26th
INTERNATIONAL
PSYCHO
ANALYTICAL
CONGRESS\$**

In the photo below, published in *l'Espresso* on August 3, 1969 (p. 17), we see from above Berthold Rothschild, Elvio Fachinelli and Marianna Bolko:



Roma. 26. congresso di psicanalisi: Elvio Fachinelli (a sinistra) e Berthold Rothschild affiggono un manifesto di protesta. Accanto al titolo: la principessa Alessandra Tomasi di Lampedusa, ex presidente della società psicanalitica italiana.

And below is the leaflet (translated here into English from the German. In the original it was three pages long):

PSYCHOANALYSIS IS HEALTHY!

DO YOU AGREE? YES?

SO YOU MUST GET YOURSELVES PSYCHOANALYZED!

THE PSYCHOANALYTIC SOCIETY IS HEALTHY!

DO YOU AGREE? YES?

SO YOU HAVE TO DO ANOTHER ROUND OF ANALYSIS!

PSYCHOANALYTIC TRAINING IS HEALTHY!

DO YOU AGREE? YES?

SO YOU REALLY MUST GO BACK INTO ANALYSIS!

Dear colleagues,

During the last few months some groups of psychoanalysts and candidates-in-training from different European nations have got together and, during these meetings, it has been ascertained that a certain unease, on many levels, exists in various psychoanalytic institutes. In light of this, specific points have been discussed by those participating:

1. Psychoanalytic training;
2. Relevance, structure, and function of the Psychoanalytic Association;
3. The social role of the psychoanalyst and the social image of psychoanalysis;
4. The relationship between psychoanalysts and institutions.

Briefly, the following problems emerged out of the discussion:

- In its current form, the optimal development of the training for candidates in psychoanalysis is inhibited by the fact that the psychoanalytic institutions directly interfere with the analysis;

- The present structure of the psychoanalytic associations seems to be above all an instrument directed towards protecting the psychoanalytic profession to the detriment of the scientific and socio-cultural goals of psychoanalysis;

-The hierarchical organization of the psychoanalytic associations facilitates regressive relationships among the members in that the yearning for power – whether real or illusory – is promoted on the one hand, and, on the other, triggers widespread mechanisms of passivity and dependence. Among other things, we have ascertained that many institutes are very closed, with no relationship to the outside, and this occurs in an atmosphere that inspires self-idealization and the masking of those aspects of their own structure that generates regression. In this way, the pursuit of the true goals of psychoanalysis takes second place in favour of maintaining charismatic positions and positions of power whether individually or in groups;

- These structural modifications of the objectives of the Psychoanalytic Associations inhibit the ability of psychoanalysts to undergo healthy crises and to examine their own role, and function and potential in contemporary society. In this sense, psychoanalytic associations have paradoxically distanced themselves from an entire series of profound developments that have occurred in present society even as an effect of psychoanalysis itself.

The International Congress of Psychoanalysis completely ignores these issues. It is for this reason that we suggest that we discuss them in a series of assemblies that will take place from 17:00 on July 28, 1969 at the “Carlino al Panorama” restaurant. We guarantee language translation.

P.S.: If you have been well-analyzed then come to the Carlino!

Platform

A study group of European psychoanalysts

The evening before the counter-congress we met in Rome. Other candidates from Rome and other parts of Italy joined us. We distributed the tasks amongst ourselves and we decided to stage our protest at the end of the opening speech of the then president Piet Jacob van der Leeuw. The next day, a few bold youthful men and women (35-45 years of age) grew faint and unsteady, others experienced somatic symptoms and withdrew, but the central nucleus (Bolko, Fachinelli, Rothschild, Mancina, Ravasini, Sommaruga and one or two others) rose in perfect harmony with the start of the applause for van der Leeuw and began to put up the posters on all the walls and distribute the leaflet to the participants with an invitation to participate in the afternoon meeting. Marianna Bolko had the idea of going onto the stage and distributing our invitation to the celebrities sitting up there. While she was climbing the stairs, a psychoanalyst from the organization tried to pull her down by tugging on her skirt. When she politely asked what he wanted, he let her go. The leaflets were handed out to van der Leeuw and the other seated personages who warmly thanked her. The Americans (they made up almost half the participants) thought that our action was part of the congress and smiled benevolently. The other foreigners seemed intrigued and looked at us sympathetically. The Italian organizers were initially confused, then the unmistakable face of Elvio Fachinelli, well-known to the Italian establishment, clarified any doubt. They had to accept the situation, like it or not.

The protest originated from inside the congress. The hall was covered in the beautiful posters. Everyone read the script with curiosity and at 5:00 P.M., an unexpected number of participants from the congress left the air conditioning, the carpeting, the swimming-pool, the suffocating comfort, and all the luxuries, which the Hilton symbolized, in order to join us.

It was as if a kind of lifeblood circulated through the deadly atmosphere, characteristic of situations in which adaptation to the environment is all-encompassing.

More than once we asked ourselves how it was possible that intelligent and astute people could become obtuse and uncritical in relation to the institution to which they were affiliated. A colleague from Basel said this: «This is a fundamental question: Can a candidate, within a system, still be free and independent enough so that the autonomous and critical abilities of the Ego are able to sufficiently develop?». Had it been our non-authoritarian training that allowed a group to take its distance and act accordingly, or is a training, permeated with fear and authoritarianism, necessary to survive the IPA?

To soften the opposition, Emilio Servadio invited a delegation from our side, an invitation that was obviously refused.

For three days debates followed one after the other at the Carlino restaurant (ably interpreted almost simultaneously by Rothschild into five languages), some more, some less interesting, on the themes we had proposed. As reported as well in the daily newspaper *La Stampa*, on July 30, 1969 (p. 2), Rothschild officially opened the counter-congress with these words: «We have gathered here to freely discuss and not to exchange compliments as it is done at the Hotel *Hilton*. At the *Hilton* the air is conditioned and so are the reflexes. But not here. We can speak freely. First I would like to present our promoters».

The participation also extended to psychoanalysts of other schools, candidates who had not managed to obtain authorization to participate, intellectuals, specialists, students, and the simply curious, who came to *Monte Mario* (the hill where the *Hilton* is located) on that hot afternoon in July.

The hall was so full that those present had to sit on the window ledges, on the floor, one on top of the other (as in the photo in the next page, from *La Stampa* on July 30, 1969, p. 2: Mauro Mancina is third from the left at the top, and Carlo Ravasini is fifth; at the bottom, from the left, Marianna Bolko and Berthold Rothschild). Many older analysts came, like Alexander Mitscherlich (who had given an extremely critical lecture at the congress called “Protest and Revolution” – see the Table of Contents of issue 1/1969 of the *International Journal*, published here on p. 15 [p. 706 of the original edition in Italian]), Emilio Servadio, Marie Langer, Ralph Greenson (who declared: «If Freud were alive he would be here with us!»). Finally they could speak, express their unease, and openly criticize.



Men and women who just minutes before were all grey and restrained became bright, talkative, and even a bit mad. At the end of the third day, with success already an established fact, especially in the *media*, finally able to access the sacred grounds of psychoanalysis, even Lacan became aware of it. Notified about the atmosphere by his secretary, who was sent ahead, he flew to Rome. We did not wish to await him at the Carlino; we had conversed at length about charismatic leaders as typical phenomena of psychoanalytic culture! Lacan had to be content with a press conference at the French Cultural Centre (*Centro Culturale Francese*) with Fachinelli and a few other Italians.

We collected more than 200 registrations of psychoanalysts from all countries and we acquired new comrades and friends. Through the Argentineans (Armando Bauleo and Hernán Kesselman), we allied ourselves to the dissident group of Argentinean psychoanalysts. We put forward the idea, and then the decision, to pursue a “permanent” training within the psychoanalytic association, thus remaining students forever. This was the single true point of structural rupture with the IPA, because in this way cultural substance was respected and career importance rejected. And thus the mechanism of bureaucratic power was broken. In fact, however serious the verbal protest and however crushing our speeches could be, they still took place internally; and it even seems as if they were accepted with benevolence on the part of the delegates like a time to rejoice, a carnival atmosphere where all was permitted. It was as if we had acquired the right to a type of adolescent rebellion which is fine as long as afterwards there is recovery and a return to normality. We were aware that changes do not often come into being through the actions of the one in power (even illusory): we were well-acquainted with the phenomenon of “repressive tolerance”. In fact, after a few months, requests to be cancelled from the *Platform* list began to come in from various Italian candidates, even from those who had planned the counter-congress with us. We learned that the SPI had severely intervened, threatening expulsion from educational development if they did not tone

down their subversive character. Participation in the counter-congress was interpreted as wild acting-out and as such needed to be analyzed.

Thus the Italian group died out, the content of the counter-congress was trivialized, and the event itself forgotten, or, in point of fact, suppressed.

It was expected that in the following year, 1970, the VIII International Congress of Psychotherapy would take place in Milan. Its president was Pier Francesco Galli, and it was to be organized by the group of *Psicoterapia e Scienze Umane* (www.psicoterapiaescienzeumane.it). The Zurich group through Marianna Bolko had entered into contact with them. The Swiss and the Argentineans, besides the new German, French, Austrian, and English colleagues, participated in the Milan congress delivering speeches and playing a prominent role.

After the Milan Congress, we two, with Pier Francesco Galli and Armando Bauleo, went to London where we met Aaron Esterson, David Cooper, and Morton Schatzman, who were, at the time, in full anti-psychiatric mode. We four, in the sun and the green of Hyde Park, close to Hyde Park Corner, founded *Platform International* as a receptacle, a means of unification and organizational inspiration, for our psychoanalytic-political energy. With a view to the subsequent 27th International Psychoanalytic Congress, which would take place in Vienna in 1971 (presided over by Leo Rangell, who had succeeded van der Leeuw as president of the IPA), we organized another one-day parallel gathering, entitled “Psychoanalytic Theory and Practice in the Light of the Various Paths towards Socialism”.

It was the last time in which the initiatives of *Platform International* coincided with the congresses of the IPA.

The results

After the skirmish in Rome, it was decided by the IPA to organize an “enclosure” for the training candidates. However a pre-congress for candidates was allowed at the IPA congress in Vienna in 1971 (under President Rangell). An actual candidates’ association was proposed at the Paris Congress of 1973 and at the London Congress of 1975 (President Serge Lebovici), structured regulations were formalized. This small association for aspiring psychoanalysts is still alive today. It has been called the *International Psychoanalytic Studies Organization* (IPSO), and it publishes its own Journal and every two years organizes its own congress, simultaneously with the IPA congresses, enjoying «a collaborative and productive relationship with the IPA», as the document on the IPSO site proclaims (www.ipso-candidates.org.uk/ipso/About.aspx). As far as we know, there have never again been any events similar to the counter-congress in Rome. The desire to belong to the IPA is, to this day, the principal motivation for anyone undertaking psychoanalytic training.

In our movement, the euphoria following the event in Rome (1969) and the founding in London (1970) of *Platform International* lasted quite a while. Rothschild was nominated the “international secretary” of the movement. *Plataforma Internacional*, as it was called in South America, had special significance in Argentina, where it became an important political force on the left, on the inside of the *psy* scenario. Marie Langer, Armando Bauleo, Hernán Kesselmann and many other militants were fighting the reactionary positions of the powerful Argentinean Psychoanalytic Association (affiliated with the IPA). After the military coup of the Generals in 1974, the majority of them were forced into exile. Our connections continued for many years, based more on personal relationships of friendship rather than as ones based on the group *Plataforma*.

In Zurich, the *Plattform* group took over the leadership of the Psychoanalytic Seminar Zurich and initiated a “regime” that did not much consider the different ideas of the minority. Our critical position towards institutionalized training and our refusal, for ideological reasons, to join the Swiss Psychoanalytic Society, affiliated with the IPA, created a growing conflict with other groups of the Swiss Association. Furthermore, the often patriarchal attitude of the leaders of *Plattform* pushed the “feminist” factor to form an opposition sub-group called *Merda* (shit).

It was, on the other hand, of primary importance that many training analysts in Zurich (Fritz Morgenthaler, Paul Parin, and Goldy Parin-Matthèy, Arno von Blarer, Emil Grütter, and others) protected the positions of *Plattform*. Also important were the scientific and personal relationships with the Italian group².

There were various critical moments, for example, the “Interlaken affair” (see *Psicoterapia e Scienze Umane*, 4/1975, pp. 26-31), and finally, in 1977, came the categorical break with the Swiss Psychoanalytic Society and thus originated an independent Psychoanalytic Seminar Zurich (www.psychanalyse-zuerich.ch) that to this day survives and still rejects the statutory and formal psychoanalytic training.

After the split, the *Plattform* group gradually lost its significance, as they strove to survive with the work of the “International Psychoanalytic Network” (*Internationale Psychoanalytische Vernetzung*), which had in the meantime been established. One should however note that, at the congress of the 1989 jubilee in Rome (“Twenty years of *Plataforma Internacional*”, held from November 10-12 1989, still at the Carlino restaurant, which in the meantime had changed its name to “Bagatto”), the organization had not long been in existence.

It seems instead that in the following years, at the Psychoanalytic Seminar Zurich, a new younger generation assumed the leadership, without any conflict, significantly changing the emphasis of the work and interests. The politicization of the Seminar has almost disappeared and the psychoanalytic interests have become broadly pluralistic with the creation of innumerable sub-groups. As before, there are no rules that discriminate against participation at the seminars. Through pressures of the market and political environment, the stance on rejection of the formal *curriculum* has been softened, even if no one is interested in the rules of the IPA (which in Zurich, after the rift, were managed by the *Sigmund Freud Institut*, with which individual and informal ties also exist).

In the end, the sequence of events shows once again that history’s imprint is stronger than the will.

Reflections

What remains of an event that took place 37 years ago, in Rome in 1969 – the protest, instigated by the members of an international group of psychoanalysts who, by their radical action, attempted to draw attention to the crisis in the basic structure of psychoanalytic practice, in other words, the training, or better yet, the training analysis? Without doubt all this produced an enhancement of the personal biographies of its participants, and there is a risk of easily getting bogged down in nostalgic recollections. However did something change in the psychoanalytic movement in general? Certainly, there are changes that time has already digested: a notable loss in the significance of psychoanalysis in the cultural world, in medicine, in psychiatry, in the marketplace, and in work conditions; the phenomenon of “Freud bashing” as a form of journalistic entertainment, etc. But

² In Italy, as has already been said, the movement, initiated by members and candidates within the SPI, ultimately died out. The anti-institutional fervour over the years turned into a fervour to occupy prestigious positions within the SPI. Conversely, an organic relationship was established with the “Milan Group for the Advancement of Psychotherapy” (*Gruppo Milanese per lo Sviluppo della Psicoterapia*), founded in 1960 and which in 1978 would take the name of *Psicoterapia e Scienze Umane* (www.psicoterapiaescienzeumane.it/english.htm) adopting the logo of the journal. In collaboration with the Zurich *Plattform*, regular meetings were organized in Zurich, Milan, Bologna, and Genoa. The Zurich group was made up of Lilian Berna, Arno von Blarer, Irene Brogle, Pedro Grosz, Ita Imhof, Hanspeter Meyer, Emilio Modena, Paul Parin, Berthold Rothschild, Thomas von Salis, Elizabeth von Salis-Schindler, and Judith Valk. The early Italian group was comprised of Alessandro Ancona, Piergiorgio Battaglia, Marianna Bolko, Enzo Codignola, Teresa Corsi Piacentini, Pier Maria Furlan, Ornella Formigoni, Pier Francesco Galli, Emanuele Gualandri, Vladimir Jankovic, Eustachio Loperfido, Silvano Massa, Alberto Merini, Giambattista Muraro, Berta Neumann, Eugenia Omodei Zorini, Ferruccio Tiberi. Some Swiss colleagues became part of the editorial staff of *Psicoterapia e Scienze Umane* (Rothschild joined the editorial board as well) and, in a further change, they joined the scientific committee. With the passage of time, the connection lost its sense of a politically committed collective (for reasons of aging, changes in the political situation, ennui, internal disagreements) but the relationship of friendship and collaboration persists to this day.

also within psychoanalysis, drastic changes have occurred: the fragmentation of psychoanalytic theory including the crumbling of its essential pillars (the theory of drives, psychoanalytic theory, the ground rules of the psychoanalytic situation), infant research, interpersonalism, the flirtation with the neurosciences, the expansion towards literary criticism and philosophy, the growing impotence in relation to social change (such as globalization), the “culture wars”, emigration, etc. What, on the other hand, has not changed is the system of procedures of the IPA and of the psychoanalytic corporations. Those, however, who do not participate in all this, are totally indifferent, and no one would want to change their ingrained structure, either from the inside or the outside. No one but the believers would make a pilgrimage to Rome as in 1969. One might barely admit a certain interest in some publication, book or magazine. In reading the literature, it is possible to observe that the woes in training are being painfully exposed over and over again as if for the first time. We realize with amazement that student-candidates are traumatized or pathologized, that the training committees, full of gossip and indiscretion, are inadequate, that the selection procedures are unworthy of psychoanalysis, that the psychoanalytic institutions have grown old, etc. One just has to leaf through the latest issues of the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* to read criticisms that are sometimes quite harsh³. It would be too easy to haughtily detach oneself and mention that already forty years ago we were openly speaking out against these woes; or also to point out that there have always been many authors who have been immersed in the serious problems of psychoanalytic training⁴. These repeated complaints and all the scenes of self-flagellation changed nothing, absolutely nothing, in the conception of training analysis... Our colleague, Luigi Martelli, psychoanalyst and psychoanalytic historian, has shown in various articles in *Il Ruolo Terapeutico* (see issues 72/1996 pp. 5-12, 80/1999 pp. 104-114, and 82/1999 pp. 80-85) that it was Eitingon in 1920 to make “training analysis” his own and how Freud passively consented to it, without ever being interested or committed to the institutionalization or formalization of psychoanalytic education. We can ask ourselves however if all this concerns us: do we, who feel totally remote from institutions, believe that we have deeply understood the “poverty of the institution”? Even more, we, those of the so-called “non-institutionalized” groups, have to ask ourselves what our positions are, in relation to psychoanalytic training. We would be naïve if we thought that similar problems do not exist outside the IPA.

At this point it is time to clearly formulate our thesis: *there is no need for a formalized psychoanalytic training!* We are dealing with an intentionally misleading fiction that lies in the impotent condition of the psychoanalytic profession, for which it is maintained that through the training ritual one can acquire some power and authority.

And that – and this is perhaps even more important – it can provide its participants the illusion of “belonging”. This factor plays a role that should not be undervalued even in the so-called “non-

³ See, for example, the articles by Garza-Guerrero in the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, in issues 6/2002 and 1/2004 (this last as a lead article entitled “Our long and marasmic night of one century”), and by Casement in issue 4/2005, and the *panel report* by Sonnenberg in issue 1/2006, and so on.

⁴ See the works of Balint on pp. 163-173 of issue 29/1948 and pp. 157-162 of issue 35/1954 of the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* (translated into Italian in the book, *L'analisi didattica. Chi psicoanalizzerà gli psicoanalisti?* Rimini: Guaraldi, 1974, pp. 17-64; see also Balint's book *Primary Love and Psychoanalytic Technique*. London: Tavistock, 1965 [Italian translation: *L'amore primario*, Rimini: Guaraldi, 1971; Milan: Raffaello Cortina, 1991), of Knight on pp. 187-221 of issue 1/1953 of the *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, of Grete Bibring and Gitelson respectively on pp. 169-173 and 174-183 of issue 35/1954 of the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* (this last has the title “Therapeutic problems in the analysis of the ‘normal’ candidate”, and was translated into Italian in Gitelson's book *Psicoanalisi: scienza e professione*, Turin: Boringhieri, 1980), of Stelzer in issue 7/1986 of *Free Associations*, etc., and also several articles which we have published in *Psicoterapia e Scienze Umane*, such as those of Johannes Cremerius in issues 3/1987 (on the “poverty of the psychoanalytic institution”), 3/1989 (on “training analysis and power”) and 3/1999 (on the “hierarchy of institutionalized training”), of Otto F. Kernberg in issues 4/1987 and 2/2003 (and in issue 5/1996 of the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* Kernberg had published an article entitled “Thirty ways to destroy the creativity of candidates in psychoanalysis”, translated into Italian in issue 76/1998 of the journal *Gli Argonauti* and published on the Internet at www.psychomedia.it/pm/modther/probpsiter/kernberg-2.htm), of Kirsner in issue 2/2003, etc.

institutionalized” groups. Institutionalized psychoanalytic training is not necessary because those that wish to learn this profession are adult subjects, autonomous, certainly neurotic, but capable of choosing their own analyst, and of basing decisions on their own criteria. They are able to master psychoanalytic theory and obtain the necessary experience in a completely free manner. They are able to choose in total freedom their own educators, to ask for help when it seems necessary and seek counsel at the moment they feel ready to treat patients in a competent manner.

For all this there is absolutely no necessity for training committees, or for belated education. Essentially, we are dealing with what Friedrich Schiller had called *Selbsterziehung* (self-learning), and what Immanuel Kant called “*Selbsterziehung* to emancipation” (self-learning to emancipation). Unfortunately, even in this way, the problem of “the need for belonging”, within its Darwinian-sociological context, is still unresolved. We are not at all certain that for this problem there will ever be a solution for any group...

At this point it is clear that this question immediately arises: How is it possible to guarantee quality in this manner? How do we protect ourselves from abuses and charlatanism? Would we not provoke psychoanalytic anarchy in this way? The answer is simple: it is now necessary to accept that in our profession there are many stupid people, and that there have always been abuses and charlatanism, which even the most enlightened psychoanalytic association has never been able to avoid (and has sometimes even promoted). Michael Balint answered the accusation about educating “wild psychoanalysts” with his own method of psychological training for physicians in this way: «No system can eliminate a certain percentage of charlatanism; I cannot limit scientific research because of a minority of charlatans».

Should those writers, for example, for whom there is no training in a strict sense, perhaps get angry with hacks? Or should they get angry rather with capable adversaries? One could object that we psychoanalysts are not artists, and it is true, even if many would like to be. So are we scientists? If so, we should explore, freely learn, and define for ourselves the modalities of our training. Or are we unfortunately members and promoters of a *Weltanschauung*, of a world view? Are we the last of the Mohicans of a profession heading towards extinction? Anyone can and must answer in his own way.

Only one thing, however, is certain: what we are, or believe we are, depends, in any event, on how we become it. We became psychoanalysts, in the sense of *Selbsterziehung*, as long as, during the course of our training, the roads were free and the detours unobstructed. Let us not deceive ourselves: one of the greatest obstacles certainly is (and was) what we experienced or are still promoting as psychoanalytic education.

Abstract. History of the Counter-Congress of the *International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA)* of Rome in 1969. The history of the counter-congress of the *International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA)* of Rome in 1969, usually forgotten or repressed by official historiography, is reviewed. This protest was instigated because of the conservative structure of psychoanalytic training and associations. Today, these themes, after much delay, have even been officially dealt with by the IPA. In the final reflective passages, the formal training of psychoanalysts is strongly criticized, and alternative solutions are suggested. [KEY WORDS: International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA), IPA 1969 counter-congress in Rome, history of psychoanalysis, psychoanalytic training, training analysis]

Riassunto. Viene raccontata la storia della contestazione e del controcongresso dell'*International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA)* di Roma del 1969, che le storiografie accademiche hanno dimenticato e occultato. Ne vengono discusse le ragioni, che riguardavano la struttura conservatrice del training e delle società psicoanalitiche. Oggi questi temi, con grande ritardo, vengono affrontati anche ufficialmente dall'IPA. Nelle riflessioni finali viene discusso criticamente il training istituzionalizzato degli psicoanalisti e vengono proposte soluzioni alternative. [PAROLE CHIAVE: *International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA)*, controcongresso dell'IPA di Roma del 1969, storia, training psicoanalitico, analisi didattica]