sa femme, Lagache, Granoff et Anzieu. L’IPA avait fait une enquête et avait eu trente ou quarante entretiens.1»

Peu après, le 20 juillet, Serge Leclaire annonce à Daniel Lagache que Sacha Nacht ne s’oppose pas à l’affiliation de la SFP.

Mais, avant l’ouverture de ce Congrès, Pierre Turquet a fait parvenir au Central Executive un texte dont nous ne donnerons le texte qu’en anglais, ne voulant pas risquer les erreurs ou approximations de traduction qui ont été tant reprochées à François Perrier et que nous ne souligneron pas.

«Strictly Confidential
«Paula Heimann, Dr P.J. Van der Leeuw, Miss Ilse Hellman, Dr Wilhelm Solms, Dr P. Turquet, Secretary.»

Suit, après une table des matières et des documents en possession de Maxwell Gitelson, le long texte de ce rapport que nous citons intégralement, y compris les fautes de frappe visibles sur le manuscrit dont nous avons la copie:2

«JULY 1963
«I. COMMITTEE’S ACTIVITIES WITH THE S.P.P.
«(1) The Committee was slow in getting under way with its work and although there were communications from Dr. Leclaire, as Secretary of the S.F.P., no effective contact was made till the Secretary visited Paris, 22nd June the 2nd July 1962.

«(2) Our reasons for this slow start were mixed; in part a lack of time on our part, as also a wish to see what the S.P.P. did if left to themselves. Our delay gave them time to find their own feet after Edinburgh, as well as an opportunity to show their true colours. Forces bath for and against the Requirements were thereby allowed to develop and take shape.

«(3) This slow start may have been a mistake on our part. Certainly we did not actively interfere, and hence our silence was taken on occasions as consent; thus we did not protest at Lacan’s election as President. It is arguable if any such protest would have helped; in fact the trial of strength between us as the representatives of the Central Executive (C.E.) and Dr. Lacan’s followers was only thereby postponed. In the interval some forces may have matured in our favour.

«(4) The Secretary’s visit to Paris brought out the following points:-
«- The Requirements were being put into effect.

2. Je tiens ici à remercier Anikó Solti Lejonborg, Board Secretary of the International Psychoanalytical Association, qui a retrouvé et m’a fait parvenir ce texte dont l’interprétation par François Perrier a suscité les commentaires que nous avons lus. On trouvera une traduction de ce texte sur le site des PUF: www.puf.com.
Progress was being made in the administration and record-keeping of the Society.

Lacan continued to be the major problem.

Lagache, whose loyalty to the International could not be doubted, was found not to have the necessary position or psychological strength to oppose Lacan.

Strasbourg, as a provincial centre, was growing in importance.

The S.P.P. were reorientating themselves to the new situation with the S.F.P. but required Dr. Gitelson's answer to two questions:

(a) Who constituted the Study Group? Was it only Members-at-Large and their analysands, or did it include the list of Members, Associate Members and Candidates according to the card index of August 1961?

(b) Who was to be allowed to train? Was it only the Members-at-Large, or those who had candidates in training August 1961?

The Committee then met in London 21st-22nd July to consider this situation, Dr. van der Leeuw being absent. The total situation was examined with mutual profit. At the executive level the Committee decided:

- to ask Dr. Gitelson to answer the S.P.P.'s questions
- to inform Dr. Leclaire, as Secretary, that Professor Anzieu and Mons Safouan, who were to be nominated as future training analysts for Strasbourg, could not be recognised as such till after the Committee's visit when the Committee proposed to interview them, and at which time they would be discussed with the Study Group's Council.

The Committee then planned to visit Paris in October, a visit which was regretfully postponed to the beginning of January 1963 due to illness in the Committee and patient commitments.

In September the Committee received a full reply from Dr. Gitelson.

Because of these delays, and because Dr. van der Leeuw had not been present at the London meetings, the Committee met in Vienna 17th-18th November to agree plans for the now January visit, Vienne being chosen to make things easier for Dr. Solms.

At this meeting, after a general review of the situation, the Committee focussed its attention on two problems:

- How had the Requirements been explained to the Members of the S.F.P. and how had they been accepted?

- The danger of the S.F.P.'s rejection as a Component Society by the C.E. of the I.P.A. The continued presence of Lacan as an active participant in the conduct of the affaire of the S.P.P. at all levels was seen as increasing the danger of the S.F.P. being rejected as a Component Society of the I.P.A. by the C.E.

The Committee therefore decided to ask its London members to meet the
Edinburgh representatives (Drs. Granoff, Lagache, Leclaire and Perrier) to discuss these problems with them.

«The Committee also discussed Dr. Gitelson’s replies to their enquiries and the form of reply to be sent to the S.P.P.

«(9) The Committee’s invitation to the Edinburgh representatives to attend a meeting in London was accepted, the meeting being held on Sunday, 25th November, at which were present Dr. Granoff, Dr. Heimann, Miss Hellman, Professor Lagache, Dr. Leclaire, Dr. Perrier, and Dr. Turquet as Secretary.

«An account of this meeting, which was considered by the Committee to be satisfactory, is attached.

«(10) The Committee visited Paris 2nd-6th January, 1963, interviewing a selected number of Candidates (21), Associate Members (11) and Members (9). The two new nominated training analysts, Anzieu and Safouan, were interviewed, as also a potential third, Dr. Pujol. The whole situation was reviewed with both Training Committee and Council. Dr. Benassy and Dr. Lebovici of the S.P.P. were also seen.

«Unfortunately, through illness, Dr. Heimann was not able to be present. The visit was also complicated by the European weather situation, Miss Hellman arriving late and Dr. van der Leeuw leaving early. Nevertheless much fruitful work was done.

«Details of the visit, its principles and aims are set out in Appendices IV, V and VI.

«(11) This January visit has provided the background information for the present Report which was considered in an interim form at a meeting of the Committee in Amsterdam 16th-17th March, Amsterdam being chosen to meet the convenience of Dr. van der Leeuw.

«At this meeting it was agreed:-

«that the Secretary should go over the interim Report with the Council of the S.F.P. before the Committee’s next and final visit, and before the Stockholm Congress. The Committee’s aims in sending the Secretary were:-

«to check the main facts with them;
«to inform them of its contents;
«to outline its Recommendations so as to enable their Council to formulate its replies to these Recommendations
«To visit Paris in June to finalise the Committee’s report to the C.E.

«(12) The Secretary visited Paris 18th-19th May and, in the presence of Dr. Leclaire (President), Professor Anzieu. Drs. Dolto, Granoff, Lacan, Lagache and Perrier, gave a full verbatim translation of the Committee’s interim Report, together with the section entitled “Recommendations” (Section XV). Full notes
were taken. No major correction of fact to the Report was required by those present.

«(13) The Committee visited Paris 22nd-23rd June to hear the Council's comments on the Recommendations. These are embodied in this Report in Section XV “Recommendations”.

«(14) Because the position of Lacan's analysands remained unresolved, the Secretary stayed on for another forty-eight hours to explore their position. The results of this exploration however remained inconclusive.

«(15) Because the Committee wishes to draw the attention of the C.E. to certain events that occurred in the recent June visit, these are separately reported (Section II).

«II. PARIS MEETING 22nd-23rd JUNE 1963

«(1) As explained, the Committee visited Paris 22nd-23rd June to discuss with the Council of the S.F.P. this Report and, in particular, its Recommendations (Section XV).

«(2) In making arrangements, the Secretary requested that the meeting should be between the Council of the S.F.P. and the Committee. Leclaire in his reply asked that the Training Committee should join this meeting, thereby bringing in Mons and Mme Favez. He added that he did not expect Lacan to come, and that he was uncertain about Dolto's presence, the former attending ex-officio as a past President, the latter as a current Vice-President.

«The Secretary replied: “As to your Training Committee joining the Council, this I must leave to you. As far as my Committee and the International is concerned, the responsible people are the Council. If from your point of view you wish the Training Committee to appear at the discussion, we on our part would have no objection”.

«(3) On the Saturday afternoon prior to our evening meeting, the Committee met, examined this situation at length, and were unanimously against discussing the Report in the presence of Lacan who, on recent information from Leclaire, was now likely to be present. The Committee’s view was founded on three points:

«It was not part of their normal custom or experience to discuss an individual in front of that individual.

«It was feared that his presence would have an inhibitory effect on the discussion.

«It was not clear to the members of Committee what they were being asked to sanction or to take part in by having Lacan present at the forthcoming discussions.

«(4) This point of view was put to Leclaire who, in the exchanges, said:
«– Neither was it their wish that he should be present.
«– It was also not part of their custom to discuss such matters in front of the individual concerned.
«– But that to date with Lacan all discussions had taken place in his presence and that therefore –
«Leclaire wished the Committee to discuss as hitherto in front of Lacan.
«(5) The Committee, whilst firmly making its attitude quite clear that it did not wish to pursue these matters any further in Lacan's presence, agreed to accede to Leclaire's request. Lacan was therefore present throughout Saturday evening's discussion.
«(6) On the Sunday morning, prior to renewing the discussions, the Committee met and felt even more strongly that no further discussions should be held in Lacan's presence. Furthermore, as the Council of the S.F.P. alone was responsible to the C.E., there was no need for the Training Committee either to be present. Leclaire was therefore informed that the Committee wished only to meet the Council without Lacan.
«Leclaire replied that he would have to discuss this with his Council and the Secretary put a room at their disposal in the Committee's hotel in which they could hold a meeting.
«(7) After an hour's delay Dr. Leclaire replied that his Council wished himself, Granoff and Lagache to attend on the Committee. The Committee agreed to this and it transpired that they came as the Edinburgh representatives with no particular powers and able to make only personal statements. As a result the Committee had no further contact with Council.
«(8) The Committee is firmly of the opinion that it was completely right in insisting that Lacan should no longer be present. The statements made by both Lagache and Leclaire showed how inhibiting his influence had been.
«(9) The Committee at this point wishes to make the following comments on this situation, which will again be referred to in Section XVI “Conclusions”, being of the opinion that –
«– the Council of the S.F.P. sided with Lacan in this situation, their viewing the situation, so it seems, as a trial of strength between the Council and the Committee.
«– Leclaire, Lagache and Granoff were not able to carry the Council with them, hence the compromise solution of sending the Edinburgh representatives.
«– The inconclusive ending to the Committee's visit represents the present state of affairs.
«III. SOMS (sic) GENERAL IMIDRESSIONS (sic)
«Looking back over this period of work with the Study Group, the Committee is left with a number of important general impressions, some aspects of which
will be discussed in greater detail in the later sections of this Report. The situation contains many contradictory elements, which this Report itself reflects.

«(1) General Atmosphere

«In general our visits have been welcomed and the atmosphere frank and friendly. They have not been treated as a mere formality. Provided there was no head-on clash over the Lacan problem, things went smoothly. It was only at our fast meeting on the Sunday morning when we insisted on making Lacan’s exclusion a reality that a serious breakdown in our negotiations occurred, the word “negotiation” being here used advisedly.

«(2) Lacan

«For us therefore Lacan has continued to be the major problem in the whole situation. But he is also a problem for the overall development of psychoanalysis in France and hence is as much a matter of concern to the S.P.P. as to the S.F.P. He was certainly uppermost in much of the Committee’s thinking, and by implication was frequently “present” at interviews and discussions.

«(3) The fact that Lacan (unless he were to become the object of a major personality change) is never likely to be acceptable to the International except under conditions of total exclusion from training, was not initially fully perceived or accepted by Council. On all occasions we made our attitude clear that his exclusion from training must in the end be total and for ever. There can be no claim that they do not know where they stand on this point.

«(4) But the problem does not end with his personality or his training methods. It contains the further one of his pupils. In some quarters the “society” is identified with him. Furthermore he has always had a large number of analysands, double that of any other analyst. Therefore his withdrawal does not necessarily mean that the “Society” will be any the less “Lacanian”. It is difficult to foresee what this means for the future. For within the group his views are strongly defended and regarded as seminal. The quality therefore of those forces which could and would oppose and counteract his influence remains of the greatest importance, as likewise the fostering of those factors which will enable them to emerge and come to the fore.

«(5) The foreseen, and perhaps inevitable danger was that our presence would be used so that we could be portrayed as attacking Lacan and they could then defend and protect him. We were indeed used in this way.

«(6) Their Council and Training Committee’s attitude on the Lacan problem would seem to be the reflection of three things:

«a feeling that he would be a loss to the Society not only because of his ideas which, as already said, are thought to be original, and hence valued, but also because he is a good “recruiting sergeant”.

«An unawareness of how he is perceived in the outside world, and by the
C.E. in particular, this unawareness being perhaps itself the reflection of their "shut-in-ness" and their lack of contact with the outside world.

"It must also be remembered that he was a founder member and in the early difficult days an inspiration. In their view he provided the ideas, the enthusiasms, and the energy with which to continue the struggle for existence.

"(7) As a consequence there has always been a hope that somehow or other a solution could be found "to exclude without excluding" Lacan. The Committee on all occasions firmly opposed any such plan.

"(8) The Dolto problem has points of similarity in that her ideas are valued, her "intuition" is sought and found helpful, and her "maternal" qualities needed. But it should be added immediately that the "Dolto question" is otherwise not to be compared with the "Lacan question": her exclusion is in general accepted and not really controversial. Whilst protesting, she appears to accept the decision. Furthermore, her main interest is in children, in which field she exerts an important influence.

"In both cases it is very easy for those of us who come from well-established groups to diagnose the "neurotic quality" of their appeal. From within an extruded, struggling, isolated group, things may well [sic] appear different.

"(9) The problem has however a further aspect. There is some evidence that the application of the Requirements is being given a bias so that pro-Lacan elements are being pushed forward, and in this way the Requirements would be defeated. We have been left with the uneasy impression that whilst in general the Requirements are being enforced, it is with this twist. There is a feeling that they should not apply to Lacan: he is worthy of exception.

"(10) S.F.P.'s changed status

"There appears to be a failure to appreciate the current change in their status, namely, from that of a "Groupe d'Etudes Freudianennes" – their own self-description of 1953 and an appropriate one in the then current circumstances to that of a Study Group with obligations under the I.P.A. As a corollary it would seem, too, that they have not yet found the necessary frame of mind in which to become a Component Society.

"(11) The "Troika"

"The Study Group has been, and is, in the hands of the three Secretaries, Granoff (Business), Leclaire (Training), Perrier (Scientific), the three being known as the "troika". They took over after Edinburgh and have "run" the Study Group over since. They are agreed on a general policy, in which they are supported by Lagache, to see the Study Group through to final Component Society status. Within this framework, and despite individual differences, they work well together and complement each other. As Leclaire is now the President they should now be in a stronger position.
Their fundamental weaknesses are that they are still young in terms of analytic experience, and that they are not able to constitute an effective force to contain Lacan. On the other hand, they are efficient, loyal to each other, politically ambitious, and have many of the attributes of an “inner cabinet” of a political party seeking power, which may be necessary in the current situation.

Leclaire is the leader. Both he and Perrier, the former as a candidate, the latter as a second analysis, are Lacan analysands. Here, therefore, Granoff has a different background. Privately and singly they will strongly criticise Lacan, but between and together they seek to protect him, not only in the sense of sparing him, but also for an eventual return to a position of authority within the “Society”. Granoff supports this policy because he believes in supporting Leclaire as the most constructive force in the Society. The “troika” therefore are agreed amongst themselves to find some solution to the Lacan problem which would preserve his general influence, keeping his teaching at one remove, and giving him an “honourable” place.

Leclaire’s personal position is further complicated by being President. He sought this position as a means of seeing the Requirements implemented and as a way of solving the Lacan problem. He was elected on these grounds and as representing the wish to join the International. He is probably seen as the person most suitable to get the Society out of its present difficulties.

But all this in a way ties him. As Chairman he feels he has to find a compromise where no compromise can really exist. He seeks to preserve the cohesion and wholeness of the Group where extrusion, certainly as far as training is concerned, is the order of the day. He can be seen, therefore, as “fixed” by the inherent ambivalences and ambiguities of the situation. His position is full of contradictions and his attitude to us therefore very mixed.

The “troikats” pro-Lacan feelings conflict with their wish to join the International. Their task is not an easy one as inevitably it involves hurting other members. They dislike the notion of having to “pay” to join the Internationale yet this is exactly what the situation requires, the price being the elimination of Lacan. Here without doubt they need the Committee’s help in facing their problem realistically.

On a real show-down they might split. Granoff, not being a Lacan analysand, is less committed. Leclaire, as a Member-et-Large of the International, is more objective, though he is very set on maintaining the overall cohesion of the group. Perrier is perhaps the most involved with Lacan and therefore the most unwilling to examine the fundamental conflict.

In their defence it should be said that the “troika” has “manoeuvred” as well as the situation will allow, though it may be regretted that such a word as “manoeuvred” has to be used. But a group is no easy thing to handle and this
Study Group, in our opinion, is no exception. Further explosions and disruptions would have been of doubtful service to anybody, least of all to psychoanalysis in France, and the Committee sympathises with this aspect of their dilemma.

«(17) Professor Lagache

«Whilst Professor Lagache was most helpful and actively demonstrated his primary loyalty to the International, he is not the “strong” character which the situation requires. Without doubt he is on the side of the angels and from the Committee’s point of view has all the right ideas. However, he is too isolated a figure, too scholarly in approach, lacks the necessary leadership qualifications and is too manifestly anti-Lacan to be effective as the leader or the founder of a further group, should this ever become necessary. In this situation his integrity, which is beyond reproach, is a disadvantage.

«(18) In truth there is no effective counter-leader at present. This requires time.

«(19) Administration

«Administratively great progress has been made and in this connection the Committee has nothing but congratulations to offer Dr. Leclaire. The problem now is not the quality or efficiency of its administration but the purpose to which it has been put. The group has been reorganised and its analytic and training effectiveness thereby increased.

«(20) Training question

«Training was the primary task of our inquiry and therefore the field of concentration of our work. In these matters the Study Group has been handicapped by:

«the restricted number of the training analysts acquired in 1953 at the time of the foundation of the group as also by the then dearth of potential material. Only very slowly has the group been able to bring forward new training analysts from out of its own midst.

«Their discovery has been the slower because the fundamental aim of the Group at the time of its formation was not training but “liberty”, itself for them an opposite concept.

«The uncertainty of their position in the psychoanalytic world, the need for a “work through”, to settle clown, the lack of preoccupation with wider psychoanalytic issues, all have meant that responsibility (dependency) was left to elders and has resulted in the absence of any drive on the part of potential seniors to come to the fore.

«(21) As is somewhat to be expected with a small number of Members, there has been a marked tendency to “inbreeding”. The round of seminar-takers is limited, even more so when it comes to a provincial, though university centre such as Strasbourg. Originally as a small “private group” the primary task has
been the survival and not the assumption of teaching responsibilities for students. But this primary task has now changed, as indeed the Training Committee now fully realise: it is to train. The need therefore is great for senior Stagiaires to proceed to Associate Member status and for Associate Members to become Members so that there can be a wider choice of trainers.

« (22) Study Group status has however already resulted in the promotion of two new training analysts (Anzieu and Safouan). A potential third (Pujol) was seen, and others are on the list.

« (23) Strasbourg

« The Strasbourg Group is rapidly going ahead and has good training elements. But there is the danger of ambitions out-running technical capacity, and therefore the danger of the situation getting out of control.

« (24) Groupe Méditerranéen

« The Mediterranean scene remains confused. The Study Group has still too limited resources to be encouraged to undertake any major activity in that area.

« (25) Relations with S.P.P.

« The attitudes of the S.F.P. and S.P.P. towards each other appear to be changing, at least in a number of respects. Contacts between the younger generation are numerous, Lacan being an indirect conjunction since they attend his seminar at Ste.Anne's. Relations between seniors appear however to remain estranged. The C.E.'s act in openly recognising the situation, namely, that the Society of the S.P.P. and the Study Group of the S.F.P. bath exist as established facts, has contributed greatly to the present détente. There is some recognition of the fact that mutual rivalry will harm psychoanalysis in France and that some agreement has therefore to be reached. The possibility of shared facilities, e.g. elementary lectures, libraries, exchange of information on rejected candidates, are in the air, as also the exchange of supervisors. That the C.E. insists on certain predetermined standards for the one, which are not uniformly used in the other, is an undoubted complication in the present situation.

« The Committee welcomes these moves towards improved relations between the two Societies and has used its influence to encourage closer relationships.

« (26) Three Final Impressions

« The first relates to their attitude to Freud. Without doubt he is closely studied, especially in his earlier work, the case histories (Rat-man, Dora), but rather less in his later writings. The writings of other analysts appear as peripheral and marginal to their studios. It would seem that in their search for legitimacy and so as not to be accused of frequenting "undesirable company", they may have stultified themselves. Over their teaching work there hangs a pall of sterility. As a result they created in us a claustrophobic feeling and a need for fresh air. This is their need too.
"(27) The second relates to their handling of transference. The Committee was let with a disturbed feeling about the candidate's experiential knowledge of transference phenomena. It is not only that the students and members are giving their patients an experience of transference by seeing them four times a week on four separate days, radically different from their own experience of transference in training which for the most part is based on three sessions a week, with perhaps two in one day, or three sessions one part of the week and none in the rest, but the actual management of the candidate's transference experience is unsatisfactory.

"We did not have the feeling when discussing their analytic experience with senior candidates that their knowledge and familiarity with transference phenomenon was comparable, especially in quality, with that of students in England or Holland. Its negative aspects appear to be ignored. It has a theoretical rather than a "lived" quality about it, due in part to a failure to appreciate the operation of phantasy in the transference which is therefore seen in a literal and restricted way.

"(28) These last two impressions are fundamentally related to the quality of the training offered to their candidates. The primary raw student material, judging by our interviews, is good and in some cases excellent. But in a number of cases we felt that this good material was being wasted. Some candidates had acquired psychoanalysis as one might go and buy a suit for a special occasion. They did not give us the feeling that they had been well and truly tempered in the analytic fire.

"IV. THE STUDY GROUP AND THE REQUIREMENTS

"(1) Initially the Requirements came as a shock and the Edinburgh representatives on their return had to be circumspect. In particular R. 131, by naming Lacan and Dolto, caused hurt. It seems that although steps were immediately taken to inform the group in the first instance as to their general tenor, and later at a meeting on 23rd October as to their detail, only vary slowly has their full significance dawned upon the Group.

"(2) At the time of our January visit there were still two tendencies:-

"- First, to believe that the Requirements did not mean what they said.

"- Second, that the Advisory Committee would not seriously insist on their implementation.

"We believe that our visits were useful in dispersing these illusions.

"(3) Though we doubt the wisdom of the gesture, the election of Lacan as

1. R. Requirements. See Appendix I.
President and Dolto as Vice-President was a gesture of solidarity towards publicly named colleagues.

«(4)» Matters however came to a head anew at a specially called General Meeting on 14th May, 1962, which had as its focus the exclusion of Dolto from training. At this meeting, at which they were again rend out and without the need to proceed to a vote, the Requirements, together with their implications, were more fully accepted. To date there has been no public querying of Dolto’s position.

«(5)» Without doubt the “troika”, together with Lagache, has been the main supporter of the Requirements and excepting the presence of the “question Lacan”, has seen to their application.

«(6)» We believe that our January visit was most useful in bringing home not only to the members we saw, but also to the Council and Training Committee, that the future of the Study Group lies in their rigorous application. We further indicated that the Requirements had implications for their future policy decisions which were as important as their strict observation. There has been a failure to appreciate this point.

«(7)» As is perhaps both natural and desirable, candidates appear to have been little affected by the affaire at the top or by the presence of the Requirements. The more senior Stagiaires are aware of the Group’s new situation and appear keen for the Study Group to achieve Component Society stature. But they are above all preoccupied with their own training.

«V. APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENTS

«(1)» The Committee are of the opinion that Council and Training Committee are doing their best to apply the Requirements to the fullest extent. Mention however has already been made of the possible slant in the way in which they are being worked as likewise, of the notable exception, Lacan.

«(2)» Some of the training difficulties are outlined in other sections. Here we would like to stress that it requires time –

«- for new trainers to emerge since they have themselves to acquire the necessary experience;

«- for the establishment of new norms, particularly when they run counter to traditions and other influences;

«- and that the outcome of many of the analyses must inevitably remain an unknown quantity for a number of years to come.

«(3)» R.1 is slowly getting under way, especially as far as “old” candidates are concerned. New candidates are conforming wherever possible. Provincial candidates coming to Paris are the greatest problem. It was however interesting to
note that senior analysts (e.g. Favez-Boutonier) commented spontaneously on the beneficial effects of this Requirement.

«(4) R.2, apart from Lacan, is universally applied.

«(5) R.3 is also in application, though Strasbourg here presents a problem.

«(6) R.4 is being implemented. Thus of the 12 new Stagiaires, 6 are still in analysis, 2 have been asked to resume their analysis, 3 are somewhat special cases from the Groupe Méditerranée left over from pre-Edinburgh days, and the other remaining candidate, an analysand of Favez, has had five years analysis, ending in 1961. Of the 2 Stagiaires authorised to start a second case, one is still in analysis and the other ended his analysis with Favez in 1960.

«(7) R.5: there is no evidence of candidates becoming Stagiaires any earlier. There is however satisfactory evidence that the Training Committee has encouraged “old” candidates to take more active steps to complete their training by applying to become Stagiaires. Likewise there has been an increase in the number of elections to Associate Member. On the other hand, the Training Committee plans to draw up stricter rules for Stagiaires in order to differentiate between those who continue in training by starting a case and those who do nothing further, with the additional aim of depriving the latter of their statue.

«(8) R.6. The first case for all new Stagiaires is in individual supervision. There are still two group supervisions with Favez-Boutonier and Lagache respectively. Both supervisors were encouraged, and accepted, to end these. Lagache added that as he found it useful, particularly for provincial students, he would make it into a postgraduate seminar.

«(9) R.7 and 8. Apart from Lacan, these Requirements are being followed. The Committee is however of the opinion that all decisions concerning a candidate’s training activities outside his personal analysis are the concern of the Training Committee, and that the Training Committee, though in consultation with the training analyst, should alone authorise such activities, e.g. attendance at lectures, become a Stagiaire.

«(10) R.9 and 10 are being fully implemented in a completely satisfactory way. In addition all candidates are reassessed by interview when they apply to become Stagiaires. This procedure has much to commend itself, particularly in this Study Group, where many of the candidates went into training without being rigorously examined, the important problem being the extent to which the training analyst should be involved, e.g. in providing reports. In our view there should be no hard and fast rule, the training analyst being left to report as and how he thinks best, including a “no report”.

«(11) Training in child analysis, as required by R.11, does not exist, a serious matter, further mentioned below.

«(12) With regard to R.12, this has been somewhat simplified by the death of
Dr. Laforgue, though one of his analysands was seen by us. Dr. Hesnard no longer functions as an “analyst” in Toulon: he is reported to have moved to Nantes. However, his late analysands present a difficult problem since they constitute a backlog of previously acknowledged “candidates”. This is however part of the problem of the Groupe Méditerranéen discussed below. All these applicants are being refused unless they undertake a new, and full, analytic training.

“(13) R.13 (a) is in the course of application. Lacan had one new candidate who had been accepted before the Edinburgh Congress. She was seen and reported her analysis to be four times a week and that her sessions were of 45 minutes. She is not a particularly good candidate and, in our view, will require reassessment.

“In connection with Lacan’s analysands, the Training Committee has had to face her following three difficulties:-

“— Mme Kamouh, the wife of a Stagiaire, was advised in 1957 by the Training Committee to have a personal analysis, which she had with Lacan, 1957-61. She has now applied for official training and was accepted as a Stagiaire on the condition that she had a further period of analysis with a training analyst other than Lacan. Lacan has accepted this recommendation. So far she has not taken any further steps in the matter and therefore is only a potential Stagiaire.

“— Dr. Lemoine: in personal analysis with Lacan 1953-57. He repeatedly asked Lacan to put him forward for training; on each occasion Lacan “ignored” these requests. Since 1956 he has attended the scientific meetings of the group, frequently acting as an honorary “rapporteur”. Recently he has renewed his application, and this time to the Training Committee. The Training Committee have agreed to accept him as a Stagiaire but only after he has had a further period of regular analysis with another analyst. Lacan agreed that he would not take him on personally, pleading lack of vacancy, and would refer him elsewhere.

“— Mlle Michaud, initially trained as a psychologist and now completing her medical studies, and in analysis with Lacan since 1959. Her application was considered and she was accepted for a “didactique” analysis. She was advised to continue her analysis with Lacan who has agreed that at a suitable moment he would hand her over to another training analyst. Her case would then be reviewed when she applied to be a Stagiaire, at which moment she would be required to be already in analysis with someone other than Lacan.

“The Committee considers these three decisions to be sensible and show that the spirit of the Requirements is being correctly applied to special and difficult cases. In each case their futures as candidates depend on their having further analysis with a training analyst other than Lacan.

“However, in all the Training Committee’s dealings with Lacan there is a
tendency to shelter behind the “sanctity” of the personal analysis and to use this as a means of protecting him. This argument, in so far as it concerns a candidate in training, had no particular appeal to the Committee. Elsewhere in fact we have advocated a separation of Lacan’s candidates on the basis of suitable/unuitable to become an analyst and their re-allocation to other analysts accordingly.

«(14) As far as Dolto and R.13 (a) is concerned, she has had no official candidate since Edinburgh despite the attempt of two potential candidates to force the issue of her official training position. Another patient of hers applied to the Training Committee to be a candidate but was rejected. Her official training activities are therefore slight; one didactic analysis and two supervisions. Unofficially she continues to be consulted about cases, especially children, because of her “intuitive” gifts. Phase are matters over which the Training Committee and, a fortiori, me, have no jurisdiction.

«Candidates are bound to seek help from a great variety of quarters and this is difficult to prevent even if this was thought to be desirable. She is in any case a recognised member of the Study Group and also a late member of the S.P.P. Though the Study Group as a whole has a poor appreciation of her faults, tending only to focus on her qualities, her “intuitive” methods do not appear to lie widely copied.

«(15) R.13 (b) is likewise in force. During the period under review there has been no change in the status of Dolto’s one candidate, and only one of Lacan’s, Dr. Simatos, applied to the Training Committee and was accepted by them as a Stagiaire. Dr. Simatos was seen by us and we were not opposed to his promotion,

«(16) R.13 (c). This Requirement, as far as Lacan is concerned, is discussed below. As far as we know Dolto has never infringed it.

«(17) R.14 is fully implemented, the Committee being regularly supplied with a précis of the Training Committee’s deliberations, this précis giving details of all training applications and promotions.1

«(18) R.15 has already been discussed, as also R.17. Both still need to be solved.

«(19) We have little further information in connection with R.16. We still feel the selection of cases is not sufficiently looked at from the point of view of suitability as a training case. The fact that these cases are paying patients is an undoubted complication.

«(20) The situation of the provincial groups, the subject of R.18, is discussed later under individual regional headings, as well as in the general considerations on Training. We are however firmly of the opinion that at present the Group should not be encouraged to expand these activities. Closer links with the S.P.P. in this matter could perhaps be explored.

1. See Dr. Gitehon’s personal file.
«(21) We have no further information concerning R.19.
«(22) R.20 is being respected. There have been within this period two cases, Dr. Laberge, a Canadian, and Mlle Strohl, from Basle, both of whom, with the permission of their respective Societies/analysts, have been accepted as official candidates.
«VI. THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE AND SCIENTIFIC SITUATION
«(1) As already explained, Dr. Solms and Dr. Turquet spent a whole day during the January visit to Paris with Dr. Leclaire examining the Study Group’s records.
«(2) As required by R.9 and 10, reports and confidential files are being kept on all candidates at all stages, and these were available for inspection. Likewise the Minutes of the Training Committee and Council were examined.
«(3) Throughout the period under review, we have regularly received reports of the activities of Council and Training Committee.¹
«(4) All these records are extremely well kept. Leclaire was able, whenever asked, to provide all the necessary information required. Certainly some training analysts are brief, or late in their reports on candidates, but such instances as we came across were the exception. Reports are full and give good pictures of candidates accepted or refused, and of their progress through training.
«(5) The Committee is of the opinion that Dr. Leclaire should be congratulated on the efficient manner in which he has carried out these duties.
«(6) The 1961 and 1962 December elections were as follows:
1963:
COUNCIL:
TRAINING COMMITTEE:
Chairman: Favez-Boutonier – Secretary: Leclaire – members: Mons Pavez [sic], Granoff, Lagache, Perrier
1964:
COUNCIL:
President Vice-Presidents: Leclaire – Dolto, Lagache – Business Secretary: Granoff – Scientific Secretary: Perrier – Treasurer: Anzieu
TRAINING COMMITTEE:

¹. For Dr. Leclaire’s précis of these Minutes see Dr. Gitelson’s personal files.
«(7) The list of Members, Associate Members, Stagiaires and Guests, which includes invited students, is attached.¹

«(8) In this period there have been 5 new Members, 4 of whom are known to us, and 10 new Associate Members, of whom 5 have been seen by us.² We approved their promotion. All such promotions are rigorously examined by the Training Committee. Thus it is interesting to note that one newly elected Associate Member (an ex-analysand of Hesnard’s, dating from 1952-55), was not only at first rejected but, even when put forward for election, was asked to take a further case under supervision.

«(9) Two new “ correspondents” were elected, Dr. Faure and Dr. Lombard, both from the Groupe Méditerranéen. Both were analysands of Hesnard and both applied to be Stagiaires. The Training Committee refused to accept them as such, but in view of their psychoanalytic connections and psychiatric experience suggested they should be invited to be “ correspondents”. Dr. Faure is a lecturer in psychiatry at the medical faculty, Montpellier, and has contributed to the psychoanalytic parts of a “Vocabulaire de la Psychiatrie”. Dr. Lombard is a well-established psychotherapist at Nice, whose seriousness of purpose and reliability is said to be beyond doubt.

«We felt that this solution was quite elegant on general policy grounds.

«(10) As indicated in the Section on “Training Matters: General”, applicants are on the increase and of the 90 applicants, 45 were accepted. There is however an important shift in the direction of more medical applicants. Of the 90, 63 were medical and 27 non-medical, and of the accepted, 38 medical and 7 non-medical.

«(11) With regard to new candidates, of the 45 accepted, 14 have started their analyses, distributed as follows:-

«Anzieu 3, Favez 2, Lagache 1, Leclaire 2, Ferrier 3, Saffouan 3. All save 2 attend at a frequency of four times a week.

«(12) Scientific meetings have been held in this period and continue to be well attended.³

«(13) As part of both the Training programme and the scientific work of the Study Group, Journées de Province have been held twice a year during this period.⁴

«VII. THE LACAN QUESTION

«(1) As has already been indicated, the “Question Lacan” took up a great deal of our time and energy.

¹ For Current List (June 1963) of Members of the S.F.P. see Appendix VII.
² For Analytic Biographies of Promoted Members and Associate Members see Appendix VIII.
³ For list of papers see Dr. Giedion’s personal file.
⁴ For details see Appendix IX.
« (2) He was never seen alone, but was present at our January Meeting on the Friday morning when we met the Training Committee, and on the Sunday morning, as a past President, when we met Council. He was also present when the Secretary read this Report to Council and Training Committee, and at our first meeting on the evening of Saturday, June 22nd.

« (3) On all occasions frank and blunt things about his work were said in his presence. Neither Committee was left in any doubt that we saw Lacan as a problem, about which we had strong views, as summarised below.

« (4) Lacan’s reaction to our strictures varied from one of shock – he appeared not to expect us to be so frank and direct – to that of being frankly disruptive – yawning, sighing and causing irritation. However, for the most part he was silent and self-contained. Later he revealed himself to be anti-our Committee and sought to create an atmosphere of “me or they”. As has already been indicated, his hold on the group is strong, is anti-C.E. and hence disruptive. Since he has learned of the Committee’s open opposition to his activities he has sought typically to establish dependent relations with his ex- and current candidates. The danger is that in trying to save himself he will ruin everybody else.

« (5) In defending himself he failed to impress us: the main points he made were:-

« – “I am being victimised. More is being made of my short sessions than they warrant. They are the scapegoat for other problems”. There is truth here, for the “other problems” relate to further aspects of his analytic practice, in particular his handling of the negative transference.

« – “If required I would devote the whole of my next year’s seminar to the subject of mime and Psychoanalysis”

« – “We are a ‘Groupe d’Etudes’; therefore it is right we should experiment”. Such an attitude is contrary to Freud’s own view and evades the point that he is personally engaged in training candidates. It also ignores the Group’s changed status.

« – “What will my pupils think if I now revert to 45 minute sessions?” Though there is a problem here, the notion that this itself might be a matter of analysis seems to have escaped his attention.

« (6) In general it was perhaps striking that he failed to show any appreciation of the fact that his analytic behavior was endangering the status of the Study Group. The preservation of his seminar appeared to be his main preoccupation and he is fighting to preserve it at all costs. For him this seminar is the group and is the source of his power. As a person, to the Committee he was unimpressive and it was difficult to see where the so-called “fascination” lay. Nevertheless the C.E. would be wise not to underestimate his hold on the Group and the intensity of his struggle to maintain it.
«(7) As a training analyst, the Committee are unanimous in the opinion that R.13 is being evaded and must therefore be strictly enforced.

«– He still continues to give short sessions; indeed, except for his latest candidate to whom he gives four sessions a week, 45 minutes each, sessions of normal duration are the exception.

«– All students seen agree that he is quite unpredictable in the selection of a session to be a short one, sessions being from 15 to 35 minutes maximum.

«– Stories that during sessions he will read or be otherwise occupied seem to have more than a grain of truth.

«– Other stories appear also to be true, that he handles a candidate’s negative transference so as to re-establish friendly relationships once the session is over.

«– Without any doubt he regards himself as the source of rewards and punishments; thus he believes he alone should authorise candidates, without consulting the Training Committee, to attend his seminars or to start their control cases. This he does for the purpose of gaining personal power over his analysands. Again, he has done this with his latest candidate, a most unsuitable decision in our opinion.

«– Under these circumstances it is extremely doubtful if the majority of his candidates can be said to be analysed – a disturbing thought in view of the fact that he has 12 candidates in training. It should also be pointed out that he plays fast and loose with transference and that his analyses appear to be more a question of transference manipulation.

«(8) As to, his wider influence, the evidence is not clear cut. Much has been said about candidates imitating him in the style of dress (bow ties or small long ribbon ties), in adopting his psychoanalytic vocabulary and opacity of thought, as well as in imitating his personal way of thinking about psychoanalytic problems.

«Though in these matters it is difficult to generalise, we were not impressed by the evidence quoted in support of such stories of identification; rather to the contrary. The depressed and angry state in which he leaves his candidates tends to preclude this. Here three points:-

«– Two of his analysands (Laplanche, Lefèvre-Pontalis) are close collaborators of Dr. Lagache, being well praised by him, and show no signs of this kind of identification.

«– A number of his pupils are critical of him, e.g. Dr. Pujol, who declared it took him a number of years to recover from his Lacan analysis, which left him in a very self-destructive state.

«– His short sessions are not copied by any member of the Society.

«(9) But four further points:-
A striking point was the lack of reaction on the part of his candidates to his treatment of their sessions. Angry reactions do not seem to occur. It is all passively accepted as “one of those things”. Neither does it seem that this passivity is itself analysed; it is just left to be accepted. There is a search on the part of the analysand to understand, but this remains unsatisfied. Curiosity is killed. Bewilderment is dealt with by denial. We were most critical of this state of affaire to the Training Committee who, in our opinion, is too passive in its acceptance of this situation.

It would seem that the transference relationship remains inadequately resolved at the end of his analysis, the candidate having two alternatives – an angry break-away or prolonged dependency. Here it should be also noted that his analyses are prolonged. His analytic training results are therefore very mixed and unpredictable. But it is not possible to generalise about them.

His work as a therapist seems poor, and at times irresponsible.

A number of his analysands are said to fall by the wayside. Though at the moment there are 12 in training, not all are reported to be likely to stay the course. Again, although this situation has advantages, it has certain disadvantages and the drop-out may have to be examined.

(10) Lacan is however also an interpreter of psychoanalysis to a wider audience through his weekly seminars at Ste. Anne’s Hospital. These seminars, unpaid, under the sponsorship of Prof. Delay, are vast, popular, social affairs with audiences of from one to two hundred. These audiences are mixed, containing candidates of both Psychoanalytic Societies, as well as doctors, philosophers, film stars, and other elements from the “lunatic fringe”. It attracts possible future candidates. The seminars have their devotees, early arrival being essential to get a seat. Their comprehensibility is variable and depends on assiduity of attendance over months. It is true that to understand him needs a degree of training in his way of thinking, and particularly in his vocabulary: and here he has imitators such as Perrier who, in his writing, is a particularly turgid “Lacanite”. There are however in the Study Group a number of clear writers who are interested in expressing the main lines of his thought and are willing to devote the necessary intellectual knowledge to clarifying it. Such work belongs to the future and time will show the psychoanalytic value of his contribution.

Our attitude in this connection therefore was:

It was not within our powers, even if it was thought desirable, to require that Lacan should stop this seminar.

It is however within our powers to require that this seminar should not be advertised as part of the official training for candidates of the S.P.P.

It was also within our powers to require that the Training Committee
should veto attendance of candidates et the seminar, especially if in analysis with Lacan.

«(11) The Committee’s attitude therefore to the Lacan problem both with the Council and Training Committee was:

« – Lacan remains, and will remain, unsuitable as a training analyst: all policy decisions in the future must stem from this fact.

« – Guarantees will have to be given for his permanent exclusion, even if the Study Group becomes a Component Society.

« – Steps may have to be taken to withdraw his analysands and they should be asked to continue their analyses with another senior analyst.

« – Any move to give him special status, e.g. extraordinary Member-at-Large, cannot receive any support from the Committee.

« – That such moves to provide him with such a statue would in fact endanger the position of the Study Group in the eyes of the Executive and the International.

« – That his seminar at Ste. Anne’s Hospital cannot be, or become part of, official training.

« – As a lecturer-exponent of psychoanalysis he cannot be prevented continuing his seminars.

« – The Committee does not wish to interfere with his “scientific work”.

« – In the last resort much must depend on the emergence of opposing and counter-balancing elements and on their strength. Here time is essential as time clone will tell.

«VIII. THE DOLTO QUESTION

«(1) Mme Dolto asked to see us and was therefore seen.

«(2) Only Favez-Boutonier at her personal interview complained of the treatment meted out to her. Neither the “troika” nor Lagache were heard to complain, the former being perhaps prepared to sacrifice her in order to save Lacan.

«(3) She has strong partisans in the group and, as already described, their action on her behalf led to the May meeting. One of her adherents, Mme Mannoni, was seen by us, again at her request, and created a most unfavourable impression.

«(4) Since the May meeting it appears things in the Society have settled down. Mme Dolto continues to be esteemed for her sympathetic “intuitive” approach. It does not nor seem likely that she will form a splinter group.

«(5) At her interview two major points emerged which revealed the poor quality of her contact with reality.

« – Though repeatedly asked to give her views on adult training she continued to talk about child training, indicating thereby also that in reality her primary interest was in children.

« – She made no attempt to disguise the fact that in her hands supervision
can mean a second analysis for the candidate including, if need be, putting him on the couch.

«(6) In our view there are no good grounds for revising R.13 in her favour.

IX. TRAINING MATTERS: GENERAL

«(1) The Study Group's training problems arise from a variety of factors and especially from trainer shortage, increased student interest, dispersion of pupils, and lack of promises. None of these are in themselves major problems, but together make for great difficulties.

«(2) As has already been said, the Training Committee is serious and conscientious in its work, being almost lavish in the time it spends on interviews and deliberations. Candidates, either as pre-training applicants or when applying to be Stagiaires, are fully interviewed and discussed. If initial opinions differ, the candidate is further interviewed. Thus one Stagiaire applicant had six interviews, three being additional. As already mentioned, all later promotions within this group are also examined by the Training Committee.¹ To judge by records examined and candidates seen, the Training Committee performs its task sincerely and to the best of their ability.

«(3) Its hand should however be strengthened. We would like to see all decisions affecting a candidate's training outside his personal analysis either originate from or be referred for final approval to them. Though the training analyst should, when necessary, be consulted, the relevant decisions are not to be thought of as his, and certainly not his alone to make.

«(4) Only very gradually are new trainers coming to the fore, e.g. Anzieu, Pujol, Safouan. Slowly the younger Members are acquiring candidates, e.g. Granoff 1, Leclaire 5 and Perrier 3. The 49 candidates in personal analysis are spread over 11 analysts, with 32 of them and their 6 analysts dating from pre-Edinburgh days. Gradually the "ingrown" quality is decreasing, though it remains at times rather evident. But this slow growth is also wise.

«(5) Students' demands are growing. In the period under review 90 candidates presented themselves: ² 20 were rejected outright, 25 postponed (e.g. advised personal analysis), and 45 were accepted. Of these acceptances only 14 have actually started their analysis, including 6 from Strasbourg. In our opinion the Group is not in a position to cope with all its acceptances.

«(6) Its candidates are dispersed not only around Paris but also to the four corners of France. Many pre-Edinburgh provincial students still come to Paris

¹. For specimen letters sent by Training Committee see Dr. Gitelson's personal file
². For list of candidates in training and their training analysts, list of supervisees and their supervisors, list of accepted candidates from September 1961 to December 1962 see Dr. Gitelson's personal file.
for 2 days (3 sessions) and give the impression of hanging about or of filling in
time between sessions. Some have therefore an unemployed feeling about them
which cannot really be considered as healthy. The lack of premises is an obvious
contributory factor in this situation.

«(7) As a consequence the personal analysis becomes the centre of training.
Whilst we do not wish to underestimate the importance of the place of personal
analysis in training, we would question if it is the only thing in training. It would
be a poor training which offered personal analysis and nothing else. This situa-
tion of “all eggs in one basket” must put additional strain on the personal analy-
tical situation, a strain which could be relieved by a more adequate system of
basic lectures and tutorials.

«(8) Basic primary lectures on psychoanalysis are still missing. ¹ Perrier’s lec-
tures on Freudian texts are much appreciated, as also Favez’s on “Technique”
for Stagiaires starting their first case, though it is to be regretted that only a very
few Stagiaires attend. There is no properly planned course which aims at cove-
ring in detail all aspects of psycho-analysis. Attendance at lectures is still volun-
tary: the absence of compulsion in this connection is being overdone. Again we
noted that the candidates are not taken in hand to the degree which we would
have liked. It would seem that senior Stagiaires could play a bigger part in
training, e.g. in contributing to a basic lecture course. In this connection the
S.P.P. seek to contrast themselves with the S.P.P. who have an “Institute”: this
too can be overdone.

«(9) Many of these difficulties stem from the lack of premises. Lectures or
seminars take place in the flats of Members. There is a library but it is not central,
being in Granoff’s home at Neuilly. A centre would also be of great assistance to
provincial students.

«(10) None of this is of course to deny the great strides that have been
made in the last 21 months, or the sincerity and hard thought: That is given to
the welfare of students. Our remarks should be read as indications for improve-
ment, or where greater effort could with benefit be made.

«(11) Some further points axe taken up under various specific training head-
ings below.

«X. TRAINING MATTERS: NEW TRAINING ANALYSTS

«(1) At their January meeting the Committee saw three potential training
analysts, Prof. Anzieu and Mons Safouan for Strasbourg, and Dr. Pujol of Mar-
seilles. ²

«(2) The status of Anzieu and Safouan is different from that of Pujol, the two

¹. For Lecture Programme see Dr. Gitelson’s personal file.
². For curricula vitarum of the above see Dr. Gitelson’s personal file.
former being Members since March 1962, while Pujol has only just been elected Member. Furthermore, Anzieu and Safouan have already been “nominated” as training analysts, and Pujol was “still under consideration”.

«(3) In Prof. Anzieu the Committee found an experienced and mature psychologist, holding the Chair of Psychology at Strasbourg, and therefore the successor to Lagache and Favez-Boutonier. His clinical experience is good and is well reinforced by a strong sense of responsibility. He did not appear the kind of man who would take medical risks with his patients. He expressed himself as willing to work with doctors, and no reason was seen to disbelieve this. He has been in regular psychoanalytic practice since becoming an Associate Member in 1956. Though he did not become a Member till last year (18.6.62.) his slow promotion is more the expression of a lack of incentive to become a Member rather than of his unsuitability for such a position. It seemed that he could be relied on to do serious and honest work. He is esteemed as a loyal colleague: he is now the Treasurer. He accepts the Requirements. Though a pupil of Lacan he is neither a “lacanite” nor a close supporter. On general grounds therefore he appears suitable.

« There are however objections:—

«— He is only in Strasbourg three days a week and has no intention of being there more often.

«— Paris is his home and his aim is to obtain a post there at the earliest opportunity. Whilst this is understandable, and in many ways typical of the French scene, Paris being a great attraction, it may prove awkward for his analysands.

«— He has many sociological and industrial psychological interests which may compete with his analytic work. The future of the Society is therefore perhaps not his primary concern. These problems are however known to the S.F.P.’s Training Committee and were also openly brought out by ourselves.

«(4) The Committee therefore informed Council that they were prepared to see him go forward as a training analyst.

«(5) With regard to Mons Safouan, opinions were mixed. Although trained in France, both culturally and analytically his main analytic experience has been in Cairo (1952-59). Political events drove him back to France. It was not possible to form an accurate judgment of the type of analytic experience he had in Cairo. Furthermore he does not give the feeling of being a real clinician. He appears to lack sensitivity, e.g. he showed none of the expected anxieties or inhibitions about finding himself an Egyptian with an accent as a training analyst in Strasbourg which, for historical reasons alone, is a special city. His French is competent but formal and rigid, like his personality. To two of us he appeared rather as an Arabic scribe, immersed in minutiae, as exemplified for example in the slow progress of his doctorate thesis where he had not gone beyond the Freud of
1894. Whether he would be able to get to grips with a candidate's problems remained an unanswered question, as also the warmth of his humanity. We found it impossible to tell how good a training analyst he would be.

«In view of our doubts, Dr. Heimann, who had not seen him in January, saw him in June and fully endorsed the above opinion.

«On the other hand Lagache spoke well of his doctorate thesis which is under his supervision. Though reported to be a Lacan follower, he was critical of Lacan. He was willing to go to Strasbourg, at first for three days a week. He seems anxious to do a good job of work there. Since the January visit, and in response to our request, he now spends four whole days in Strasbourg. Prof. Kammerer, Professor of Psychiatry at Strasbourg, though at first uncertain about him, expresses himself pleased with the way he had settled in and thought that he would be acceptable. His candidates seemed to take to him, and those not in analysis with him valued his seminars.

«(6) The Committee was uncertain, and net really positive about him, and said so to Council at the time of the January meeting, reserving their judgment on this matter. After further discussion amongst ourselves, we agreed to endorse his status as a training analyst provided the number of his candidates was limited and controlled (see Recommendations).\textsuperscript{1}

«(7) With regard to Dr. Pujol in Marseilles: the two members of the Committee who saw him were impressed. Though reported by Lagache to be pro-Lacan, being a Lacan analysand, at interview this was not the case and he was very critical of Lacan's work and indoctrination methods. He is a lively and energetic young man who would certainly be an asset. He appears to be reliable and has leadership qualities, a good sense of responsibility and a sound appraisal of the realities of the situation. The main contra-indication is his lack of analytic experience. He, too, was seen by Dr. Heimann in June who declared herself well pleased with him.

«(8) With the proposed supervision (see Recommendations)\textsuperscript{2} Pujol could make a good training analyst and on these conditions the Committee was prepared to recommend him.

«XI. TRAINING MATTERS: THE STRASBOURG GROUP

«(1) The Strasbourg Group is active and lively, containing decent, good and serious elements. Its presence stems from the now well-established tradition that the occupant of the Chair of Psychology is an analyst – Lagache, then Pavez-Boutonier, and now Anzieu.

«(2) Additionally the Professor of Psychiatry, Professor Kammerer, is a trai-

\textsuperscript{1} See Section XV.

\textsuperscript{2} See Section XV.
ned analyst (Associate Member) and allows his staff all the necessary facilities for their training analysts. He has good relations with Prof. Anzieu and the close working together of psychiatrist/psychologist in a university setting is therefore optimal for the development of psychoanalysis.

«(3) We saw Prof. Kammerer and found him very helpful. He made it plain that he regards his primary task to be a Professor of Psychiatry. He values the insights given by psychoanalysis, but by reason of his post does not seek to be an active psychoanalyst or therefore a training analyst, nor do we think this entirely desirable. On the other hand, he is a statesman – like person whose advice should be of value to the Council and Training Committee.

«(4) The group however is not without its problem. It is understaffed in that it has only two visiting training analysts, Safouan and Anzieu, both young in experience. Furthermore Anzieu, as already indicated, aims to get a post in Paris as soon as possible. Both have already 3 candidates in training and there are more on their waiting lists. Pressure from these candidates to be taken on is great. We do not think however it would be wise at this juncture to increase their load.

«(5) Part of the pressure can be, and is, relieved by candidates travelling to Paris for training. But although the train service is good (some five hours), this type of training by “commuting” has many undesirable aspects.

«(6) The situation is worse as regards supervisors and seminar leaders. Anzieu and Safouan have to exchange candidates for supervision purposes, and seminars have either to be conducted by them or by the less experienced (knowledgeable) candidates. Although again attendance in Paris on a monthly or twice monthly basis is a possible solution, Paris is somewhat far off for this purpose.

«(7) We were struck with some candidates by the seeming distortion 3 or 4 sessions of personal analysts in one part of the week gives to their experience of transference. Some candidates tended to describe a split life, one half analytic, the other non-analytic. Furthermore the second session on, for instance, the second day, does not seem to result in the production of new material but more in a non-productive milling over of the morning session.

«(8) There is also a lively sub-group of mixed psychologists and psychiatrists in Strasbourg, all interested in psychoanalysis, with monthly meetings attended by senior analysts. Anzieu and Safouan occasionally lend a hand at these meetings.

«XII. TRAINING MATTERS: GROUPE MEDITERRANEEN AND ELSEWHERE

«(1) There are marked differences between the Groupe Méditerranéen and the Strasbourg Group, differences which stem from three facts:

«– the absence of a mature senior leader;
«– the failure of Hesnard as a training analyst;
«– the greater travelling distance Marseilles/Paris.
«(2) It appears that there are quite a number of Hesnard and Laforgue "analysands" awaiting an appropriate moment to apply to join.

«(3) The group is unequal and dispersed along the coast from Marseilles to Nice, and thus its existence as "a group" is to be queried. It is very much a student group with inadequate leadership and of necessity orientated towards Paris.

«(4) Pujol will undoubtedly be a stabilising influence but he is as yet, from the training point of view, inexperienced and will need help. Not possessing any notable seniority, there will probably be rivalry, and possibilities of friction are there.

«(5) Whilst in one way the decision of the Training Committee not to delegate a more senior analyst to this region it was once thought Perrier would regularly visit is sensible in view of the heavy Paris commitment; on the other hand it leaves this area very weak.

«(6) There is a backlog of Laforgue and Hesnard "analysands", though the Training Committee appears to be competently dealing with these matters: thus -

«— Drs. Bascou, Pache, Reboul, 3 Hesnard "analysands", whose analyses have already terminated, have been accepted as Stagiaires provided they go to Paris for supervision. Their situation will be further reviewed in the light of their supervisors' reports. As yet they have taken no steps to implement this and are therefore provisional Stagiaires only.

«— Mme Dongier, herself a doctor, the wife of a recently promoted Associate Member and an "analysand" of Dr. Hesnard. In March 1961, on her first application to be a Stagiaire, she was advised by Favez-Boutonier to continue her analysis with Hesnard (started January 1959) at a rhythm of at least three times a week instead of the previous once a week. This she did and in March 1962 Dr. Hesnard indicated that the analysis in his view was completed. On this she re-applied (June-July 1962) to the Training Committee. In the opinion of the Training Committee her analysis appeared "to be superficial". On the other hand she had fulfilled Favez-Boutonier's requirements. She was therefore accepted on condition that she followed the new norms for Stagiaires, namely, further analysis for at least a year four times a week.

«She was seen by us and though a pleasant and sensible doctor, one cannot conceive of her training being anywhere near complete. She is having supervision with Favez but has not yet managed to organise her life for further personal analysis. In our view this is an urgent need. This situation is therefore not a satisfactory one.

«— Drs. Faure and Lomba both "analysands" of Hesnard, as already described, have been elected "correspondents".

«— Dr. Postel, an "analysand" of Laforgue, was accepted as a Stagiaire since
of his own accord he had sought further personal analysis and training. He is now in analysis with Lagache. He was seen by us and deemed a suitable candidate.

«(D) Dr. Dacourt, who has had a personal analysis with Pujol, was accepted as a candidate provided he had further analysis in Paris. It is understood that he is trying to find a post in Paris or in the Parisian area which will enable him to undertake this.

«(D) Dr. Bertero, an entirely fresh candidate, has been accepted and is destined in all probability to be one of Pujol's first training candidates.

«These decisions are typical of the work of the Training Committee and, apart from the Dongier one, in our opinion should not be faulted.

«(7) But the outstanding immediate problem is for this group to be brought together as a group and strengthened in its leadership.

«(8) No significant training activities are taking place elsewhere in other parts of France.

«XIII. S.P.P. AND S.F.P. RELATIONS

«(1) In January we saw Dr. Benassy and Dr. Lebovici of the S.P.P. Dr. Pasche, their President, was to have come but mistook the date of the meeting.

«(2) The meeting was not a very happy one in that these two appeared to wash their hands of the whole situation. Their attitude had changed and now was that there was nothing further they could do and that the future of the Study Group was not their concern. They said that they accepted the present situation as a de facto one, that the S.F.P. had already consumed too much of their energy and now they had other and better things to do. Therefore they would no longer oppose the S.F.P.'s application for component status. The future of the Study Group was the unenviable task of the Advisory Committee and therefore no concern of theirs. With the recognition of the S.F.P. as a Study Group and the acceptance of their current candidate analyses as training analyses, an episode had ended.

«(3) There is clearly mutual bitterness at the level of the more senior and elderly analysts. This is to be regretted; it is also understandable.

«(4) However, amongst the younger generation - and there is the future - there is much fraternisation.

«(5) More constructively, the possibility that the S.P.P. might be willing to co-operate over the following matters was discussed:-

«- a basic lecture course;

«- shared library facilities provided some kind of financial arrangement as some payment for the extra work could be agreed;

«- exchange of information on accepted/rejected candidates to avoid candidates playing one Society off against the other. In this connection the S.F.P. accepted a candidate already on Dr. Lebovici's list and notified him they were
doing so. The candidate opted for an analysis with Dr. Leclaire and likewise notified Dr. Lebovici of her choice;

«– possibly exchange supervisors.

«(6) The above-mentioned promotion of shared facilities was not discussed in detail with the Council of the S.F.P.

«(7) The Committee are of the opinion however that not only is such a co-operation necessary, but also that it will come with the passage of time. We would add that by not pressing the matter it is more likely to be sooner than later. In addition the more the S.F.P. puts its house in order, the stronger its position will be for negotiation with the S.P.P.

«(8) The Committee has always refrained from encouraging or listening to comments from the S.F.P. about the S.P.P.’s activities. Nevertheless the Committee is aware, and feels that the C.E. should be also, that the norms and standards they are striving to enforce with the S.F.P. on behalf of the C.E. are not those observed by the S.P.P. where, for instance, three sessions a week is frequent and where the strict separation between analysand and analyst in outside activities is not observed. Such discrepancies are an embarrassment and a source of bewilderment to all. Where possible therefore they should be eliminated.

«XIV. CHILD ANALYSIS

«(1) The absence of training in child psychoanalysis in this group is to be deplored.

«(2) We consider that this state of affairs should be of some concern to the Executive.

«(3) Our solution would go in the direction of the C.E. providing visiting supervisors to help plan and organise such training under the aegis of the Advisory Committee.

«(4) Such help could be offered to both S.P.P. and S.F.P. jointly, though we appreciate all the difficulties of such a collaborative effort.

«XV. THE COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER ACTION TO THE CENTRAL EXECUTIVE

« The Committee’s Recommendations for further action are here considered under a number of headings.

« We wish at the outset to point out that we have deliberately used the word “Recommendations” rather than our previous word “Requirements” because we believe that the present attitude of the Central Executive towards this Study Group should be one of encouraging and recommending rather than requiring and exacting.

« As previously explained, at our June Paris meeting the Committee went over most of these Recommendations in detail with their Council and Training Com-
mittee. The outcome of these discussions is included under each point, together with such additional comments from us as appear suitable.

«A. Study Group Status. The Committee is of the unanimous opinion that at Stockholm -

«(1) Study Group status should be maintained for all the various reasons set out under our Conclusions (Section XVI).

«(2) No definite promise should be given for component status by 1965.

«(3) The Study Group should continue for the next two years under the tutelage of an Advisory Committee nominated by the C.E., who would report to the C.E. at the next Congress.

«Discussion: Information only of the Committee’s attitude was given on this point as the final decision rests with the C.E.

«B. “Question Lacan”. Resolution of this thorny problem should be envisaged under the following three headings:

«(a) As far as his training activities are concerned:

«(1) R.13 (a, b, c) must be rigorously enforced.

«(2) We recommend that plans should be drawn up for transferring his analysands to other training analysts before the completion of their training.

«(3) Lacan has no Stagiaire in supervision: this state of affairs should continue.

«(4) Plans for his continued exclusion from training, if full component status is achieved by this Study Group, should also now be envisaged.

«Discussion: Leclaire said:

«Re 1. Requirements 13 (a, b, c) have been communicated to Lacan and in those areas where the Training Committee has authority they are being applied, e.g. no new candidates, no new supervisions. However, the Training Committee has no authority over Lacan’s analytic practice. He has been informed of what is required.

«Re 2. This is a new Requirement: candidates will be, and are being examined, when they apply to become Stagiaires, viz. Simatos. At that moment, and at that moment only, can the Training Committee legitimately intervene.

«Re 3. Accepted.

«Re 4. That the resolution of this problem will coincide with their suitability to become a Component Society of the International.

«Comment: The Committee was not at all satisfied with these answers and sought to find an acceptable solution.

«The “accusation” that the proposed transfer of candidates is a new Requirement was rejected. For the Committee it is a logical outcome of the C.E.’s Requirement (R. 13) for Lacan’s progressive withdrawal. The seeming lack of move on the part of the Training Committee and Council in this matter has
however somewhat forced our hands. We were against a situation which appeared to allow so much power to Lacan and so little to the Training Committee. To this Leclaire replied that their power lay with new candidates and not with old ones.

«We proposed a fifteen to eighteen month period in which the Training Committee would sort out his candidates into two groups – suitable/unsuitable to become analysts – the time allowed being the longest delay between now and the next Congress, which would allow their Training Committee to sort out, and we to examine and consider the results of their selection, and also leave time to mark through their transfer to their subsequent analyst.

«Since this came as a new suggestion, no definite answer was given, though Leclaire stressed that no answer could be given without Lacan’s agreement. This reply probably means that nothing will be done and that we are back on our previous position, i.e. when his analysands come to apply to become Stagiaires they will be examined, and only then. Lagache did suggest that the Advisory Committee might join the Training Committee when they came to examine these applicants.

«The Secretary tried to take this matter further at a later meeting with Leclaire, Granoff and Perrier. Of Lacan’s present 12 candidates, 1 (Simatos) is already a Stagiaire, and of the remaining 11, 4 are thought likely to become analysts. This percentage of failures – two-thirds – agrees with the overall percentage for the last ten years for his candidates in training. A possible solution might therefore be to accept 4 only of his candidates, the first 4 to come before, and to be accepted, if suitable, by the Training Committee as from September 1963. All others would then be “unacceptable” unless they had a further analysis elsewhere.

«Leclaire very tentatively thought that this solution might be acceptable.

«(b) As a teacher of psychoanalysis-at-large: the Committee recommends that –

«– Lacan’s public seminar at Ste. Anne’s should not be included as part of the official training programme since such inclusion must carry the implication of sanction.

«Discussion: Leclaire said that his seminar was no longer included on the official list of lectures.

«Comment: The Committee considers this to be satisfactory.

«(c) As a member of the Study Group:

«– He should be left free to work and to make his scientific contribution to the Group’s activities in an unfettered fashion.

«Discussion: There was little or no discussion on this point as here we are essentially meeting the Study Group’s wishes.
«We would ask the C.E. to express an opinion on the attitude adopted by
the Committee as described in this Report during its recent visit to Paris on the
“question Lacan”.
«C. “Question Dolto”. The Committee recommends:-
«- that the current training position of Mme Dolto should remain unchanged.
«Discussion: There was little or no discussion on this point. She was present
when it was made and agreed to it, at Leclaire’s suggestion.
«D. Listing Training Analysts. The Committee recommends:-
«- that the new list should be revised and that the new list should not contain
the names of Dolto and Lacan.
«Discussion: Leclaire felt that he was in no position to produce a revised list
in time for the Stockholm Congress.
«Comment: To say the least, the Committee was deeply shocked at this state
of affaire as it seemed to them to contain a deceit. Whilst it is argued that the list
should contain the names of those analysts who have candidates in training, and
that their elimination from this list would needlessly complicate the transference
situation in these analyses, it is in our opinion not permissible for such a list to
be sent, as is done at present, to new candidates since it “tantalizes” them with
the names of Lacan and Dolto.
«A possible solution was put forward by us, namely, two lists: the first of
those with candidates in training, and the second of those with vacancies. In the
latter case it would not contain the names of Dolto and Lacan.
«Even this modified proposal did not seem to be acceptable to their Train-
ing Committee before Stockholm. In our opinion it is the minimum that the
C.E. should require.
«E. New Training Analysts
«(a) We would recommend that Prof, Anzieu and Mons Safouan be recogni-
tised as training analysts subject to two conditions and one recommendation:-
«(1) Their activities should be limited to the Strasbourg Group until the
results of their work can be properly assessed.
«(2) Anzieu’s training load should not exceed 4 candidates and Safouan’s 3
in order to reduce excessive “inbreeding”.
«(3) We would recommend and urge that a further senior Member should
arrange to regularly visit Strasbourg for supervisions and seminars.
«Discussion: These proposals were accepted by Leclaire, though it was poin-
ted out to us that it would cause hardship since there was a constant pressure of
applicants. Furthermore much as they appreciate the need to send a senior
Member, at the moment this did not seem possible.
«Comment: We suggest that they should have a waiting list and, where
possible, candidates should be orientated on Paris. We would again stress that
provincial centres have an urgent need to be visited by senior analysts and that
unless this is possible they should not really be allowed to start. It is in view of
the known press of candidates and the problems of “inbreeding” that we consi-
der our above recommendation to be necessary.
«In this connection a later recommendation that senior analysts from other
Societies should visit them to conduct seminars could be usefully offered to Stras-
bourg.
«(b) We would accept Pujol as a training analyst for the Groupe Méditerran-
éen provided that –
«(1) For the next few years he was supervised in this work; in this connection
we would suggest he worked with Lagache.
«(2) That there was a very strict selection of his candidates.
«(3) That these should be restricted in the first instance to 2 or 3 to enable
his work to be evaluated.
«(4) He should not be involved in other activities with candidates, e.g. semi-
nars.
«Discussion: Leclaire agreed to this proposal, though it seemed he had not
fully discussed it with Pujol.
«Comment: We ourselves understood from Pujol himself that he was
agreeable to this condition and would like to work with Prof. Lagache. Prof.
Lagache also gave his agreement.
«(c) We said the Advisory Committee would be pleased to examine and
advise on other new potential training analysts.
«Discussion: Leclaire indicated there were others that the Committee would
hear about from the Training Committee.
«F. Training: General: Programme: Training Facilities. We would recom-
mend:-
«(1) Whenever possible, further active steps should be taken to ensure a mini-
mum of 4 analytic sessions a week on 4 separate days. We are of the opinion that
such a step would have important consequences for the whole of training, such
consequences being entirely beneficial.
«Discussion: Leclaire agreed to this proposal, pointing out that this Require-
ment was brought to the notice of all new candidates. He did however refer
again to the different practice in “another place”, which was an embarrassment.
«(2) All decisions affecting the candidate’s training, outside those which
concern his personal analysis, should be taken by the Training Committee and
require the Training Committee’s authorisation.
«Discussion: Leclaire agreed, but pointed out that if Lacan’s seminar was
placed outside their control they had no power to stop his candidates from attend-
ing.
«(3) The various decisions of the Committee concerning candidates taken during the period under review should be accepted with the exception of-

«-- Mme Dongier who should be firmly told that her training will not be recognised until she has resumed a personal analysis with a training analyst other than Hesnard.

«-- The 3 Lacan analysands mentioned in the Report -- Mme Kamouh, Dr. Lemoine and Mlle Michaud should be accepted as Stagiaires and allowed to take a case, but that this promotion would not be officially recognised until they are in analysis with a different analyst.

«-- Drs. Bascou, Pache and Reboul, as Hesnard analysands, should be closely followed up and the probability that they will require further personal analysis not only envisaged, but discussed with them.

«Discussion: Leclaire replied that the position of Mme Dongier had somewhat changed as her husband had become Professor of Psychiatry at Liège and that her analytic position was therefore uncertain. Mme Kamouh, Dr. Lemoine and Mlle Michaud had made no move to change their analyst and therefore would not be considered to be Stagiaire till they did so. Likewise the three Hesnard analysands.

«He also added that the Training Committee proposed to introduce new regulations for Stagiaires, the aim of which was to prevent them from using their title if within a reasonable time limit they had no case under supervision.

«(4) A basic lecture course of two years’ duration must be given the highest priority. We do not believe that such a lecture course must of necessity be given by one training analyst, though it should be the overall responsibility of a named training analyst. There are a number of well-established senior Stagiaires who could be invited to participate. A Register of Attendances at these lectures should be kept.

«Discussion: Leclaire replied that every effort would be made in this connection: the matter of a Register of Attendances would be considered by the Training Committee.

«(5) Plans for premises should be forwarded as soon as possible.

«Discussion: Leclaire said they were doing all they could: they had hopes.

«(6) Because of the lack of premises, a tutorial system should be instituted whereby each candidate becomes the responsibility of a named senior analyst, known as his tutor, for the purpose of seeing that the candidate’s training needs are being adequately met. Each candidate would have the same tutor throughout his training career.

«(7) These tutors, different from supervisors, and with only a moral responsibility for the candidate’s welfare, should form a small group, reporting direct to the Training Committee. One of their duties would be to help candidates become Associate Members. Their other task would include helping with read-
ing lists, changes in lecture programmes, help in the finding of cases, and other matters affecting the general welfare of the students. They would meet the students on a once a month basis, and the Training Committee at the end of each term. Naturally Dolto and Lacan would not act as tutors.

«Discussion on (6) and (7): Leclaire said that the Training Committee had accepted this recommendation and that the responsibility for running this service had been given to Dr. Perrier.

«(8) Training in child analysis, as has been stressed, is an urgent problem and deserves special consideration.

«(9) Well-established analysts from other Societies should be encouraged to come for week-ends to lecture and to take seminars, on the model of the Frankfurt Institute and the Hamburg Society. In this connection we would urge that the C.E. establish a training fond for the provision of expenses of such lecturers to help train this and other study groups.

«Discussion: Leclaire said that he would welcome further help of this kind.

«Comment: In general we felt satisfied with these replies, noting in particular the plans for a stricter control of Stagiaires. Two points remain of concern:

«– Attendance at the Lacan seminars: we regretted the somewhat legalistic attitude to this question. We consider that the Training Committee should make its views clearly known to all candidates.

«– There is a great resistance to the notion of compulsory attendance at lectures and seminars. We reminded the Training Committee that it had a sanction – exclusion of offending candidates from training. Clearly such an idea goes against the grain, but perhaps they are not close in this!

«We would again emphasise our wish for a fund to sponsor outside lecturers and seminar-takers.

«G. Provincial Training Centres

«(1) Since Strasbourg is the most coherent group, it should have absolute priority for training. Dispersion of provincial effort should be avoided at all costs.

«(2) The number of candidates in training at Strasbourg should be limited over the next four years.

«(3) Another senior analyst should visit Strasbourg one day a week for the purpose of conducting supervision and seminars.

«(4) The Groupe Méditerranéen should only have second priority for at least the next two years.

«(5) The aim should not be to provide supervision for the Groupe Méditerranéen locally; this must for the time being be found in Paris.

«(6) The plans for a senior training analyst to visit Marseilles on a once a month basis should be revived.
"(7) No new provincial activities should be undertaken until after the 1965 Congress.

"Discussion: Leclaire agreed completely with these recommendations as far as the Groupe Méditerranéen is concerned. He pointed out that Strasbourg always had a certain fascination in view of the extraordinarily favourable conditions for the development of psychoanalysis: to which we would add – hence the constant wish to develop it beyond its training resources. Regrettably there was really no senior analyst available to go to Marseilles. He assured us that there was no question of new provincial centres being developed. Anybody from Bordeaux or elsewhere would have to come to Paris.

"Comment: We felt satisfied with these assurances. It will obviously be very much better if a senior analyst could aid Pujol in Marseilles where the evolution of the situation will much depend on the quality of Pujol’s leadership. The same comments we have made with regard to Strasbourg, that they should be visited by outside lecturers, could apply here, though only as a second priority.

"H. Relations with the S.P.P.

"(1) Improved relations with the S.P.P. are to be encouraged and might in the first instance include -

"(2) shared facilities, e.g. library, basic lectures, supervisions;

"(3) exchange of information about applicants applying for training.

"Discussion: Leclaire indicated that he was in contact with senior officials of the S.P.P. and he would do his best to encourage good relations and shared facilities.

"Comment: It is our opinion that Leclaire is sincere in this matter and the Advisory Committee, on its part, should be willing to help "fraternization" between the two Societies.

"I. Further Members-at-Large

"(1) We do not wish to recommend that any further Member of the Study Group be invited to become Members-at-Large of the International.

"(2) We believe the Study Group must be viewed as a whole with a sense of collective responsibility of all for its future, which the random award of the statue "Member-at-Large" is apt to destroy.

"(3) This Committee may wish to review the above in the light of the outcome of the Committee’s discussions with the C.E. and the nature of the final decisions taken.

"Discussion: This point was not enlarged on with the S.F.P.

"XVI. CONCLUSIONS

"(1) To summarise:

"On the one hand

"- Important administrative progress has been achieved: every effort has been made to put the house in order.
The Requirements are being followed and correctly interpreted, with the exception of those concerning Lacan.

Increasing and effective control is being exercised over the provincial centres, though they still have their problems.

As a Study Group, its members are working to establish and build it into a Society devoted to the study and development of psychoanalysis.

The Study Group contains a number of good people and there is therefore a possible future for the Group as psychoanalysts.

(2) On the other —

What has been called the “problem Lacan—booms as large as ever, though there is some substance to Leclaire’s claim that for the first time Lacan’s analytic practice has been brought under observation and hence certain of its aspects can be controlled.

Lacan has also changed his tactics with the Committee. Instead of trying to convince, if not seduce us, now he is actively fighting both our views and our activities by his insistence on being present at all meetings when his future is under discussion, as also by his passive, silent behaviour at these meetings. From now on it must be recognised that the fight is on.

(3) The question which both the Committee and the C.E. have now to ask themselves is —

Can any further progress be made in the absence of an effective resolution of the “problem Lacan”?

By “effective resolution” we mean the strictest application of R.13 which we now consider must contain clauses for transferring certain of his candidates to other analysts, as well as safeguards for his permanent exclusion from all official training activities.

(4) It is possible to give a negative answer to the above question and therefore to advise that the status of “Study Group” should be suspended till the “Society” can offer the C.E. an adequate and realistic plan for its resolution.

(5) A variety of arguments can however be put forward against such an answer.

The “good” elements, both in terms of candidates in training as well as Associate Members and Members, would then be sacrificed on the altar of “Lacanism” and the seriousness for candidates of such a withdrawal of Study Group status cannot be exaggerated; their future would be in suspense through no fault of their own.

This withdrawal might very easily result in the isolation and analytic death of those elements which are struggling to counter-balance Lacan, e.g. Leclaire, Granoff, Lagache, Pujol, and all who are “friends” of the C.E.

On the other hand it is doubtful if the opposing elements are strong
enough at the moment to form a new group of their own. Lagache is no such leader, and Leclaire is committed at the present to a work, through and to bringing in the whole Group, and hence is not in a position to undertake such a role. Time is still needed: the various counter-forces are actually in the process of crystallising out. The Advisory Committee’s future work must be to help accelerate this process and to help all to see where individually they stand.

«– By maintaining Study Group status, the C.E., on behalf of Psychoanalysis, is keeping some sort of hold on this situation. Withdrawal of this status might easily lead to the rapid spread of “wild analysis” and to a variety of undesirable people calling themselves “analysts” on the grounds that they have had some sort of personal analytic training.

«– It is important in this connection to bear in mind that for a long time low standards and deviationary techniques have been current in France and some European Societies, a fact which has contributed to the S.F.P.’s feeling of bewilderment vis à vis the Requirements. Hence Lacan’s deviationary techniques appeared to be not only in keeping with the circumstances but also as specially creative, and as such not to be suppressed.

«– Whilst on the one hand, by applying to the C.E. to join the International, the Study Group is exposing itself to a situation in which the C.E. has every right to impose terms, on the other hand terms that are imposed from the outside and remain unworked through, are unlikely to result in a sound Component Society. At present the situation between the Study Group and the Committee, as representatives of the C.E., is a “we/they” one, and this essentially as a result of the “Lacan problem”. There is as yet little sense of “us all” which could only develop after more intensive work.

«– The achievement then of an “us all” attitude requires time. So far the time factor has been thought of in terms of the time between Psycho-Analytic Congresses, i.e. two years. In analytical terms this is not very realistic. On the other hand nobody should work for an interminable situation. The problem of finding the right time element is in this case as difficult to determine as it is with any individual patient. Impatience here not only does not help, but may only serve to increase resistances.

«– The C.E. has started a process of work and it is difficult to foresee the repercussions of stopping this work at this stage. At present its failure would be judged by the world at large on the political aspects of our work. In the Committee’s judgment it would be unwise to allow the present situation to end in such terms. In this connection Leclaire’s claim that the Study Group’s fitness to become a Component Society will coincide with their own internal resolution of the Lacan problem is quite correct.

«(6) After careful weighing of the arguments bath for and against forcing an
immédiat solution to the “Lacan problem”, the Committee is of the opinion that the position of the S.F.P. as a Study Group and the work started by the Advisory Committee should be continued, and request therefore the C.E. to endorse the Recommendations set out in this Report.

Du dimanche 28 juillet au jeudi 1er août se déroule dans le Concert Hall et le Parliament Building de Stockholm le XXIIIe Congrès international de l’Association psychanalytique internationale.

Il débute par un hommage à Marie Bonaparte que Rudolf Loewenstein prononce et qui se termine par: «Pour nous elle vit comme une grande analyste, une grande personnalité et une très grande dame.»


Les membres du bureau et de la Commission des études de la Société française de psychanalyse sont tous présents à Stockholm, sauf Didier Anzieu. Le Comité et le Central exécutif en sont informés mais il n’y a aucun contact officiel (ni officieux), aucune négociation avant la discussion du Business Meeting. Celle-ci aboutit à «La directive de Stockholm», qui stipule: «1. L’Exécutif Central prend note du fait que depuis le Congrès d’Édimbourg:

«a) Le Groupe d’études a fait des efforts considérables pour remettre en ordre son administration;


«2. En ce qui concerne les points susmentionnés, l’Exécutif Central adresse ses félicitations au Dr Leclaire, dans ses fonctions de Secrétaire puis de Président, pour les résultats qui ont été atteints jusqu’à présent.

«3. Néanmoins, l’Exécutif Central prend note également, à propos du Dr Lacan, du fait que:

«a) Il continue à avoir voix au chapitre en ce qui concerne la formation;

«b) Il ne se conforme pas aux Recommandations d’Édimbourg dans sa pratique analytique avec les candidats en formation;

«c) Il a entravé le Comité Conseil dans son travail avec le Conseil d’administration.

«4. L’Exécutif Central considère que le Dr Lacan ne peut être compté plus longtemps parmi les analystes didacticiens du Groupe d’études, et que la recom-