

## THE PAPER

**[Note, 2013:** On current editorial re-review, some sections have been given special emphasis by bolding. They highlight early areas of study that developed gradually and led to complex, scientifically-testable hypotheses and proven theories over the years. I was very surprised to see how much my mind at the time was occupied with the distant goal of a psychoanalytic science, and how far I had moved towards it.]

### THEORETICAL DISCUSSION

It would be difficult for psychoanalysis to claim that the psychoanalytic treatment method possesses a cohesive, integrated, scientifically-sound theory of technique. Evidence for such a statement can be readily found. The curricula of institutes tell no tale of a sequentially-developing theory of technique throughout the years. Their reading references contain statements of technical principles unsupported by a scientific clinical investigative process. Clinical supervision in Institutes reflects the degree to which technical activities have their origins in mental processes little understood or only partially conscious, in that underlying principles of intervention are only slightly available for teaching. At Scientific Meetings, members can be heard offering conflicting opinions about intervention in response to details of a single clinical situation, and often such differences do not become objects of curiosity. Vigorous arguments have continued for years, about the validity of making deep interpretations at the beginning of an analysis, and the question has never been settled. Many more examples are available.

This subject has not been much studied. Freud himself does not appear to have taken it up as one to be systematically studied. Taking one dimension of theory of technique - the listening and formulating process - J. Ramzy pointed out in 1974 that Freud gave only “an occasional description of it”, a major one, of the process of “*evenly-suspended attention*” (1912 - p.112, p.115).

“..... he must turn his own unconscious like a receptive organ towards the transmitting unconscious of the patient ..... “. “Those elements of the material which already form a connected context, will be at the doctor’s conscious disposal; the rest, as yet unconnected, and in chaotic disorder, seems at first to be submerged, but rises steadily into recollection .... .“

The context of the paper makes it quite clear that Freud gave the description to assist other analysts. He did not refer to it, in any way, as an object of study. This is most understandable because, at the time, theoretical concepts essential to a study of the process such as repression and the psychic structures lay years away, in 1915 and 1923 respectively. We could sum the problem up by saying that Freud could not have studied the working analyst's mind without first having an extensive metapsychological Basic (not Applied) theory of the mind obtained from the study of analysands. However, even up to the time of his death, and his paper on difficult and interminable analysis (1937), he did not turn in this direction.

Other workers after Freud, who have taken the subject up in one or another of its various dimensions, have either had little impact on colleagues with their conclusions, (e.g. R. Fleiss, 1942), or have abandoned the issue as a mysteriously impenetrable one, (e.g. D. Rappaport, 1944), (J. Ramzy, 1974). Close examination of each effort reveals a possible source of the difficulty - problems in application of the Scientific Method. Let us examine some of these efforts in the light of this hypothesis.

R. Fleiss addressed himself to what he called the essential process involved in the analyst's "sizing up" the analysand's "utterances" and said, categorically, that it depended on:

"his ability to put himself in the latter's place ..... and we ..... should like to suggest calling it a 'trial identification'."

Although his essay is a very thoughtful and useful one, Fleiss does not proceed to his conclusions from any of the essential initial scientific steps of observation and documentation, of his own and others' formulative activities. If this is done, it can be readily illustrated that Fleiss describes only one possible phenomenon of several, and that his statement about that single phenomenon deserves the scientific status only of a hypothesis to be tested, not of a conclusive statement of theory.

D. Rappaport set about examining the total question of Theory of Technique in a series of lectures, "The Scientific Methodology of Psychoanalysis" (1944). He begins, however, under the influence of a motive not compatible with scientific curiosity - to derive pleasure from abstraction - and his lengthy work is dominated by it. Though he refers to several clinical.

aspects of technique ((e.g. free association, interpretation), his whole essay is devoid of even the briefest clinical example. He says, for example:

“I feel some reluctance about this because I am myself too fond of abstractions, too ready to linger among them, and enjoy them for their own sake.”

It becomes his nemesis, as he concludes with:

“To publish? I feel that my thinking about this matter is, at the moment, much more in a chaos than it was at the time of the ..... lectures.”

Rappaport’s article has become an oft-quoted, cynical example, by analysts, of the impenetrability of the subject, without apparent justification.

J. Ramzy, in a valuably focussing and stimulating paper, returns to the process of formulating that Freud described. He registers his surprise, (“unbelievable as it may sound”), at “the lack of logical guidelines” or “methodological rules that the analyst follows in order to understand his patient”. Unfortunately, in his own efforts to contribute to the field, Ramzy, somewhat in the manner of Fliess, draws conclusions without having proceeded towards them scientifically. For example, he casts out the whole of metapsychological theory, specific to analysis, as a factor in the process of formulation, without providing the reasonable degree of documentation that science would require to warrant doing so. He says:

“The psychoanalyst does bring to the analytic situation a mental set or a certain number of basic postulates without which he cannot make sense of what he observes.

These postulates are not analytic discoveries, neither are they a monopoly of psychoanalysis. They are general principles of reasoning ..... “.

Because of Ramzy’s admirable provision of a verbatim excerpt from a case, the reader can demonstrate that he was led to his formulative conclusions by his knowledge of at least the Topographic Theory and Transference, and was not led to “detect such phenomena” by “general principles of reasoning” as he asserts. He shows his own skepticism of the conclusions in these final remarks:

“In the present state of our knowledge, all that can be offered is a thumbnail sketch or a list of large topics which have to be closely investigated, carefully documented and explained.”

In the light of this review, then, it becomes an interesting and, important question as to **how to account for the phenomenon of the faulty application, by analysts, of the Scientific Method, at least in this one sphere of investigation? It is this author’s view that one contributing factor is the profession’s lack of possession of a historical view of those of its elements that are scientific entities as certain in existence as the elements of any physical science. This unclear state then permeates institute teaching programs, and graduates often cannot demonstrate the “science” in analysis. Indeed they are often unsure whether to regard it as science or art.** The physical sciences have what might be termed an “object of study”, a “source of observable data” about that object, and an “instrument of observation and investigation”. When the limits of the “instrument” have been reached, while certain phenomena of the object remain unexplained, the scientists turn to efforts to improve that instrument. And if the fruits of investigation appear to have applications to the modification of man’s life, they are developed.

**Fleming’s development of theory about the bactericidal substances produced by moulds in the science of Bacteriology, serves to illustrate the basic features of a science. He observed that bacterial growth on agar media was absent when certain contaminating moulds were present. He proceeded to make regular correlations, develop a hypothesis, test it, and establish a theory of antibiotics. Then his discovery, of course, was found capable of an application that had enormous consequence for man.** A different development in Atomic Physics serves to illustrate a science’s effort to penetrate to a deeper understanding of the “object of study” by improvement in the “instrument”. In 1931, British scientists, Cockroft and Walton, using knowledge about the positive and negative valences of the particles of the atom, and employing recently-invented, powerful magnets, created the “Particle Accelerator”. This “instrument“ enabled physicists to discover and counteract the powerful atomic binding energy of proton and electron, and to separate those structures for the first time.

**Psychoanalysis has its own scientific elements, but they have not been so clearly extracted from the huge body of literature it possesses.** When Breuer interested Freud in his observations about Anna O, (1880), the “object of study” was determined. It was to be the mental activity (thoughts,

affects, etc.) that exists outside the human being's consciousness (i.e. in an "unconscious"), and the relationship of this activity to neurotic and psychotic symptoms, unexplained moods, fragmentary thoughts and behaviours, at a conscious level. Breuer (1893-1895) proceeded from observation:

"The regular order of things was: the somnolent state in the afternoon, followed after sunset by the deep hypnosis for which she invented the technical name of 'clouds'. If during this, she was able to narrate the hallucinations she had in the course of the day, she would wake up clear in mind, calm and cheerful."

He then developed, a hypothesis and tested it:

"I used to visit her in the morning and hypnotise her."..... "each symptom disappeared after she had described its first occurrence."

He thus established with scientific certainty the presence of unconscious mental life and its link with conscious phenomena.

The "observable data" was then soon to be established by Freud (1893-1895) as the "free associations" provided by the analysand. Again, this means of access to the "object of study" was established in sound scientific fashion. Freud said about Frau Emmy von N. (p.56):

"It is as though she had adopted my procedure and was making use of our conversation apparently unconstrained and guided by chance. .... "

"Thus her behaviour in waking life is directed by the experiences she has had during her somnambulism, in spite of her believing, while she is awake, that she knows nothing of them  
 "..... Even without questioning under hypnosis, she can discover the cause of her ill-humour that day."

One could go on to illustrate how, following much establishment of theory about the workings of the "object of study", attention underwent some shift to the "instrument" - the *analyst's* mind. Countertransference was discovered, and found to be capable of adversely affecting the process of investigation. Personal analysis, to effect improvement in the realm of this unconscious complicating factor, was inaugurated. This, in turn, permitted deeper penetration into the transference-resistances of the analysand.

Sometimes modifications to the “instrument” were not properly developed scientifically. Ferenczi’s “Active Technique” (1931) is an example. He says:

“There are two motives which might lead one to change the usual technique ..... (1) if one has not made progress with work lasting weeks, months, or even years, and the analyst is faced with dropping the case ..... “

Ferenczi here does not proceed from observation of unexplained phenomena to hypothesis-formation, etc.

If this thesis is correct then - that the lack of an historical view of the scientific elements of analysis is contributing to the problems of workers in the field of Theory of Technique - where does it reveal its interference, and how can the above clarifications be of assistance?

One manifestation of interference is the persistence, unchanged, of out-dated technical, theoretical concepts into present views of technique. Freud’s 1912 view of the listening-formulative process illustrates this problem. It has not been formally modified as the enormous growth of the field since that time would permit and demand. Psychoanalysis now knows a great deal about the “object”, and how it can be studied using “observational data”. This knowledge is contained in the body of theory, metapsychology. It is available for the possession of practitioners, and can be held at a conscious level, thereby allowing analysts to have far-reaching control (to the limits of metapsychology’s development - which is far from complete) over the process of formulation of material. They no longer need rely, as Freud did, on their “unconscious”, essentially an aspect of the instrument beyond control. The process, in up-dated, version, might be described thus, (Anderson 1978):

“ ..... “the analyst’s ego would be turned towards, and highly attentive to, the derivatives of the analysand’s unconscious - his associations. This attention will be effortful. It will be to content and to associative sequences of different contents. The analyst will be identifying derivatives from different structures – Id impulses, Ego defences, Super-ego and. Ego-ideal **Motives for Defence**<sup>1</sup>. He will be observing those

---

<sup>1</sup> **2013 a retrospective comment:** While converting this paper from typewriter to text, I was struck by my awareness of this concept so early in my career and bolded it. It is so important as a key part of “Surfaces and Layers”

elements of structure that have been projected in the phenomenon of the transference, and noting the topographic and economic aspects of each identified element, while also reviewing history to determine the genetic aspect.”

Another example of this problem is the acceptance of intervention on the basis of “feeling” or “hunch” - the intervention that cannot be systematically explained. A great deal is known now about the instrument in its “investigative” (as complementary to its “observational”) dimension. The concept of “resistance”, and the necessity of its “interpretation”, for example, enables analysts to determine when intervention by the “instrument” is required in order to open new access to “data”. The process might be described thus (Anderson 1978):

“He (analyst) will be assessing presence, strength, and type of resistance, weighing the need for interpretation, forming an interpretation, ..... and honing it to its final form, in preparation for proffering it.”

The process could be likened to the bacteriologist’s introduction of a blood-agar nutriment to a bacterial swab, enhancing bacterial growth and permitting colonies to be studied by the naked eye.

Were a disciplined application of such modern versions of the “instrument” to be applied, many of the murky areas of “Theory of Technique” (into which workers venture, never to return, or out of which they emerge chastened men, e.g. Rappaport) could perhaps be brightened enough to offer encouragement to investigators. Analysts would not be spending time re-discovering the metapsychology of known syndromes, but would have them clearly available in the basic literature, and know them. And by such means, the current limits of metapsychological knowledge about the “object” could be clearly defined, with phenomena not yet explicable by existing theory made known. The current limits of “investigative” techniques of the instrument could

---

theory, yet still so unknown that I had to make a special point of it in Chapter 5 of my 2011 book (*From an Art to a Science of Psychoanalysis*) - “The Revision of an Old Theory”, p.115. The problem is that, though much of Freud’s Metapsychology after scientific testing and further research is a wonderful foundation for real scientific Basis and Applied theories, the profession has succumbed to: (1) the lures subjectivism, eclecticism, multiple theories to explain the same phenomena, etc.; (2) the unwitting deterrents of still-active internal conflicts accessible to resolution by MF Self Analysis.

be brought to clear focus, and they would not be confused with correctable malfunctions of that instrument. Unwarranted, (i.e. mistaken) searches for new techniques could be avoided, saving investigators time that is precious to their short professional lives, as well as unnecessary frustration. This latter area of “instrument-malfunction” appears to have been little-studied, and it is largely unknown in psychoanalysis. Workers do not even have a check-list of signs of the various faulty states of function of their instrument. And, of course, even a descriptive list of such states would only be the preliminary to a scientific study and the development of a body of theory to explain them. And such a theory in turn, would still be a step away from its application in the development of theory that addressed itself to the means of repair of such “malfunctions”.

### **APPLICATIONS – PRACTICE AND RESEARCH**

It is in this latter sphere of investigation of the “instrument”, that the application of metapsychological theory to an understanding of the various phenomena of the analyst’s working mind is a logical scientific step in the development of theory of technique. One might say: if we wish to understand an aspect of the analyst’s mental operations during the conduct of analyses, we should use that vast body of theory of mind that we consider so illuminating of the minds of analysands - metapsychology.

One group of related phenomena - parapraxes and symptomatic acts by the analyst during analytic sessions – will be used to illustrate the application of metapsychology to the study of the instrument. One paper by Dr. T. Jacobs, in the American Journal of Psychoanalysis, and three examples from the author’s practice, will be used for reference.

In the paper, "Posture, Gesture and Movement in the Analyst", T. Jacobs (1973) makes formulative use of what is essentially a symptomatic act in the analyst. In a clinical example (p.84) he describes a young woman who:

“..... began a session ..... in a sullen mood ..... She (then) remained silent for several minutes ..... “

He says of himself:

“..... I found myself rubbing my wedding ring ..... “

And he says of the response:

“[it] ,,,,,, seemed ..... to be a way of expressing my understanding of what the patient was communicating .....”

"It is as an aspect of his empathic responses that such bodily reactions of the analyst may best be understood."

When one has an understanding of the scientific components of the analytic process, it can be readily observed that Jacobs is studying the “investigative instrument”. He begins correctly by describing the phenomenon (in the analyst), but he then abrogates the dictates of science by drawing theoretical conclusions without the intervening steps of hypothesis development and testing. In this case, we can presume that the phenomenon is the outcome of unconscious operations in the analyst, and the logical source of hypotheses to explain it would be our metapsychological understanding of symptomatic acts.

**In this example, when the analyst’s experience is looked at metapsychologically, it can be determined that a series of operations takes place in the analyst. They involve: impulse (the drive expressed in the symptomatic act), ego executive functions (rubbing), a narcissistic object (the analyst’s own finger) and either an ego-ideal or super-ego motive for the repression [defense] present, (as these operations occur at an unconscious level, with only the act that is symptomatic of them becoming conscious).**

**One could further create the reasonable hypothesis that, faced with a “sullen” patient, who ceases to give free associations, a portion of the analyst’s object-catheted “work ego” de-cathects the object, and makes a narcissistic cathexis of the analyst’s own body. And one could further propose that, since ego and impulse occur out of consciousness, with repression being forced by the ego-ideal or the super-ego, a regression of the sublimated drives to analyse has been stimulated, bringing with it a regression of ego (defensive ego, i.e. repressing ego) and possible repressed forms of the other two structures as well.**

**From this standpoint then, the behavioral reaction could be hypothesized as non-specific for the analysand, and the result of frustration of the sublimated work drives of the analyst, that being due to a transference resistance in the analysand that is affecting the provision of associations.**

In another example on p.81, Dr. Jacobs illustrates an interpretive use of such symptomatic acts. He describes a man who:

(while) “visiting close friends ..... developed anxiety and palpitations ..... (when) ..... invited into the nursery ..... the mother had diapered the infant ..... “

He (Dr. Jacobs) says of himself:

“I became conscious ..... I had grasped my own belt”

After recalling some of the patient’s genetic material, he used the experience To make an interpretation:

“only (then) ..... did the interpretation occur to me as a thought. Once it did, and I communicated my understanding to the patient, there followed a flood of associations related to the original (genetic) experiences.”

While Dr. Jacobs refers to his input as the “correct interpretation”, he does not proceed through the scientific steps that would be necessary in order to draw that conclusion. He does not demonstrate the nature of the formal relationship that exists between the analysand’s material and the phenomenon that occurs in the listening analyst. **To do so he would first have to employ the technique of free association to his own symptomatic act, until the specific contents of its various predictable structure-process components had been released to consciousness. He would then have to compare the results with the analysand’s material to demonstrate the nature of the formal relationship that existed between them. And following that, he would need to show how that formal connection was of a significance that suggested a formulation derived from the analyst’s symptom could be used to understand and address a resistance in the analysand. He would then need to test the hypothesis by examining the latter’s response to his input.**

If, along with the above considerations, one makes, as well, a metapsychological dissection of the analysand’s material as provided, one finds further evidence to question the interpretation’s correctness. From the material provided, one can conclude that a current conflict in the analysand, involving current objects, is present at an unconscious level and that ego-ideal

or super-ego censure, and ego defense (repression) against impulse directed at a current object, must be in operation. Without illustration from the analysand's material, of evidence to the contrary, it cannot be disproved that the analyst's genetic interpretation produced a flood of associations from an ego defending against a present-day impulse [drive] wish, with the motive for defense being a transference fantasy of the analyst - that, in turn, being the result of a projection from an internal object in the analysand's ego-ideal or super-ego.

In each of these examples, then, the application of a metapsychological investigation of the phenomena under scrutiny provides reasoned and reasonable hypotheses of an order different from the theoretical conclusions drawn by Jacobs, and it thereby calls his conclusions into question. This application also hints at a methodology that would permit reliable scientific investigation of the multitude of phenomena comprising a total description of the analyst's working mind, the sound understanding of which would greatly assist the development of theory of technique.

Three examples selected retrospectively and at random **from an index the author has compiled on clinical phenomena**, will serve to illustrate the potential research and technical-theory value of this approach. Each example illustrates a different facet of the analyst's response to the analysand with a parapraxis or a symptomatic act, and together they suggest the riches to be mined in this single area of investigation of instrument-function.

The **FIRST EXAMPLE** is that of a near slip of the tongue by the analyst before an analytic session. As he was about to call in, one "Miss Tait", he noted a slight hesitancy of speech, following which the words "Miss hate" formed in his mind. As the session got underway, self-analysis on the spot revealed the following (recorded in his notes - with subsequent comments in parentheses):

"Miss Tait, full of hate."

*Why would I want to call her so?*

"Nyah, nyah,

Miss Tait full of hate.

Miss Tait, always late."

*She isn't. It is some kind of children's rhyme.*

The analyst recalled that in childhood:

*"S.J." never showed realistic praise."*

He then recalled that:

*"Two weeks ago this issue was aroused when that prodigious piece of work, (taking several weeks), that went into the brief for the yacht club, went unrecognized."*

That in turn reminded him of:

*"The unrequited anger I felt at those unexpected hurtful remarks that woman made at the end of my talk last night."*

[It was a talk to a literary group. The analyst had spoken by invitation. The talk was well received and the evening was enjoyable. The remarks came at the end of the meeting, and because he was taken by surprise and time had run out, he did not have an opportunity to reply. He was rankled about this afterwards.]

The analyst was then reminded of a dream that followed:

*"I am with my wife about to go to bed. I am lying down. A young woman with a knife suddenly opens the door and rushes in. I take her on. I kick at her."*

Associating to each of the parts led to the following:

*"In bed" – ideals met, work done, relationship between self and ego-ideal one of mutual pleasure. Temporary merger is anticipated in the forthcoming sleep.*

*"with my wife" - someone loves me and whose loyalty is certain - most of the members of the literary group are known and respected by the analyst.*

*"lying down" - 'off guard', anticipating pleasant merger with the loved and loving ego-ideal (group) - unprepared for attack (the surprise of the night before).*

*“young woman bursts in with a knife” - the young woman “attacker” of the night before who “cuts me up” - (in this case of the dream she has not yet, done so). As I think of the incident the night before, I liken it to “feeling the blade’s thrust and twist”*

*“I kick at her” - a kick coming. (In the dream he kicks before being struck. In reality he did not, but still has “a kick [i.e. ‘complaint’] coming”*

As he was reminded of the incident, the analyst was again rankled, and he returned to wondering how he could manage to obtain satisfaction and shut the obnoxious woman up at the next meeting, without embarrassing himself or others in the process. He then hit upon the answer and realized that he felt relieved from a vague dis-ease that had been present that morning,

He then treated this work as the first phase of an investigation into the functioning of the “instrument” in the interest of furthering his understanding of theory of technique. In this phase, he had satisfied himself that the formal relationship that linked the symptomatic phenomenon in himself with the analysand, was the availability that the sound of her name provided for the expression of the analyst’s conflict. He then naturally deemed that such a formal connection contained no suggestion of a potential use that the parapraxis might have had in a formulation of the analysand’s material.

In the **second part** of his investigation he reviewed his notes which provided' a reasonably verbatim record, of the analysand’s material and his interventions. The material was readily understandable metapsychologically. The significant (interpretable) resistance had been subjected to intervention of an appropriate degree. This was a negative maternal transference acted out with a denial of reality in the service of attainment of wished-for, (genetically secretly gratified) oedipal [**See following note**] impulse aims deriving from the co-existing covert paternal transference.

Interestingly, within this situation, there had been mention made the day before this reported session, of the affect “hate”, in a description of displaced negative maternal transference that had been acted, out in an extra-clinical relationship. This matter had come into the material on the day of the slip, at a later time in the session. After an initial period of silence followed by reported tension, it was mentioned directly, against resistance. In the subsequent two days, as the affect was found to be accepted without criticism by the analyst, there was emergence of depression, guilt, ideas of objects

withdrawing due to the analysand's badness, and intense crying in relation to feelings of loneliness. This had occurred in response to testing and movement within the above-mentioned transference configuration. The significant (i.e. technically important) operative transference to the analyst was shifting from negative maternal oedipal to negative maternal pregenital involving defects in the early development of the ego-ideal.

**[Note, 2013:** Every part of the formulation proved out except the "Oedipus" idea of its genesis. There never was truly concrete Oedipal material, but there certainly was *early* conflict, and it was not so-called "Pregenital".

The year was 1977, months before the end of the author's training analysis, and Freud's assertion that one could not call himself an analyst if he did not believe in the Oedipus conflict still rang in the ears. Later, as research applications of the Scientific method grew, and all hypotheses were tested for predictive capability, there was no need for uncertainty. The best of Freud's theories were proven (there were many), and the rest were discarded. The Oedipus Complex became one of the latter kind when no sign of it was *ever* encountered in clinical material.]

As the analysand put it:

In the first remarks after the analyst's near parapraxis:

"I feel terribly tense ..... what do you care!

And in the middle of tears, two sessions later:

"No one knows how defective I am inside. Something is missing. I doubt if it can be replaced."

The analyst was interested in this parallel between important material in the session and the idea expressed in his slip. He wondered if a relationship existed, one that the analysis of his parapraxis had not revealed. He thought to consider Dr. Jacobs' empathy idea as a hypothesis, rather than as a theoretical conclusion, and test it out. At the same time he was satisfied, that any formulation- interpretation of "hate" based on his slip would have sprung from an unconscious situation that used the analysand for expression of the analyst's wish for retaliation against a detested third object. Hence, it could not have been well-founded.

He knew as well, that if he were to be formulating hate **[i.e. (2013) a Cat. III aggressive-drive, impulse-related affect]** in his analysand, he would be grossly and incorrectly responding to material three layers down (i.e. *impulse* lies under *defense*, which lies under *motive for defense*), and sudden panic would be the result. (The analysand would have instantly incorporated the surface transferences as "real analyst", and he would have become the

equivalent of a heartless detective who had penetrated her defenses and found the “evil” - really healthy aggressive drive - she had been “hiding”.)

In the **third part** of his investigation, the analyst broke down his analysis of the slip metapsychologically, and compared this with a meta-psychological breakdown of the analysand’s psyche at that point. He particularly wished to compare the respective places of the affect, “hate” in the two psyches. In the analyst’s material, that affect was located in the object of the woman he labelled with the word “hate”. This referred to the self-hate that he endowed her with, as a consequence of identifying her with the genetically important figure, “S.J”.

S.J.’s own lack of a loved and loving ego-ideal made her “late with praise” for the analyst. That in turn threatened to evoke in the analyst a response from a primitive ego segment closely in association with primitive id, and involving primitive aggressive revenge (*the “Nyah Nyah tease that would have exposed S.J.’s defended hate and frightened her*) that then threatened to offend the realistic, higher-level, analytically-acquired segments of his ego-ideal. This led to control of the inclination towards immediate impulse expression, and its replacement by long-range planning for gratification and solution

**[NOTE, 2013: In what follows, the analysand’s concrete material (“hard data”) allowed a viable formulation without the Oedipus idea. The latter was not supported by any material at all, so it has been crossed out to avoid confusion. The “Pregenital concept derived from it has also been eliminated.]**

In the analysand’s material, the hatred was a displaced hatred for the oed~~X~~ipal mother in the transference, a hatred acceptable to the ego by way of the defense “denial of reality”, observable in the denial of the analyst’s evident signs of caring. As this defense became less tenable in the face of reality, hatred of the analyst at an oed~~X~~ipal level shifted to the need for love from a prege~~X~~nitally-determined hating mother in the transference. Guilt and depression now appeared, as a result of conflict between the aggressive oed~~X~~ipal aims and the increasingly introjected real and caring object of the analyst into the ego-ideal.

The analyst’s ego, then, in his slip, by the reference to the analysand as “full of hate”, was seeking an outlet by displacement, of aggressive drives not sanctioned by his ego ideal, and that a “protagonist” rather than an “empathic” hypothesis was suggested. Self analysis of this process, and removal of its influence permitted empathic potential to emerge. And indeed the nucleus of

an empathy of analyst for analysand could be seen in the similarity of pregenital conflict in each. This, however, was not present in the slip material where the converse situation existed.

In the **fourth phase** of his investigation, the analyst examined the influence of the extra-analytical reality conflict in the analyst upon the analytic situation being examined. It was apparent to him that continued integrations by self-analysis, of his analytically-formed ego ideal, with both his reality ego and the remnants of his primitive-aggressive ego, were important to his increasing development at a technical level. Self-analysis leading to a genetic breakdown of the current-day conflict at the literary group, was regarded as insufficient by itself in removing the intruding interference of such experiences. To achieve an ultimate goal of smooth reflex-functioning of the ego in instant, socially-suitable response to the hurtful woman, would serve to move the conflict back to its point of origin internally and deal with it at once. In connection with this phase of his investigation, the analyst considered that an exploration of the interference in analyses of unresolved current extra-analytic conflict in analysts, would be a worthwhile piece of research.

**[NOTE, 2013: As the analyst discovered gradually, during an intense, systematic, ten-year self analysis ('79-'89) after a training analysis, his solution to "the woman-at-the-meeting situation" was still considerably hampered by unsolved conflict forcing suppression and repression of his healthy aggressive drive. That problem eventually gave way without his knowing it until one day, faced with a discharge of inappropriate unrealistic aggression from a colleague, he spontaneously formulated and aggressively addressed the behaviour in a split second. And the other person stopped at once.]**

In the **SECOND EXAMPLE** as obtained by self-analysis, a libidinal impulse in the analyst, (as contrasted with the aggressive impulse of the first example) was displaced onto the analysand, as a consequence of a situation involving a highly significant current female object in the analyst's life the evening before. The situation involved an unusual irritability on the part of that object, with an unexplained abruptness of attitude to the analyst. This resulted in the experience of loss (presumed to be temporary) of a central external source of self esteem. A regression of structures occurred within a segment of the analyst's mind and stopped at the most significant early trauma of his infant life. And the first conscious manifestation of the process was a symptomatic act involving his first analysand of the day;

(On the first occasion of being inclined, to look at the analysand's breast),

*“Why am I looking at the breast?”*

(Upon being drawn to look again, twice over the span of ten minutes),

*“There is something unusual here.”*

(The analyst then gave himself to the impulse, in fantasy, and the following came into his mind)

*“I am sucking furiously. It seems in the manner of an infant about to lose the breast, the mother, or something.”*

(Further associations then led to the frustrating object of the night before, then a dream was recalled. Analysis of the parts revealed, the various components of the regressive reaction to the object, as well as the infant source of the reaction,)

A review of the verbatim account of the session (i.e. material and interventions) revealed, to the analyst’s great interest, the importance of the removal from unconscious operation, of this libidinal drive displaced onto the analysand. As the session progressed, unconscious material emerged in which the analyst was seen to be in desperate need - as the analysand “discovered” (not actually), to her own pleasant surprise:

**"You need me to produce new associations <sup>2</sup>**, to have each ‘section’ (a slip for ‘session’) (brings to her mind ‘Caesarean’) why isn’t he pushing me to get on? I am holding back. When will he start yelling? Why do I make him wait? It pleases me in some way. I could want to do something that pleases me without wanting to be a monster (a current image of self – a ‘monster baby’ from which parents withdraw). I seem to remember sitting on the toilet. Mother is begging, pleading, praying that I will shit.”

The analyst was readily able to surmise how **his displaced libidinal drive, had it operated out of awareness, might have found expression in a misdirected interpretation of resistance in the analysand. This, in turn, might have provided the fulcrum upon which the unconscious fantasy in**

---

<sup>2</sup> [Comment, July, 2013: This is a reference to a key finding that was to jell and be defined later in my career in connection with my studies of transferences in the first moments of initial consultation sessions.]

**the analysand would have been brought into different and unproductive expression (i.e. acting out in the transference).<sup>3</sup>**

Once again, in this example, the analyst was interested in the role of current events in his extraclinical life as influences upon his working mind.

In the **THIRD EXAMPLE**, a symptomatic act of a different order is illustrated. Here there is a narcissistic **[See following note]** expression of conflict within the analyst, and it is not an extraneous development from current events in his life outside the analytic situation. It is the effect of an at-first unknown resistance in the analysand on the analyst's sublimated drives to analyse, and it involves a regression of such drives that was initially unconscious.

**[NOTE 2013: The term does not really apply here, but it was the language of the day. Researches over the years and studies of its applications in the profession found it worse than of no use. They did not neutrally describe anything, and criticism came with the attribution.]**

In the early part of the session, the analyst noted clear signs of a resistance that was familiar to both analyst and analysand – one that was not being moved by the analysand. He (the analyst) began to make small rocking movements back and forth in his chair. From prior observation of this symptomatic act and its analysis on several occasions, he had determined that its origin was to be found in a frustration of his sublimated drive to analyse, and in a regression of structures in a segment of his mind that was activated when that situation prevailed.

The frustration of the drive appears to revive regressive id, ego and ego-ideal structures in a part of the analyst's mind. They involve a need to gain the favour of an archaic internal ego-ideal object by an archaically-determined display of skill. Under the dominant influence of a higher-level, analytically-acquired component of the structure, the frustrations of sublimated drive are accepted, as the necessary conditions of the particular analytic situations in which they occur. Impulses, demanding as they are, however, are not initially stilled by this process, and that leads to their regressive expression within the analyst's own ego. That is, there was a narcissistic expression. In the example cited, the analyst rocks himself as a mother does a child.

---

<sup>3</sup> **[Comment, 2013:** And this (bolded section) is the seed of another key concept to be discovered in a later research, the **“Glover Effect”]**

In a latter part of the session being described, and after several instances of rocking, the analyst bit his lip. Analysis revealed the impulse to say:

“Get the f--- on with it.”

Containment of the drive to analyze, and the prevention of its expression in a rationalized intervention, eventually bore fruit in this session, as an underlying acted-out transference in the analysand began to emerge

“I heard a tapping noise. (*not in reality*) I imagine you holding a cigarette (*I never smoke cigarettes and never smoke anything in sessions*) and tapping hard with ashes on the floor ..... I imagine you saying: ‘If you can’t do better than this, I’m getting absolutely fed up.’ ”

And later:

“I imagine telling ‘Y’ (a maternal surrogate): ‘I’ve been dismissed. Dr. Anderson says there’s not much sense going on. That would please Y, and it would give me release. I could go on and on, forever throwing at her, i.e. ‘See what you’ve done!’ ”

The analysand’s behaviour in the resistance was thus observed by both parties as one manifestation of a symptomatic expression of important conflict.

## **SUMMARY**

The view is put forth that Theory of Technique can be advanced by first having a clear understanding of the scientific elements of the analytic situation, and they have been described. One of them, the "instrument", in its "smooth-functioning" and "malfunctioning" dimensions, has been made a primary focus. An example of the investigation of "instrument function" from the literature has been used to illustrate the scientific pitfalls that stand in the way of discovery in this realm.

By contrast, a logical, conceptually-sound approach to this research task using a metapsychological breakdown of the phenomena that comprise the analyst’s working mind, has been described and recommended as a means whereby researchers can avoid such problems and the consequent “scientific oblivion” to which they lead.

It is hoped that this paper will serve to stimulate other workers to investigate many of the unexplained phenomena of the analyst’s working mind, and that a gradual compilation of findings will lead to a thorough, integrated

understanding of the mind as “instrument” in both its constructive and disruptive aspects during analyses. It is further hoped that this compilation will help to increasingly elucidate the enigmatic area of “Theory of Technique”.

## REFERENCES

**Anderson, H.** (1978)

Formal discussion of the paper, “The Dimensions of a Single-Word Association in the Analyst’s Reverie”, by Dr. John Flannery, presented to the Canadian Psychoanalytic Society, Toronto, October 1978

**Breuer, J.** (1880)

Fraulein Anna O. (Breuer). Studies in hysteria, Breuer and Freud, S.E. 2, Hogarth press

**Ferenczi, S.** (1931)

Notes and Fragments, (subheading: On the Patient’s Initiative) The Selected Papers of S. Ferenczi, Problems and Methods of Psychoanalysis. Basic Books Inc., First Edition, 1955

**Fliess, R.** (1942)

The Metapsychology of the Analyst. Psychoanalytic Quarterly Vol. II, 1942

**Freud, S.** (1893-1895)

Case 2: Frau Emmy von N. S.E. 2, Hogarth Press

Freud, S. (1912)

Recommendations on Analytic technique. S.E. 12

Freud, S. (1915)

Repression. S.E. 14

Freud, S. (1937)

Analysis Terminable and Interminable. S.E. 23

**Jacobs, T.** (1973)

Posture, Gesture, and Movement in the Analyst: Cues to Interpretation and Countertransference. American Journal of Psychoanalysis, Vol. 21, 1973, #1

**Ramzy, I.** (1974)

The Mind of the Psychoanalyst. International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 1974, Vol. 55, Part 4

**Rappaport, D.** (1944)

The Scientific Methodology of Psychoanalysis. The Collected Papers of David Rapport. Ed. By Merton Gill. Basic Books, 1967