

pation'. In tandem with this change Fernando argues that the black voluntary sector needs to be strengthened to enable innovative projects that are under the control of black and Asian groups. He cites funding as a critical issue in which many funders seek leaders in the black voluntary sector who have taken on characteristics of their white counterparts in the statutory sector. More access should be allowed (with the patients' permission) to notes, treatment plans and reasons for medicines so prescribed. This would not solve the problem of racism but it might move the struggle forward. Likewise Fernando suggests that psychotherapists and counsellors have some form of training that enables them to recognize the strategies that black and Asian clients use to cope in Western society and thus in practice to be aware of techniques for counteracting racism. Fernando goes on to describe a vision of a multicultural society that embraces a multicultural psychiatry within the mental health services. That is a psychiatry that no longer exists in a vacuum but addresses the changing nature and psychodynamics of society, cultural difference and the institutional nature of racism.

There is no doubt this is an important book and should be read by a wide audience in the caring professions. It gives a clear outline of the pervasiveness of institutional racism within the mental health sector and pinpoints some of the key areas of concern. Critically Fernando suggests ways in which racism can be combated and how the profession may move forward while recognizing that it is a pretty tall order to eradicate racism altogether. My only criticism is that in order to get his point across Fernando frequently repeats material from one part of the book in another. This can often be more confusing than helpful and makes the text quite diffi-

cult to follow. This largely stems, I feel, from a discussion of racism, notions of ethnicity and identity and culture difference in wider society that is then brought back to the specifics of mental health. As such I don't know how the author could avoid this slightly fragmented feeling one has when reading the text. In sum, then, this is an extremely important book, which all mental health practitioners should read, or at least be aware of, and it should find a wider audience among sociologists, students of social policy and those doing research into the politics of cultural difference.

Clarke S, Garner S. Psychoanalysis, identity and asylum. *Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society* 2005; 10(2): 197–206.

Fanon F. *Black Skin White Masks*. London: MacGibbon & Kee, 1968.

Foucault M. *Madness and Civilisation: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. London: Routledge, 1967.

Goffman E. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. London: Penguin, 1959.

Winch P. Understanding a primitive society. In Wilson B (ed.) *Rationality*. London: Blackwell, 1974, pp. 78–111.

Winch P. *The Idea of a Social Science and its Relation to Philosophy*. 2 edn. London: Routledge, 2000.

Dr Simon Clarke

Centre for Psycho-Social Studies  
University of the West of England

DOI: 10.1002/ppi.3

### **A VERY PRIVATE AFFAIR**

*Hate and Love in Psychoanalytical Institutions*. By Jurgen Reeder. New York: Other Press, 2004; 397 pp. £21.50.

Psychoanalysis is essentially very private. There is a mystique surrounding psychoanalysts which is maintained by themselves – the chosen – not choosing to explain to 'us'

– the potential patients – their art (or should it be science?). Destroy the mystique and what may you find? Is it like catching a butterfly and discovering that what you are examining is not the tantalizing fascinating creature that resists being grasped but something that dies if it is grasped too firmly? Jurgen Reeder has confronted the defences of the psychoanalytic institution. He writes about the practice of psychoanalysis, its training, its conflicts and disturbances. Jurgen Reeder is a training analyst member of the Swedish Psychoanalytic Association. The book is the result of research supported by the Swedish Council in the Humanities and Social Sciences, carried out under the aegis of Stockholm University.

Reeder proposes that institutes in general, and psychoanalytic institutions in particular, generate a superego that houses conflict arising out of hate. The superego complex in the psychoanalytic institution is manifest in the conflict between love and hate. Reeder cares about psychoanalysis but is not afraid to undress the mystery.

In the first chapters Reeder reveals his own thinking and practice, which set the scene for his later theories. Analysis is not, he states, a relationship between an ego (the analyst's) and an object (the analysand). Rather, it is, or should be, an experience of an intersubjective kind where the worlds of the two, analyst and analysand, mix. Interpretation is a tool to achieve this. There is a constant interpreting-in-process to which both participants should contribute. Reeder is very keen for us to get rid of the idea of an analyst 'knowing', holding the power. It is more a question of being, not of knowing. He underlines this with his introduction of *cotransference* rather than countertransference.

He supports and suggests a return to the original Freudian view that countertransfer-

ence – unanalysed disturbing aspects of the analyst's personality – interferes with the analysis. Through the concept of cotransference he is emphasizing the mutuality of the therapeutic relationship, where analysand and analyst are interacting within the matrix of communication. This becomes the matrix of transference.

The superego complex of the institution is Reeder's original idea. He follows Freud's definition and makes a convincing case for the superego being a repository of hate. He introduces his idea of the superego complex that lives and thrives in psychoanalytic institutions. Reeder defines hate as a primary psychic source of energy together with the libido. Like the libido it is a force looking for an object and crystallizes primarily as an impulse to destroy what is foreign or 'other'. Freud described love as an instinctual energy that has an adhesiveness making it reluctant to let go of an object once chosen. Reeder claims the same is true of hate. Just as the ego is the reservoir of libido, so the superego is the reservoir of hate. The superego complex is an instrument for exploring how destructive factors are transmitted within psychoanalytic organizations. The complex is, he states '... played out on the interface between the professional superego and the institutional superego system' (p. 174), each feeding the other. Thus we see more clearly his earlier explanation of cotransference being applied to the superego of the individual and the superego of the institution.

The superego, Freud discovered, originates in things heard, 'conveyed by the medium of the voice' (Reeder, p. 214). The many voices heard – parents, friends, authorities – are added to by the subjects own experiences. This creates what Reeder calls 'narrathemes': internal conversations and references that influence our internal dialogues and responses to outside experiences. It is this internal conversation that

can bring about a shift from the threat of the superego to the values of the modified ego ideal. What was once used in the service of hate enters the libidinous economy of the ego, valuing interest in the other and self-esteem. Reeder illuminates this concept by demonstrating how a super-ego message— ‘do not . . .’ – instead of bringing fear, in the tone of ‘thou shalt not’ (Bion, 1967, 260) – can be thought about by the analyst, who may say ‘what will happen if I do?’ ‘Will something different happen if I don’t?’ And so forth. Then it is possible to evaluate real and fantasized actions against the commandments of the superego. It is possible to become ‘playfully explorative’.

Reeder explains with great thoroughness and erudition how the superego complex manifests itself through the rigidity of training. Under particular scrutiny is the practice of appointing training analysts. He claims that power is maintained in the institution by selecting followers who will toe the party line. This risks losing the creative and innovative. The important thing is to choose those who fit an ideal, for by this method the survival of the whole is assumed to depend.

Reeder quotes analysts who claim that it is necessary to practise for 10 years before there is a relaxation of the dogma and tendency to work with maxims. This freeing up of thinking can also happen when an analyst is appointed as a training analyst. He points out that the graduating psychoanalyst tends to be of the older age group and so has less time for modification to take place. If it is necessary to become a training analyst *before* personal creativity can be liberated, that, he says, is a tragedy.

The psychoanalyst’s career is in contrast to most other professions. There is no public affirmation and the resultant feedback that comes from this. He inhabits a

private space ‘closed off from view’ deprived for the most part of support from an audience offering appreciation and criticism. The analyst has only himself to use, his inner reflection in a solitary state, living with the illusion of ‘always moving in a goldfish bowl, with the world always breathlessly watching to see what our (omniscient) stand will be’ (Wallerstein, 1981). There is little public exposure of this inner life, perhaps, Reeder suggests, because the psychoanalytic experience is a fragile one – not easily shared. Or perhaps the superego emerges here: ‘As psychoanalysts we have been too busy with what we thought we were supposed to be like, we have given very little thought to how we actually utilise what we are taught and how we change ourselves our minds and our ways of practising’. There is a reward in becoming a training analyst but this has its own price in separating the chosen from the rest. The psychoanalyst is particularly attached to his institution.

Economically and administratively, psychoanalytic institutions have kept apart from all public institutions. They have thus kept absolute control over training, and they do not fit in with a welfare attitude where more egalitarian notions can be introduced. It can be likened to a class system. This isolation has led to psychoanalysis fighting for survival against sometimes hostile challenge and criticism. By demanding very strict internal levels of competence and quality, the psychoanalytic institute sought to be accepted and to gain respect from the community with which it has an uneasy relationship. Strong institutions cultivate a superego that might be described as orthodox. Orgel is quoted, wondering whether lack of external recognition as a discipline has led to ‘our need for rites, for secrecy, in and out groups a secret language’ (Orgel, 1978, 513).

The analyst, then, has to withstand not just the tensions of the analysis but also the demands from outside that the practice of psychoanalysis should be more open, cheaper, quicker, more intelligible and less exclusive. In this isolation is it any wonder that the analyst is so dependent on his institution for reassurance? In this situation there will be a fear of altering existing structures, a reluctance to suggest change which may leave you more exposed and without friends.

The raw issue of personal analysis is inextricably intertwined with the training. Reeder writes about the way information is covertly gathered about candidates and about how decisions remain inscrutable. With such a closeness between trainees and trainers – all contained within the institution, it is very difficult, Reeder says, to question, let alone rebel, for fear of being found wanting, unsuitable and deviant. Kernberg (1968, 803) is quoted on ‘the paranoid atmosphere that often pervades psychoanalytic institutions and its devastating effect on the “quality of life” in psychoanalytic education.’ Reeder emphasizes this with the accusation that the institute operates in a ‘hush-hush atmosphere where there is a marked reluctance to clarify in clear and precise terms what is required of the candidate’ (p. 178). This, he states, leads to the candidate being kept in the dark about how major decisions are reached. This is mainly due to the social structure of the institution and the way information is disseminated through psychoanalysis. Senior members analyse students and are also involved in administrative decisions that are influential in the careers of the student. The business of analysis creates an underground network of information from the analyses of students and also the analyses of people who know them who are in therapy privately with a senior member.

There seems to be a fear of challenge and it is this fear that holds the institution together. This creation of an exclusive and excluding faction results in the excluded group internalizing the standards of the excluding group in a harsh way, a form of ‘identification with the aggressor’ (Anna Freud, 1966). The values of the excluded group are perceived by them to be inferior and there then arises a desire to become a part of the excluding group and adopt its values, so perpetuating the authority of the super ego of the institution. Hate is passed down from generation to generation.

That organizations develop practices for defensive purposes was explored by Menzies Lyth in her work on containing anxiety in the institution (1988). That the individual’s own psychological defence structure can be supported by the institution’s was developed by Jacques in the 1950s. He thought that individuals unconsciously used the social system to help defend against anxieties (Jacques, 1953).

Reeder is, I think, only too aware of the dangerous thoughts he is putting into words. He writes with tremendous care. The main body of the book is building up of evidence like water in a dam. He writes of the history and how different school of practice arose. He describes the history and how different schools developed with their differences and arguments resulting in competition and paranoia. Then in the last chapter – the concluding reflections – the making of the case spills over into a relieving stream of how things could be different. What is needed is ‘good enough’ analysts. The would-be psychoanalyst should perhaps have a personal analysis before embarking on a training. The training analyst should be abolished altogether. The trainee should be involved in the assessment process and generally there should be more openness about the whole matter. The

role of supervisor is crucial and again should be open to scrutiny. There is a danger that the trainee's problems may be interpreted as resistance or inadequacy rather than examining the supervisor's own internal influences. Reeder describes Kernberg's four alternative models as possible ways forward for psychoanalytic training. The art academy, the technical school, the monastery and the university college (pp. 225–6).

It is the institutional superego that keeps the situation as it is. It creates power struggles and hatred, as well as encouraging idealization of authority. Reeder pulls no punches here. Institutional problems include 'authoritarian training structures, dictatorial training analysts, a general lack of theoretical curiosity, power struggles between rival groups and exaggerated expectations of supertherapies' (p. 223). This has remained the same since 1948, when Balint (1948) was grasping the nettle. Psychoanalysis is in crisis and, he suggests, is in danger of not surviving at all.

Reeder is a reformer rather than a revolutionary; he is no 'enfant terrible' but what he is suggesting would mean a major rethink on the part of the psychoanalytic institution. I wonder if echoes of Winnicott's experience are part of his narthemes. Winnicott's reading of a paper at the New York Psychoanalytic Society in 1968 was received with a 'totally hostile attitude'. There are more examples of challenges of received wisdom, met with charges of heresy or sacrilegious outrage. Perhaps Reeder is only too aware that this could happen to him. The interesting thing

is that Freud himself sets an example of being open minded and not afraid to modify or change his ideas. Now it seems it is the institute that will not allow change, keeping ideas and the power fixed.

Reeder is, I believe, writing from a position of love of psychoanalysis. He is serious. He is bringing it to the group. The group should listen. Psychoanalysts ought at least to begin the conversation. It has to stop being a very private affair.

- Balint M. On the psycho-analytic training system. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 1948; 29: 163–73.
- Bion WR. (1967) Notes on memory and desire. In Langs R (ed) *Classics in Psychoanalytic Technique*. New York: Jason Aronson, 1981.
- Freud A. (1936) The ego and mechanisms of defence. In: *The Writing of Anna Freud*. New York: International Universities Press, 1966; 2: 117–131.
- Freud S. *The Essentials of Psychoanalysis*. London: Hogarth, 1986.
- Hinshelwood R, Skogstad W. *Observing Organisations*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Kernberg O. Institutional problems of psychoanalytic education. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 1986; 34: 799–834.
- Jaques E. Social systems as a defence against persecutory and depressive anxiety. In Klein M, Heimann P, Money-Kyrle R (eds) *New Directions in Psychoanalysis*. London: Tavistock, 1955, pp. 478–98.
- Menzies Lyth I. *Containing Anxiety in Institutions*. London: Free Association Books, 1988.
- Orgel S. Report from the Seventh Pre-Congress on Training. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 1978; 59: 511–15.
- Wallerstein RS. The psychoanalyst's life: expectations, vicissitudes, and reflections. *International Review of Psycho-Analysis* 1981; 8: 285–298.

Anne Harrow  
DOI: 10.1002/ppi.4