Psychoanalysis is a branch of scientific knowledge that investigates the conscious and unconscious dynamic motivations of the processes of the human psyche, a psyche impressed upon by our genetic endowment and the historical-social-politic-economic forces of our milieu. The methodology of psychoanalysis lends itself both for research and for therapy, for it de-represses and in so doing, clarifies, de-mythifies and objectifies dynamic motivational systems and processes. The activity required to de-repress is time consuming and a salient virtue of Freud was his unconcern for the time required by an individual, as in the "Case of the Wolf-man"; this dedication is one of his humanist traits. Properly speaking, psychoanalysis has no time limit, although one must avoid the pitfall of an "analysis interminable", without significant gains and thus senseless.

It is rather odd, that for all practical purposes, we have institutionalized a time limit for the graduation of a student in training setting thus, unwittingly and implicitly, a maximum duration of 4 or 5 years and a tolerable minimum of 300 sessions of 45 minutes at least (Federation Statutes p.3) There has thus been established a difference —unwarranted as far as I can see— between a therapeutic and a didactic or training analysis. One cannot but agree with Hanns Sachs when he wrote in 1947 (p. 158): "I must say that I have found the
difference between the analysis of training candidates and of neurotic patients negligible", to which we could just add: that there should be no difference. It thus becomes a travesty that we can prolongue for more than 5 years the analysis of a non-candidate, for it is needed and we cannot retard the graduation of a student. We know that there is no way by which we can precipitate results and shorten the duration of an analysis, for each analysand has his own rhythm to integrate what he learns about himself. Psychoanalysis is a reeducational process that gradually breaks the chains of repression and overcomes the defense mechanisms of the subject; it is a process that seeks a dialogical truth, consensual to the diad and thus we proceed from what becomes known to what remains unknown; it is a process that engages and commits both analyst and analysand in an incessant and patient effort, for an indefinite period without becoming "interminable".

For Freud, the aim of psychoanalysis was to make conscious the unconscious and thus sublimate the antisocial and polymorphously perverse sexual libidinal drives rooted in infancy. Overcoming the castration complex, that constant companion of the unresolved Oedipus, leads us to search for a woman not our mother —or a man not our father—; penis envy in women becomes fully sublimated by the fortune of giving birth to a male son. In other words as Fromm states (1979 p.7): "Freud's therapeutic aim was control of instinctual drives through the strengthening of the ego; they have to be subdued by ego and superego".
Fromm, trained in freudian psychoanalysis, since his first communication in 1932 begin to realize the significant impact on the family and the individual of the social structure and the resultant way of life; he also realized the impact of the individual on his family and on the psychology of his social group. A case in point of the latter, is Sigmund Freud’s monumental influence on our culture. But Fromm (1962 pp 126 ff.) realized something more: man's deep fear is of isolation and ostracism at the hands of the family and the social group; a fear that will influence the repression of his creative or destructive psychic qualities, according to the prevailing norms: Freud had understood that fear is the "agent provocateur par excellence" of all repressions, but he emphasized that such fear was essentially a castration fear. He could not conceive, within the framework of what was then considered true, that for "man, inasmuch as he is man—that is to say, inasmuch as he transcends nature and is aware of himself and of death—the sense of complete aloneness and separateness is close to insanity" (Fromm: 1962 p. 126). Insanity has often one immediate consequence: it evokes that isolation and ostracism we so deeply fear, precisely because we have withdrawn into ourselves. Martin Buber (1942) expresses clearly that man is in himself and with others, and adds (p. 146) "The fundamental fact of human existance is that man is with others". Man must relate to his fellow men if he is to preserve some degree of sanity; the degree of his sanity will depend on the quality of his relatedness. But man fears the process of his growing individuation; he fears the ever greater emergence of his potentialities, because he fears to be different from those who surround
him, as much as he fears breaking his primary ties to his mother, his family, his clan... breaking away from all that which has given him his sense of identification —though not his identity— within the family and his social group, an identification that was induced, programmed into him from earliest infancy and which allowed him to survive.

The above mentioned led Fromm to an entirely different concept of conscious-unconscious (1967, p.3): "Speaking... as an analyst I must add... that one can be aware or not be aware of something... This leads us to say that to become conscious of something means that one acknowledges or observes that which exists within and outside of ourselves and to be unconscious means not to see, to be blind... consequently I'm referring to a human function". For Fromm, it does not suffice to become conscious of that about which we were unconscious; he added that one must make every effort to continue conscious of it and more importantly, one must evolve in action, this new awareness. With this in mind, when Fromm (1955, Chapter 3 and 1973, Chapter 10) speaks of those human needs derived from the conditions of our human existence, he signals how essential it is to know our inherent existential dichotomies, so that we can grasp with precision our utopian goal-options or, in other words, the way in which we can orient our efforts towards individuation, thus achieving our most genuine identity possible. He adds (Fromm: 1955, p. 63 f): "Man finds himself surrounded by many puzzling phenomena and, having reason, he has to make sense of them, has to put them in some context which he can understand and which permits him to deal with
them... The further his reason develops, the more adequate becomes his system of orientation, that is, the more it approximates reality. But even if man's frame of orientation is utterly illusory, it satisfies his need for some picture which is meaningful to him. Further on he adds: "it takes a long evolutionary process to arrive at objectivity, that is, to acquire the faculty to see the world, nature, other persons and oneself as they are, and not distorted by desires or fears". Learn to be objective is easily said, if we wish to ignore that it implies transcending the irrational system of the transference rooted in the negative character orientations that relates us irrationally with our fellow-men, other living beings, nature and things; and these negative character orientations are molded by the family's and the social group's repressive impact; so that one is only conscious of that which makes it possible to survive amongst them. A pretense at objectivity, at an intellectualized cerebral level, without manifest changes in being or doing, is not the same experience as that intimate one which jars, jolts, renovates and re-educates; that objectivity that leads us to see our surroundings and our intimacy with the "eyes of an elephant" as Nikos Kazantzakis wrote in his "Report to Greco": "To see all as if for the first time; to see all as if for the last time". We are all aware that we achieve a little bit of this.

Hanns Sachs (Op. cit. p. 160) states that psychoanalysis should strive for the "will to win insight into conflicts and to thus

*In this respect read Arthur Koestler's "The sleepwalkers".*
govern the relations to reality". Is this enough in truth? I do not believe so, for to "govern" implies here, merely an intellectualization and not a newly acquired disposition, integrated in our self that no longer requires governing nor control.

In psychoanalysis we tread the path of progression towards our growing individuation with anguish and intense fear, the transcendence of our original frame of reference, programmed and induced since earliest infancy, leads to a head on collision with the dreaded isolation and ostracism; the intense dramaticism of this event, cannot be minimized; Zen Buddhism adroitly depicts it as daring to walk straight through an avalanche of rocks that threaten to destroy us. It is not enough to become conscious of what was unconscious, one must exercise one's will and rational hope to dare proceed despite fear. This is one of the reasons Fromm spoke of "Fear of Freedom", for it is no simple endeavor to pursue the way to the freedom for our potential individuality.

It makes no sense to speak theoretically of the dread of aloneness, though clinically quite obvious, there are those who speak rather blandly of a tolerance to being by themselves, but dynamically this is more apparent than real. What finally does emerge, with great clarity, is the fear of isolation from mother and the resultant family ostracism, be it by silence or by overt, explicit rejection. It is useless to expound that all mothers have little tolerance for the prolonged absence of their children...the narcissistic wound is too deep and in our present world where there is a prevalence of sado-
masochistic trends, mothers are prone to be retentive, possessive and
domineering toward their offspring. In our present social structure,
the father figure is of lesser significance, although exceptions are
not uncommon. When maternal and paternal figures are demythified and
clarified, the analysand may become independent of them, but not
infrequently the process is not taken to completion out of fear of
the decisive break. It must be made clear that by independence or
break, we are not referring to a mandatory rejection of any and all
relationships to the parents; we refer only to that affirmation of
the self who becomes thus his own authority and can decide how he
wishes to relate to them.

When psychoanalysis has a therapeutic purpose, we may
interrupt or terminate therapy if we become aware that out of fear or
whatever, the analysand ceases to be committed to the process; or
when, they decide to terminate for reasons of their own. Why can this
not be the standard procedure with candidates in training? Any number
of authors (Greenacre: 1961; Anna Freud: 1960) have written on this
theme and they claim that the mere possibility of interrupting or
terminating the analysis is traumatic for the candidate, or that
they become submissive toward their therapist; sometimes adduce that
anyway the suspended candidate will practice psychoanalysis. These
arguments are rather spurious, for we well know that such individuals
will often find a professional enterprise of their own, quite
successfully. It is possible that the alleged trauma or submissiveness
are only iatrogenic, induced by the climate of quasi unconditionallity
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of the candidate's graduation, on admittance. On the other hand, are we not stimulating our own and the candidates narcissism? Are we not evading dialogical truth and reality when we choose to ignore those inadequate elements in a candidate's make-up, so as not to create problems? Psychoanalysis was born of Freud's search for truth and he never stooped to compromise; he stated what he believed he observed and the fruits of his thoughtfulness; he never knowingly lied. That some areas of his theory are mistaken is an entirely different issue dependent on the knowledge of his time and of his social group... never willfully.

As psychoanalysis guides us toward higher levels of individuation, our horizon of options widens and by the same token, our possibilities of freedom grows; this does not imply any certitude about our knowledge, nor the verity of our suggestions or assertions... thus an essential credo: de omnibus es dubitandum —doubt everything— that can be rather a generator of anxiety. How can we know that a candidate will be or not be competent? A whole series of possibilities impinge on our evaluations. We have witnessed how an incident may twist a biophilic orientation of joyousness and well-being into a narcissistic, aggressive and insolent one; or have we not seen how ageing and rivalry stimulate trends towards proselitizing, permissive and seductive behaviors, that overthrow a previous generous effort of self-transcendence?

Freud (1937 p. 249) in his "Analysis terminable and
interminable" mentioned some of the facts I have made reference to: "Hostility on the one side and partisanship on the other create an atmosphere which is not favorable to objective investigation... a number of analysts... remain as they are and are able to withdraw from the critical and corrective influence of analysis... It would not be surprising if the effect of a constant preocupation with all the repressed material which struggles for freedom in the human mind were to stir up in the analyst as well, all the instinctual demands which he is otherwise able to keep under suppression". He therefore added: "Every analyst should periodically—at intervals of five years or so—submit himself to analysis once more, without feeling ashamed of taking this step". This latter presents rather serious practical problems. And Freud (Ibid: p. 248) adds two more indications that have had their consequences: "It is therefore reasonable to expect of an analyst, as a part of his qualifications, a considerable degree of mental normality and correctness" and a little further he added: "For practical reasons this analysis [training analysis] can only be short and incomplete". I wish to comment on these three points Freud made in this 1937 paper.

1. The periodic need for a new analysis.
2. The concept of "psychic normality" and
3. The suggestion that a training analysis be "short and incomplete".
It is doubtless that these three points have influenced candidate selection. This selection is not an isolated event, for it pertains to the theoretical-practical orientations of the training institute concerned and it is a consequent cog of the training program and of the functions of the selection, candidate process and graduation committees.

A periodic analysis every five years or so: this seldom takes place except in very specific circumstances and not infrequently with the same analyst one trained with. These facts do not diminish the significance of the theme and it should be carefully considered but, since its occurring today is more the exception than the norm, one should not be taken aback by the narcissistic celerity with which some candidates terminate their analysis once graduated, thus indicating that they have now complied with all required requisits. A periodic return to an individual psychoanalysis is by far more feasible in a fraternal and trustworthy institutional environment; as Freud commented, a rational and fraternal milieu is of doubtless benefit to psychoanalysts and students alike, in all its interpersonal friendly relationships and the possibilities of study and research; such ambient stimulates the free and ample discussion of clinical material and theory because there prevails the expectation that all criticisms voiced are constructive and never destructive.

Clinical practice and the unfolding of our lives impose the need for continuous learning; in fact these events make such a need
imperative, so that self-analysis, as another way of a periodic renewal of psychoanalysis emerges as a must. We are perfectible and our progression should only terminate with our demise. We are all aware of the numerous opportunities of taking a wrong turn, frequently narcissistic; and we are all aware that we will only regain our true way if the pertinent indications come from someone we love and trust.

The second of Freud's indications: the concept of "psychic normalcy", has caused some semantic confusion, as Phyllis Greenacre (1961) stresses, where if in referring to normality Freud meant a goal to be attained through psychoanalysis or if he implied the pertinence of selecting so-called "normal" candidates. This latter was attempted but, amongst others, Bird (1968), Gitelson (1948) and Sachs (Op. cit.) have pointed out the failure of such an attempt, for they were so well "adapted" to their environment, they were immune to what is unconscious. We should not forget that Freud had a peculiar idea of who is normal, since a radical thinker though he was, he was not objective about parenthood in his time, nor was he aware of abnormal intrafamily relationships. An example should suffice: in the "Case of Little Hans" (1909) Freud implicitly considered Little Hans's parents not only normal, but a bit above average, for they "had agreed that in bringing up their first child they would use no more coercion than might be absolutely necessary for maintaining good behavior... without [his] being intimidated (p.6)" Freud, in his psychodynamic understanding of Little Hans's phobia, did not evaluate the fact that the boy's mother lied to him, nor that she explicitly threatened...
to castrate him, cutting-off his "wiwimacher" with a scissors if he again touched his penis. (see Fromm: 1970).

The concept of "normalcy" is difficult to define, and what has been arrived at is to consider it an statistical average, although conscious that this average has many variables. Our concept of health though still a utopia, is valid in so far as it offers orienting norms; in fact, if we list in two columns Fromm's existential dichotomies (1955 and 1973), we see that they constitute valid norms of mental health or illness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental Health</th>
<th>Mental Illness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loving relationship</td>
<td>Narcissism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>Destructiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brotherhood</td>
<td>Fixation to mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuality</td>
<td>Herd conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationality</td>
<td>Irrationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>Idolatry-fanaticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression</td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efectiveness</td>
<td>Inefectual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activating stimuli</td>
<td>Simple or primary stimuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Hopelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral courage</td>
<td>Cowardliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be</td>
<td>To have</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The list is pertinent and useful as guidelines, both in the selection of candidates as well as norms of their progress, otherwise we will continue considering as a "normal" individual our present day statistical average: an alienated, sado-masochistic, hopeless man.

Freud's third point that the analysis of a candidate be "short and incomplete": Today "time is money" and we measure it by fractions of a second, no longer by matins and vespers; where this relates to psychoanalytic practice some therapists have changed from a 60 minute hour, to an analytic hour of exactly 50 minutes and from thence to the present revelation, rather prevalent, of "hours" of 45 minutes without break from analysand to analysand and even eating lunch in front of them, so as not to loose time...

Undeniably there is a stringent demand on the time schedule of an analyst devoted to training students, specially if he belongs to the Selection Committee, for then he is inherently obliged to belong to the Progress and Graduation Committees as well. All of these committees require ample time to discuss each case. If the decision of the Selection Committee is that two or more analysts interview each candidate more than one hour, time must be spent amongst these interviewers before the formal meeting of the Selection Committee takes place. Add to this the time to prepare and preside seminars, time to discuss other institute problems, time to prepare and present scientific papers; time devoted to supervision analysis and time to live and to love those dear ones, plus time to analyse non-students...

Indeed the everyday load is heavy, so much so that many refuse it or limit the time involved at a cost to objectifying pertinent conclusions. Under these conditions one can resort to hunches of intuition or accept whatever out of hurry, tiredness or boredom.

Consequent to the central theme of his paper that an analysis should not be "Interminable", Freud uses arguments that seem rationalizations. He who had to fight physicians in order to uphold the validity of unconscious motivations, now uses examples derived from organic medicine to diminish the significance of the analyst's own conflicts. One could say that there is some validity to his reasoning since man cannot be perfect, but Freud could have been truer to his radical thinking if he simple would have conceded the limited extent of our knowledge and that more-often-than-not we are the proverbial "one-eyed man leading the blind", such a reminder would have been a most timely counter against our narcissism. It is very worthwhile emphasizing one point he also made: "And finally we must not forget that the analytic relationship is based on a love of truth — that is, on a recognition of reality — and that it precludes any kind of sham or deceit". And he ends this line of thinking with his faith that: "we reckon on the stimuli that he has received in his own analysis not ceasing when it ends and on the processes of remodelling the ego continuing spontaneously in the analysed subject and making use of all subsequent experiences in this newly-acquired sense".

A psychoanalysis may be shorter or longer dependent on the
needs specific to each subject, more so in view of our meagre knowledge of the normal and pathological psychodynamics of man. There is no doubt that we mature and attain toward our individuation with fear and anxiety, more so if in so doing we become aware of the world events around us, overshadowed by the irrationality and the arrogance of those who wield the power to destroy us. If psychoanalysis is to continue true to Freud's love of truth, I fail to see how we can avoid correcting what needs correcting in due course. We lack the methodological precision to avoid human errors in selecting candidates; quite possibly, because of our own particular narcissism we may wish to believe in the competence of candidates we have trained, all of which does not justify that a Progress Committee or a training analyst should graduate an inadequate candidate. The acceptance of a student into an institute for psychoanalytic training should in no way mean that his graduation is a matter-of-course, inevitable or imperative. If we are to honor Freud's love of truth, we must banish all sham or deceit, and we are committed to search for truth with all our tenacity and energy, only thus will we overcome the growing tendency towards bureaucratization.

It is true that in these times of critical peril, many are
those who resort to guidance and orientation. This need has fostered many and diverse forms of psychotherapy and so called psychotherapies. But psychoanalysis still stands unique, for it is the center, the axis from which all the others derive their knowledge, and only some of them return a small feedback. It is also true that the Freuds of this world are rara avis; who knows when or where such another will surge forth. All this does not exempt us from promoting psychoanalysis; nor does it exonerate us from a committed effort in correcting our mistakes with a love for truth and without sham or deceit.

Jorge Silva-García M.C.
Joaquín Romo 171, Tlalpan
México D.F., 14410 México
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