

Federico Allodi

History of psychoanalysis in Spain and its contrasts with the English speaking world

The early history of psychoanalysis in the United States and the Anglo-Saxon world consisted mostly of studies by supporters and critics centred on psychoanalytic theory development and the person of Sigmund Freud. The literature is vast. The earliest and still basic reading is the History of Psychoanalysis and Sigmund Freud by Ernest Jones.¹ In trying to understand the development of psychoanalysis with its barriers and supports, the ideas and personality of Dr. Freud have been scrutinized from multiple angles. The social context in which the ideas were restrained or stimulated was also paid due attention. However, there has been little emphasis specifically on the context of the economic environment and specifically on market dynamics. Psychoanalysis is indeed a cultural product which has to be accepted by users and consumers. The link between product and consumer is provided by the marketing environment. Consequently this paper describes the development of psychoanalysis from the point of view of marketing theory as applicable to the social field and behaviour.

In an earlier paper I advanced the idea that in the U.S. the success of psychoanalysis after the Second World War depended on a number of factors both intrinsic to psychoanalysis and related to external circumstances. The list included the timeliness, quality and presentation or packaging of the product, the needs of the society in which it was going to be promoted and the existence of a well prepared cadre of professionals of psychoanalysis who, like a sale force, carried it to an extraordinary outcome.^{2,3} In a paper on the extraordinary expansion of the diagnostic categories in psychiatry after the Second World War reaching up to global levels I credited the USA genius for salesmanship for this development.⁴

Upon reviewing the extensive literature on this matter, the reasons for success of psychoanalysis in the USA particularly and in the rest of the Western world have been elaborated from many different perspectives. The following are some of the main explanations for such an extraordinary phenomenon:

- The crisis and disappointment manifest in the first decades of the 20th century with the somatic/organic

model for mental illness and less severe psychological afflictions.⁵

- The crisis in social values: Individualism, old and new, were not the same thing. The ragged individual, largely mythical, who built America from the time of the thirteen colonies was replaced by an individual lost and alienated in the industrial world of "modern times".⁶ The Enlightenment with its emphasis on rationality and efficiency has lasted in the USA longest that in Western Europe. In response to the overwhelming development of technology in the industrial society and the denial of a social or community space and spiritual support, the secularized "rational" individual was in search of an inner space to meet the needs for meaning and freedom. Psychoanalysis provided a historical alternative.⁷
- The value system entrenched in the ethos of Puritanism, including sexual mores, was challenged. The family as an institution after the Second World War shed some important functions to the school; mothers became involved in public and social life, and childhood and adolescence, as ages on their own, were discovered.⁵ The individual's insatiable need for fulfilment developed to such extreme and the 1960's and 70s were labelled the "me society" possessed by a "narcissistic culture".⁸
- Intrinsically psychoanalysis constituted a cohesive psychological system with a bio-medical basis. It borrowed a solid social base in alliance with a respected and powerful profession. Freud's decision to root his system on the organic substance of the gonads was in opposition to Jung's ideas basically inclined to rest upon on anthropological and social concepts. This line of medical orientation and control of psychoanalysis was perpetuated by the US psychoanalysts from the early stages of its development.
- It provided psychological and humanistic understanding of patients' motives.
- As it was concerned with the inner world and personal histories of each individual it participated in the scientific paradigm shift, from the universal to the particular.⁹
- Consequently it gave a new meaning to the clinical

phenomena as it went beyond the sterile syndromal descriptions and formal taxonomy of the Kraepelin's system.

- One can deduce also that it supplied novel specific market needs in a modern, secular, avidly individualistic society.¹⁰
- It also developed a sophisticated sale force and salesmanship. From the 1909 Clark University conference in Worcester, USA, by Freud developments were "stage managed by a small circle of psychoanalytic pioneers".⁵
- Finally, it showed a remarkable capacity to adapt and render itself compatible with the predominant socio-cultural values.

The present paper uses Spanish society as its prime subject and engages in a parallel analysis of the development of psychoanalysis in Spain in terms of the socio-cultural environment, and the needs and supply of services for the changing population. Furthermore, it will compare and contrast specific and appropriate observations between Spain, and US and Anglo cultures during the same historical periods.

CONCEPTS AND METHODOLOGY

History for the purpose of this study is defined as the study of the transformations in a society.¹² It is an attempt to explain changes in a society and its institutions as the result of an interplay of factors of very diverse nature. This paper will specifically describe the growth, support and barriers put to psychoanalysis in relation to the socio-cultural contexts. A critical analysis will evaluate, contrast and compare the sources and primary materials used in this study. As a guide and to marshal our information in an orderly fashion the following hypotheses are proposed:

- H1) The development and influence of psychoanalysis in Spain was dependent on the socio-cultural context
- H2) Psychoanalysis thrived under liberal and progressive forces and was inhibited under repressive and traditional forces
- H3) These principles apply equally to Spain and other English speaking countries, namely the U.S., U.K. and Canada.

The subjects and material of historical analysis consisted of the prevalent ideas and values, institutions, political events and economic changes. I have examined individual biographies of some intellectuals, writers, teachers and leaders of psychiatry. I provide the references on publications and translations of the work of Freud and of the history of the movement both lay and professional. Finally, I have also drawn from my personal recollections as a student of medicine and psychiatry in Spain, and from communications provided to me by teachers and colleagues.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Throughout the 19th and 20th centuries Spain witnessed and suffered a number of changes in ideologies represented by specific and critical events in its history. Following the invasion of Napoleon to Spain and the influx of revolutionary and Enlightenment ideas, the Spanish intellectual and political climate was altered drastically. In 1812 a first constitution was drafted and a parliament (*Cortes*) was created in Cadiz. The failure of the monarchy concluded with the promulgation of the First Republic of 1868.¹¹ This is an important antecedent to the Second Republic of 1931 by itself relevant to the fortunes of psychoanalysis. In 1898 the loss of the remnants of the Spanish empire generated a *cri de conscience* and outpouring of ideas, and their embodiment in institutions that tried to cope with this national ultimate disaster. Two intellectuals of the 1898 Generation are pertinent to psychiatry, both representing two different approaches to the problem of the intellectual stagnation and other predicaments of Spain. Miguel de Unamuno proposed a return to Spanish traditional values and spirituality. He taught himself to read Kierkegaard in Danish and became the main exponent of existentialism in Spain. This current was going to be manifested later as a form of dynamic psychopathology. The other approach to the Spanish problem is represented by José Ortega y Gasset who advocated and fully engaged into opening Spain to Europe and its modern ideas. The 1920s politically were dominated by an ineffectual monarchy and by the benign dictatorship of General Primo de Rivera acting as head of government for the nominal king. The Second Republic, elected in democratic elections for the first time in Spanish history, did away with the monarchy and established five years of progressive and all too rapid changes ending in chaos and the Spanish Civil War.¹²

From 1936 and for the next 40 years General Francisco Franco's regime dominated Spain. A crucial event not sufficiently emphasized was the 1952 and 1953 visits to Spain of John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State for the U.S., and President D. Eisenhower. It was the end of the Spanish economic boycott and intellectual isolation that had lasted 17 years. The death of Franco in 1975 and the transition to democracy became the last chapter of this evolving authoritarian state.

From 1898 to 1975, in socio-cultural terms, the Spanish historical context fluctuated between a traditional religious, family and class oriented society with a stagnant semi-rural economy, and a society with values and institutions of secular, individualistic and materialistic nature. Psychoanalysis as an ideology was innovative, revolutionary and modern, meaning with secular and individualistic values. It was also anticlassical, anti-European, anti-Enlightenment.¹³ As it appeared in the Spain of the 1920s and 1930s and after 1936 it was bound to clash with the sections of the

traditional family oriented society, which naturally enough, tried to defend or impose its own values.

EARLY PUBLICATIONS AND TRANSLATIONS

The figure of **José Ortega y Gasset** (1883-1955) dominated the field of philosophy in Spain throughout the 20th century. He was trained as a philosopher in Germany and came into contact with the current ideas of post Kantian philosophers, the historicism of Wilhelm Dilthey and the phenomenology of Edmund Husserl. His main teacher at Marburg was Hermann Cohen (1842-1918) who established a very close relationship with this young Spaniard. This Jewish professor, also teacher to Ernest Cassirer (1874-1945), was trying to harmonize Kantian rationalism with Jewish philosophical thinking and without any doubt was acquainted with psychoanalysis. It is very probable that he shared his ideas with Ortega. Back in Spain Ortega published in 1911 an article in three parts and 45 pages in the newspaper *La Lectura* entitled "Psychoanalysis, a Problematic Science".¹⁴ It was reedited in 1925 in the journal that Ortega funded and directed, *Revista de Occidente*. It had an enormous impact among intellectuals, artists and writers, and only later and indirectly in psychiatry. He wrote other papers on the same subject in 1924 and afterwards.¹⁵⁻¹⁷ His sources were the *Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, the studies on hysteria by Breuer, and Freud's lectures in Worcester, USA, in 1909. This three part conference was published the following year in German as a monograph entitled *Über Psychoanalyse* and translated into English. Ortega was not only a brilliant and precocious philosopher but also a gifted writer. Coming from a family of newspaper publishers, editors and journalists, he had an eye for the newsworthy and a clear and elegant style which made the most complex subject easy and a pleasure to read. Many generations owe Ortega their initiation and continuous interest in philosophy and critical thinking.¹⁸

Ortega introduced the ideas of psychoanalysis as a scientific method of psychological exploration and as a practice of healing. He presented for the first time in Spain key psychoanalytical concepts, such as the unconscious and repression. He objected to its pan-sexualism, more specifically in a revision of 1924.¹⁵ He later objected to the atomism and mechanicism of psychoanalysis, concretely in revisions of 1946. Although he did not comment directly on its atheistic message Ortega, even though educated by the Jesuits, held religious views considered very liberal for those times. He published an article, *God ahoy (Dios a la vista*, in Spanish), which caused something of a shock although he merely stated that in the near future God was going to be a subject for secular discussion. In his intellectual and critical detachment he did not see any conflict between religion and science, and specifically saw psychoanalysis as the scientific equivalent of religious confession.

After a quiescent period of some ten years Ortega's psychoanalytic influence on the cultural and literary world included the figures of Antonio and his brother Manuel Machado, Eugenio Dors, Salvador Dalí, Luis Buñuel, Federico García Lorca, the bullfighter and playwright Ignacio Sánchez Mejías, and Pío Baroja, trained as a physician but in fact a writer and intellectual.¹⁹⁻²¹

Although Ortega's article of 1911 had an extraordinary impact it was not the first publication on psychoanalysis in Spain. Almost simultaneously with the publication of the preliminary report on hysteria by Sigmund Freud and Joseph Breuer in the *Neurologische Zentralblatt* of Viena, number 3, of 1-15 January, 1893, this paper was published in Spanish in the *Revista de Ciencias Médicas de Barcelona* and in the *Gaceta Médica de Granada* in February- March of the same year (Vol. XI, nos. 232 and 233) with the same title of *Psychic Mechanism of Hysterical Phenomena*. However, this precocious translation had no influence on the medical consciousness or, of course, the general public.²¹ From there on till 1922 there was a hiatus in productivity in psychoanalytical matters.

The first translations that made psychoanalysis available to the Spanish readers were the translations by Luis López Ballesteros of 1922 and 1934. In Argentina Ludovico Rosenthal in 1956 and José Echeverry in 1978 translated the complete works of Sigmund Freud.²²⁻²⁶ Eventually this permitted psychoanalysis to be accessible to teachers and students in medical schools. The leadership in psychiatry, psychological medicine and psychoanalysis alternated between Madrid and Barcelona. Salamanca, Valencia, Valladolid, Santiago and Saragossa followed with Granada, Seville and Cadiz, and from the late 1970s Cordova.

TEACHERS AND LEADERS IN PSYCHIATRY

It is important to distinguish those teachers who expressed their views on psychoanalysis during the times before 1936 and after 1936. Before 1936 the most significant figures were a group of neuro-psychiatrists called the Generation of 1916,²⁷ namely, José María Sacristán Luzón, Emilio Mira y López Gonzalo Rodríguez Lafora, and, as the first trained Spanish psychoanalyst, Ángel Garma. After 1939 the prominent leaders were Antonio Vallejo Nágera, Ramón Sarró Burbano and Juan José López Ibor. Other representative figures were Pedro Laín Entralgo, Rojas Ballesteros, Francisco Marco Merenciano and Carlos Castilla del Pino. Merely a brief summary of their outstanding views and contribution is provided here.

Emilio Mira y López was the first psychiatrist to write on psychoanalysis in Spain. He had a publication on psychopathology followed by a monograph on psychoanalysis in which he gave a detailed account on its theory and technique.²⁸ Like most Spanish psychiatrists of

his time and thereafter he rejected the extreme Freudian pan-sexualism. In his Textbook of Psychiatry of 1926 he used Freud in his Ballesteros translation, Jung and Adler. He favoured the views of the latter two Freudian dissidents and his views were eclectic, pretty much at the margins of psychoanalysis.²⁷ In 1933 he became the first chairman (*Catedrático*) of psychiatry in Spain in the faculty of medicine at the University of Barcelona. To the last moment before his exile to Brazil in 1939 he played host to visitors in Spain fleeing from Nazism, which, of course, also increased his direct knowledge of psychoanalysis.²⁸⁻³¹

Gonzalo Rodríguez Lafora, after receiving his M.D. in 1907, as was the practice those days among aspiring psychiatrists, visited Berlin in 1908, coming in contact with Kraepelin and Alzheimer, and again in 1913 when he came across Freud's ideas. In his time the historical context of psychiatry was enriched by the biological discoveries of the concept of the neuron of Ramón y Cajal and the discovery of the *spirochaeta pallida* as the cause of general paralysis of the insane or brain syphilis. A controversy enlivened the discussion between structuralists and functionalists. At the same time that he espoused an organic cause of mental illness, he was influenced by Ortega and Unamuno on psychoanalysis. In 1923 he contributed to the *Revista de Criminología, Psicología y Medicina Legal* with an article on the theory and methods of psychoanalysis. He proposed and worked on the adaptation of psychoanalysis to Spanish traditions and values, and like many physicians, intellectuals and psychiatrist he was exiled in 1939 to return to Spain in 1947 in recognition of his merits.^{32, 33}

José María Sacristán, a disciple of Santiago Ramón y Cajal, received psychiatric training with Kraepelin in Munich. With Lafora and Ortega founded the journal *Archivos de Neurobiología*, the first psychiatric journal published in Spain and, except for the war years, uninterruptedly to today. A left wing liberal, he was instrumental on the reform of mental health care doing away with the Royal Decree of 1885 which kept patients in asylums indefinitely under judicial and bureaucratic control. Consistent with his humanistic and progressive views, with others, he published on psychoanalysis in this journal.³⁴ After 1939 he was sacked from his job in the Hospital Provincial in Madrid.

Ángel Garma was the first psychoanalyst who practiced in Spain. After his training analysis in Berlin with Theodore Reik in 1931, he was admitted to the German Psychoanalytical Society and soon returned to Spain. He emphasized training above all else to deal with the depurations that psychoanalysis had suffered in the Spanish eclecticism. He succeeded in training three colleagues, was invited to expose his ideas in lectures to his colleagues and published in Spanish, German and English seminal and formative material. His career was interrupted by the

Civil War and his exile to England and Argentina, where founded with Gregorio Berman the Argentinean school of psychoanalysis.³⁵⁻³⁸

One should not be led to believe that the acceptance of psychoanalysis was without criticism and opposition before 1936. Although the attitude of neuro-psychiatrists was in general favourable there were indeed a numbers of very prominent physicians and psychiatrists representing the medical profession who expressed a vigorous opposition. Most important in this group was **Dr. Enrique Fernández Sanz**, a psychiatrist of the highest reputation in Madrid. As early as 1911 he presented psychoanalysis as a form of psychological therapy but remained critical, and later, at best, cautious.²¹ He rejected the idea that a child could be a "pervert polymorph" or that God was the product of a need for dependence on an omnipotent father or a universal obsessive neurosis, as Freud proposed. He thought, like other physicians of the postwar years, that psychoanalysis was useless and harmful, and that eventually it would fall into disrepute. Eventually he softened his views although he remained a moderate conservative.^{27, 39} The association of psychoanalysis with psychiatrists of left wing political tendencies no doubt aroused the expected resistance of the conservative classes. Mira and Berman were communists, Lafora and Sacristán were left wing liberals and Garma, a republican, like Berman served in the republican army. Like Mira López and Miguel Prados he had to go into exile after the triumph of the right wing rebellion of General Franco.²¹

After 1939 the medical influence of psychoanalysis is filtered through the personality of different writers and teachers. When we subject each of these main players to a close scrutiny it is surprising that their views and statements range from a number of positions and alter at different times. **Prof. Gregorio Marañón**, the most prominent physician of his time, also a historian of psychological biographies, in 1926 published a book on sexuality in which objected to its excessive generalizations, lack of experimental knowledge and the universalization of observations peculiar to Freud's Jewish background and culture. Nevertheless, he invited Angel Garma to lecture in his clinic in the university of Madrid at the Hospital Provincial.²¹ He maintained this ambivalent attitude and labelled it as a "passing fashion". Pío Baroja called it a "semitic mystification", "subversive of the scientific method". The psychiatrists within this political spectrum were Professor Antonio Vallejo Nágera who represented the official position of psychiatry towards psychoanalysis during the first two decades of Franco's regime; Dr. Francisco Marco Merenciano displayed arch-conservative reactions; Professor López Ibor provided early liberal critiques and revisions; Carlos Castilla del Pino, a left wing intellectual, expressed the most progressive ideas during Franco's period.^{40, 41}

Antonio Vallejo Nágera received his MD in Valladolid in 1915 and visited Germany as a postgraduate student where he worked under Alfred Hoche. In 1930 he joined the Army Medical Corps and during 1936-9 was a military psychiatrist in the "nationalist" zone. He was rewarded with the professorship and chair of psychiatry in Madrid from 1950 to 1960. Vallejo Nágera published on wartime psychiatry, mental health and wrote a three volume textbook between 1944 and 1955.⁴²⁻⁵¹ Like other psychiatrists of the wartime period, such as López Ibor, Ángel Garma and Gregorio Berman, he wrote on war neurosis and other reactions and expressed, like most of them, clinical views tinted by their own and prevailing ideology. It is surprising in Vallejo Nágera to see that beside his conservative position he also expressed progressive views. He condemned the eugenic sterilization in the U.S. and Germany and he wrote extensive descriptions, mostly favourable critiques, of psychoanalysis. The textbook of psychiatry is indeed a product of its times. The volume 1 in 1944 deals with psychopathology, and the ideas of Karl Jaspers, Ernest Kretschmer, Carl Gustav Jung and William James. In volume 2, published in 1945, apart from the organic psychosis, he devotes considerable space to oligophrenia and epilepsy as they were customary subjects for the neuro-psychiatrists of those generations. These chapters were to disappear later in volume 3, final edition of 1955. This final volume deals with the neuroses extensively and dedicates 20 pages to Freud and psychoanalysis. He described it as a "cohesive system of great applicability to the understanding and practice of the neuroses and functional psychoses." He acknowledged the importance of the unconscious in dreaming and psychopathology. Like most psychiatrists of his period he objected to psychoanalysis on the grounds of its pan-sexualism and its potential for moral contamination, as it was against religion (which Freud had called an "illusion"), Christianity, family and tradition, and atheistic. He saw in it a danger as "it infiltrated politics, pedagogy and art".

Ramón Sarró Burbano received his MD in Barcelona c. 1924. In 1925 he visited Vienna, met with Freud, and was exposed to the ideas of Jung, Adler, phenomenology and existentialism. On the advice of Freud he engaged in personal analysis with Helen Deutsch which lasted one year of the prescribed duration of three years. In 1931 he directed the psychiatric service in the department of Internal Medicine under the prominent figure of Professor Pedro Pons in the University of Barcelona. In 1933 he became assistant professor with Mira López.⁵² He was very well known in all Spain to generations of students because in 1941 and 1946 he translated the textbook of psychiatry of Oswald Bumke, a standard text in those days. Although he translated faithfully the Nazi mental health legislation, included as an appendix to the textbook, he expressed clearly his repudiation of it as "prejudicial, inhuman and repugnant."⁵³

Juan José López Ibor, after his graduation in Valencia with a medical degree, he traveled to do his postgraduate studies in Munich, Heidelberg and France. In 1942 he

became professor of forensic medicine in Valencia and Santiago de Compostela. From there he went on to be Professor of Psychological Medicine in Salamanca and Madrid, and Professor of Psychiatry in Madrid in 1966. That year he became the first Spanish president of the World Psychiatric Association. From 1936-1958 he published extensively on psychoanalysis in textbooks, notes for students and monographs^{54, 55} and provided conservative critical expositions and reviews.^{56, 57} His main objections were to its naturalistic views as a value system, and to the concept of Superego, as heir of the Oedipus complex, too coarse and limited to explain the achievements of the human spirit. He predicted a poor reception of psychoanalysis in Spain as a Catholic country based on German data of 1946. López Ibor became also the chief of the psychiatric service at the Hospital Provincial, close to San Carlos Hospital, and then part of the Faculty of Medicine in Madrid. There he presided over weekly rounds attended by generations of psychiatrists later to achieve prominence on their own right. A long list of participants could be attached here. He had eclectic views on psychiatry espousing the concept of psychosomatic disorder (therefrom the acetylcholine treatment) and the philosophy of existentialism to understand the psychopathology of anxiety under the term "*angustia vital*".⁵⁸ He was indeed the leading intellectual and scientific psychiatrist of his time, at the same time that he adapted personally with advantage to the predominant political tenor.

Among other professors and leaders from 1952 to 1975 was **Pedro Laín Entralgo**, professor of the history of medicine and president (*Rector Magnificus*) of the University of Madrid. He was a member also of the *Real Academia Española* and a prolific writer.⁵⁹⁻⁶¹ As an intellectual he was traditional and catholic, and later in his life recanted his earlier political views sympathetic to the right wing *falange* movement. His critiques of psychoanalysis and Freud were mixed. In Granada **Prof. Rojas Ballesteros** was a typical psychiatrist of the Franco regime. He visited Germany and knew Lange in Munich and Kleist in Frankfurt. During the 1940s and 1950s he was professor of psychiatry in the University of Granada and expressed openly very critical views of psychoanalysis as "anathema and atheist". He was closely connected with the military leaders of his time in that city and his anti-Darwinian and anti-psychoanalytic views were part and parcel of the same reactionary attitude.⁶² In provincial universities two professors deserve mention: **Prof. Francisco Marco Merenciano** of Valencia and **Prof. Carlos Castilla del Pino** of Cordoba. They are indeed the polar opposites of each other. Marco Merenciano was largely organicist, hardly mentioned psychoanalysis and proposed an adaptation of psychotherapy to the Spanish religious climate. His views, however, were arch-conservative and he mixed religious views and reactionary ideology with the practice of psychotherapy. On the other hand, Carlos Castillo del Pino from the middle and late 1950s to this 21st century was a prolific writer and represented the left wing

political wing of psychoanalysis.⁶³ After 1975 he became professor of psychiatry in Cordoba as final recognition to his intellectuality and pro-democratic activism.

PSYCHOANALYSIS IN MODERN SPAIN

There are many largely arbitrary dates given in Spanish history for the onset of modernity. In terms of social gains, the roots of modernity can be traced to 1812 under the influence of the Enlightenment despite a number of frustrated attempts since. From that date onwards, following the limitations imposed to the absolute power of the monarch as heads of the State, there was a slow transformation signalled by the appearance of a person's rights to freedom, autonomy, dignity, equality in law and private property. In reference to the full manifestation of modernity in this particular context the visit of the U.S. President to Madrid in 1953 is a key event. In it we can recognize the end of the international economic boycott to Spain and the intellectual isolation to which it had been subjected by the victors of the Second World War. Thus began the gradual liberalization of Spain still under General Francisco Franco's regimen to culminate with his death in 1975 and the beginning of the transition to democracy. Unlike the elitist political consciousness and changes of the 19th century, from 1953 Spain began gaining a large urban middle class that could participate in the public, political and intellectual life of the country.

About this time came the end of censorship, specifically to movies and the media, which had been enacted in 1937 and 1938 by the Law of Cinematographic and the Press' Censure. The suspension of censure reflected the new liberalism and promoted deep transformations in the sexual mores, family life and intellectual freedom. Many amusing stories can be repeated here on the absurdity and comical consequences of altering the dialogue and roles of the various actors while dubbing films to Spanish to circumvent some sexual or political taboo. Nonetheless, the movies were one of the Spanish pastimes for which there was always a little money while it became a major vehicle of social transformation.^{18, 64} Hollywood, of course, brought Freudian ideas in some of its movies. (One of them was *Spellbound*, 1945, directed by Alfred Hitchcock, with Ingrid Bergman and Gregory Peck in the leading roles of psychiatrist and patient, and the surrealist dream scenes decorated by Salvador Dalí).

In this liberal modern Spain the key chronology, relevant to psychoanalysis, is represented by the publications of Freud, officially permitted in 1949, the visit of **Margarita Steinbach** from Berlin to Madrid in 1952 and the beginning of a local psychoanalytical movement. **José Rallo Romero** trained in Switzerland and settled in Madrid as a psychoanalyst. He was attached to a prestigious hospital and practiced until an advanced age. In 1954 the Ministry of Government approved the founding of the

Spanish Psychoanalytic Society, which was accepted by the International Psychoanalytic Association.⁶⁵ From there on a number of associations followed: Madrid and Barcelona created their own societies, and by 1978 there were about 200 psychoanalysts in Spain, of which 112 were members of the Psychoanalytical Association of Madrid.

Although this paper does not deal with the events following the death of Franco in 1975 some notable events and features of this period deserve at least brief mention. The biological and pharmaceutical discoveries such as Valium, the tetracyclic antidepressants, the novel antipsychotics and the SSRIs have given powerful tools and prestige to the profession of psychiatry because of its scientific base and public acceptance. These products have been promoted and advanced by an economic industrial and free market model of management applied to the administration of the health care system and clinical services. The internationalization of the market and the role of the multinational pharmaceutical companies have extended the domination of the biochemical model of mental illness across the globe. It appears that Freud's ideas have been overwhelmed by the competition and is in danger of disappearing. The question of, "Is Freud dead?" has been asked more than once. Ironically, it appears that the vanishing of psychoanalysis is taking place under the same free market forces which brought it to power half a century earlier.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

The resistance to and growth of psychoanalysis before and after the Civil War show different patterns in Spain, and in the Anglophone world before and after the Second World War.

In Spain with regard to the **prewar years** publications on psychoanalysis, as we have seen, took place early in 1893, more definitely with the articles of Ortega in 1911 and the translations of Ballesteros in 1922 and 1924. The latter was the first translation to a foreign language of the complete works of Sigmund Freud at the time. In the U.S. in 1893 Meyers provided publications on the studies of hysteria of Freud, and Abraham A. Brill in 1903 summarized Freud's papers on hysteria. The English translations of this subject appeared in 1908 and 1928, also by Brill. In the U.K., M. Clarke published a review on psychoanalysis in 1902, and in 1904 published a review of hysteria in the journal *Brain*. Havelock Ellis in his *Psychology of Sex* published in 1904 made a positive reference to Sigmund Freud and psychoanalysis. In Canada Ernest Jones in 1908 published on psychoanalytical matters in the *University Gazette* of Toronto. By comparison we can conclude that the early publication and translations of Freud's work in Spain and the Anglophone countries followed surprisingly similar chronology.

With regard to growth and resistance in Spain in the **pre-war years**, that is, before 1936, psychoanalysis

grew steadily under liberal regimes. In the **USA**, before 1945, the popularity of psychoanalysis burst practically overnight after the visit of Freud and Carl Gustav Jung to Clark University in Worcester in September, 1909. Freud's three lectures in German were a great success. The national newspapers reported on them favourably and the English translation appeared soon after (Hale, 1971). Nevertheless, there were also made some unfavourable comments, such as those by the American Psychological Association and from Canada by C.K. Clarke, dean of the Faculty of Medicine and superintendent of the psychiatric asylum in Toronto. He is reported as saying, "An ordinary reader would gather that Freud advocates free love, removal of all restraints and a relapse into savagery".⁶⁶ Brill from 1911 to 1913 founded the New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute, the American Psychoanalytic Association and the Section on Psychoanalysis of the American Psychiatric Association. It would be more accurate to say that he co-founded them with Ernest Jones and others, as his claim was disputed in the middle of internecine factions and the politics of exclusion that characterized the birth of psychoanalysis in the U.S.A.,⁶⁷ not much unlike other countries.

In the **United Kingdom** from 1905 to 1906 **Ernest Jones**, because of his inquiries on sex during interviews with children was thrown out of the National Hospital for Nervous and Mental Diseases in London, and was humiliated and bodily expelled from a children's clinic and jailed. He quickly moved to Toronto where he stayed from 1907 to 1913. In Canada Ernest Jones directed the outpatient services of the main university hospital and practiced psychoanalysis privately. Having been burned already, he displayed caution and even self repression. In his lectures to medical students there was no mention of psychoanalysis (Greenland, 2000) and when in April 1909 he gave a lecture on psychoanalysis in Buffalo, New York, he succeeded in the verbal acrobatics of not mentioning childhood sexuality. The same year, a few months later, Freud gave his talks at Clark's without any self censorship. In spite of some support and recognition by CK Clarke, eventually Ernest Jones also ran into difficulties in Toronto. There were a number of both personal and professional reasons. He brought with him and lived with Louise "Loe" Dorothea Kann, his common law wife, a fact not appreciated in the puritanical atmosphere of those days in Toronto. At the same time he published in the *Bulletin of the Ontario Hospitals for the Insane* his sexual explorations in the treatment of patients and articles on the sexual origins of neuroses.^{68, 69} In 1913 he returned to England. The first book on psychoanalysis in English was published by him in 1912. He founded also the British Psychoanalytic Society in 1913 and with others the Tavistock Clinic. At the same time traditional mental hospitals were not particular sensitive to the concepts or practice of psychoanalysis which till the postwar years remained largely limited to those institutions and small section of private practice. When Freud was in his London exile in Hampstead in 1939 he lamented that

all psychoanalysis that he had written 20 years earlier was all but forgotten. In conclusion, in the prewar years, traditional barriers and a difficult growth was experienced by psychoanalysis in all of those English speaking countries, very much like in Spain.

In the **post war years** from 1949 onwards Freud's publications were permitted in Spain. From 1956 references and articles on psychoanalysis began to appear and became gradually more frequent.

In the **USA** after 1945 with the end of World War II and the triumph of the liberal democracies psychoanalysis experienced a rapid multiplication of publications, training programmes and representation in psychiatric institutions. In fact, psychoanalysis dominated the psychiatric discourse, institutions and the treatment models. Nevertheless, there was also censorship and self censorship. Psychoanalysts migrating to the USA realized that academic medicine was very conservative and if one wanted to retain the respect of one's own medical colleagues one had to conform with to the prevalent traditional concepts of psychology and medicinal treatment.⁷⁰ The revisionist forms of a socially conscious psychoanalysis by this time in the USA were considered radical. Wilhelm Reich was jailed and died there in 1957, Adorno and Hochheimer returned to Frankfurt and the psychoanalytical left disappeared from the official or main stream psychoanalytic movement. Exceptions were Eric Fromm who wrote from Mexico and Herbert Marcuse who was revived in the turbulent decade of the 1960s.⁷¹

In the **UK** under the influence of Jones's teaching was established at the Tavistock Clinic and eventually at the Maudsley Institute of Psychiatry in London. Freeman and Glover taught and practiced psychoanalysis. Anna Freud, subsequent to the death of her father, saw her leadership challenged by Melanie Klein with the consequent schism. Winnicott wrote on child analysis and John Bowlby on the family.

In Canada Miguel Prados y Such, a Spanish exile, had impressive qualifications in neuropathology as a student of Hortegea Rios and Santiago Ramón y Cajal. In 1943 he was hired by Wilder Penfield and became Professor of the department of psychiatry at McGill University in Montreal. Although not a trained psychoanalyst, basically he introduced psychoanalysis in Canada. In 1944 he started the Club of Psychoanalysis in Montreal which eventually, with the leadership of William Clifford Scott, became the Canadian Psychoanalytical Association. Scott founded the McGill Psychoanalytic Society and Institute of Psychoanalysis in Montreal but resigned under Professor Ewen Cameron, an avowed organicist. In 1979 the Toronto Psychoanalytical Institute was founded.⁶⁶

In conclusion, during the post war years, barriers and repression alternated with gradual acceptance of

psychoanalysis in traditional societies, while it enjoyed free expansion in modern secularized social environments both in Spain and Anglophone countries. The burst of psychoanalysis in the US was cemented with *émigré* trained psychoanalysts who became the manpower and leadership of the sales force of psychoanalysis as a cultural product for consumption in an avid secularized individualistic society.

PRESENT AND FUTURE OPTIONS

The question remains, Freud or Prozac? Can we expect a revitalized or new psychoanalysis with wide acceptance? And whither the reflective self, the ideas of transference and patient autonomy, pillars of psychoanalytic psychotherapy? Besieged by the atomization and fragmentation of the human being as a consumer of services, the patient is in dire needs of re-humanization. At a global level we are witnessing the promotion of universal human rights as applicable to patients and service users in the form of health legislation and professional codes of ethics. They should provide the means to implement clinical and professional accountability to balance the power of the market forces. This promises to operationalize a value system otherwise lost in the rationality of scientific technology. Psychoanalysis may rescue the health care professions from the alternative between the unpleasant task of becoming political or losing their soul. Finally, we shall conclude with a prayer and a hope that the profession of psychiatry will develop a true bio-psycho-social integrative model. Psychoanalysis laid the foundations for this enterprise.

REFERENCES

1. Jones E. Life and Work of Sigmund Freud. NY: Basic Books, 1955.
2. Allodi F. Freud and the free market: psychological services for the modern man. Paper delivered at the Research in Progress Conference, Museum and Archives of Mental Health and Psychiatry, Queen Street Mental Health Centre; June 9, 1994.
3. Allodi F. Bases psicodinámicas de la psiquiatría. In: Ayuso JL and Carulla S, Manual de Psiquiatría. New York and Madrid: Interamericana. Mc Graw – Hill, 1992; p. 33-41.
4. Allodi F. DSM-III e Coca-Cola. Psicoterapie e Scienze Umane. 1985;3:112-6.
5. Demos J. Oedipus and America: Historical perspectives on the reception of psychoanalysis in the United States. Annals of Psychoanalysis. 1979;4:23-38.
6. Dewey J. Individualism, Old and New. New York: Minton Balch, 1930.
7. Marcuse H. The One-dimensional Man. Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964; p.233.
8. Lasch C. The Culture of Narcissism. American Life in an Age of Diminishing Expectations. (Chapter II, The Narcissistic Personality of Our Time). New York: Norton, 1979.
9. Rosnow RL. The prophetic vision of Giambattista Vico: Implications for Psychoanalysis. J of Personal and Social Psychology. 1978;36(11):1322-31.
10. Redlich F. Social aspects of psychotherapy. American Journal of Psychiatry. 1958;114:800-4.
11. Fusi JP, Falafox J. España: 1808-1996. El desafío a la modernidad. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1997.
12. Carr R. Spain 1808-1939. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.
13. Whyte L. The unconscious before Freud. New York: Basic Books, 1960; p.3-16.
14. Ortega y Gasset J. Psicoanálisis, ciencia problemática. (Published in La Lectura, Madrid, 1911). Also, in Obras Completas. Torno III, Madrid: Alianza Editorial: Revista de Occidente, 1983: p.139-391.
15. Ortega y Gasset J. Vitalidad, alma, espíritu. El Espectador, 1924; p.637-9. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 1961.
16. Ortega y Gasset J. 1910. Una primera vista sobre Baroja. El Espectador. (Articles 1902-1913) Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1928; p.107-110. Also in: Obras completas. Tomo II. El Espectador (1916-1934). 5° Edición, 1951. Madrid: Revista de Occidente. Editorial Alianza, 1983.
17. Ortega y Gasset J. Una primera vista sobre Baroja. (Appendix) El histerismo español. El espectador I (Artículos, 1910-1916). Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 1961; p.150.
18. Mermall T. La retórica del humanismo. La Cultura Española después de Ortega. Madrid: Taurus Ediciones, S.A., 1978.
19. Corcés Pando V. El Psicoanálisis en la Cultura Española de la Posguerra: Ortega y Machado. Madrid: Comunidad Autónoma de Madrid, 1989.
20. Corcés Pando V. Antonio Machado y el Psicoanálisis. Revista de la Asociación Española de Neuropsiquiatría. 1989;9(31):597-604.
21. Carles F, Muñoz I, Llor C, Marset P. Psicoanálisis en España (1893-1968). Madrid: Asociación Española de Neuropsiquiatría, 2000.
22. Lázaro JS. La recepción de Freud en la cultura española (1893-1983). Medicina e Historia. 1991;45:1-16.
23. López Ballesteros L. Sigmund Freud: Obras Completas. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 1922.
24. López Ballesteros L. Sigmund Freud: Obras Completas. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 1934.
25. Rosenthal L. Obras Completas de Sigmund Freud. Buenos Aires: Santiago Rueda, Editores, 1956.
26. Villareal I. Spanish translations of Freud. In: Translating Freud. Edited by Darius Gray Ornston. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.
27. González Duró E. Historia de la Locura en España. Torno III. Del Reformismo del Siglo XIX al Franquismo. Madrid: Ediciones Temas de Hoy S.A., 1996.
28. Mira López E. La Psicoanaliza (In Catalanian). Barcelona: Ediciones 6Z SA, 1926.
29. Mira López E. Análisis psíquicos de la neurosis I. Madrid: El Sol, 1921.
30. Mira López E. Manual de Psiquiatría. Barcelona: Salvat, 1935.
31. Mira López E. Fundamento del psicoanálisis, 1943.
32. Corcés Pando V. Las ideas psicoanalíticas en la obra del Dr. Lafora. In: Huertas, R., and Romero, Ana y Álvarez, R. (Eds.) 1987. Las ideas psicoanalíticas del Dr. Lafora. In: Perspectivas Siquiátricas. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1987.
33. Moya G. Gonzalo R. Lafora. Medicina y Cultura en una España en Crisis. Madrid: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 1986.
34. Huertas R. Mental health and psychiatric care in the Second Spanish Republic. History of Psychiatry. 1998;9:051-064.
35. Garma Á. El psicoanálisis, la neurosis y la sociedad. Madrid: Archivos de Neurobiología, 1936.
36. Garma Á. Psychoanalyse du suicide. Imago, 1937; p. 23.
37. Garma Á. Psicoanálisis de la melancolía. Buenos Aires:

- Asociación Psicoanalítica Argentina, 1948.
38. Lázaro J. Obituary. Ángel Garma (1904-1993). The first psychoanalyst from Spain. *History of Psychiatry*. 1993;4:441-5.
 39. Fernández Sanz E. Histerismo, teoría y clínica. Madrid: Librería de Francisco Beltran, 1914.
 40. Carlos Castilla del Pino C. *Vieja y Nueva Psiquiatría*. Madrid: Seminarios y Ediciones S. A, 1971.
 41. Castilla del Pino C. La psiquiatría española (1939-1975). In: *La Cultura bajo el Franquismo*. Ed. by J M Castellet et al. Barcelona: Ediciones de Bolsillo, 1977.
 42. Vallejo Nágera A. La Asexualización de los Psicópatas. *Higiene de la Raza*. Madrid: Editores Medicina, 1934.
 43. Vallejo Nágera A. *Eugenesia de La Hispanidad*. Regeneración de la Raza. Burgos: Editora Española, 1937.
 44. Vallejo Nágera A. *Eugamia*. Selección de Novios. San Sebastián: Ed. Española, 1938.
 45. Vallejo Nágera A. *Higienización Psíquica de las Grandes Urbes*. Monografía de Vulgarización No.3. Bilbao: Instituto Provincial de Sanidad de Vizcaya, 1941.
 46. Vallejo Nágera A. *Psicosis de Guerra*. Madrid: Morata, 1942.
 47. Vallejo Nágera A. *Tratado de Psiquiatría*. Vol. 1, Primera Edición. Barcelona y Buenos Aires: Salvat, 1944.
 48. Vallejo Nágera A. *Tratado de Psiquiatría*. Vol. 2 y 3. Primera Edición: Buenos Aires y Barcelona: Salvat, 1945.
 49. Vallejo Nágera A. *Tratado de Psiquiatría*. Tercera edición. Barcelona: Salvat, 1954.
 50. Vallejo Nágera A. *Lecciones de Psiquiatría*. Quinta Edición. Madrid: Librería Científico médica, 1955; p. 316.
 51. Vallejo Nágera A. *Ilícitud científica de la esterilización eugénica*. *Acción Española* 1932;1(2 and 3).
 52. Rodríguez Sarró R. *Autobiografía*. Madrid: Antropos, Revista de Documentación Científica, 1987.
 53. Rodríguez Sarró R. In: Bumke, O. Madrid: *Tratado de Psiquiatría Clínica*, 1953.
 54. López Ibor JJ. *Lo vivo y lo muerto del psicoanálisis*. Madrid: Editorial Miracle, 1936. Re-edited in 1946.
 55. López Ibor JJ. *La agonía del psicoanálisis*. Segunda edición. Buenos Aires & México: Espasa Calpe Argentina, 1951; p. 163.
 56. López Ibor JJ. *Los problemas de las enfermedades mentales*. *Corrientes actuales del pensamiento psiquiátrico*. Madrid: Editorial Labor S.A., 1949.
 57. López Ibor JJ. *Lecciones de psicología médica*. Segunda Edición. Madrid: paz Montalvo, 1973.
 58. López Ibor, JJ. *La angustia vital*. Madrid: Paz Montalvo, 1950.
 59. Lain Entralgo P. *La Historia clínica*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1950.
 60. Lain Entralgo P. *Teoría y realidad del otro*. Madrid, 1961.
 61. Lain Entralgo P. *España como problema*. Madrid: Aguilar, 1962.
 62. Núñez M. Personal Communication, 1998.
 63. Castilla del Pino C. M. *Estudios Sobre la Depresión*. *Fundamentos de Antropología Dialéctica*. Tercera Edición, 1970. Barcelona: Nueva Colección Ibérica. Península, 1966.
 64. Bosch A, Del Rincón MF. Franco and Hollywood, 1939-1956. *New Left Review*, 1998; p. 232 .
 65. Muñoz ML. Contribución a la historia del movimiento psicoanalítico en España: Formación de la Asociación Sicoanalítica de Madrid. *Revista de Psicoanálisis de Madrid* 1989; No. Extra: 121-52.
 66. Parkin A. A History of Psychoanalysis in Canada. Toronto: The Toronto Psychoanalytical Society. 1987;16:89-93.
 67. Richards A. A Brill and the Politics of Exclusion. *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*. 1997;47:9-28.
 68. Friedland M. The University of Toronto. A History. Toronto: Toronto University Press, 2002; p. 242-3. Paskauskas RA. The Complete Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Ernest Jones, 1908-1939. 1993; p. 4, 30, 34.
 69. Roazen P. *Freud and his followers*. NY: New York University Press, 1984; p. 509-10.
 70. Jacoby R. *The Repression of Psychoanalysis*. Otto Fenichel and the Political Freudians. New York: Basic Books, 1983.