

2023年9月2日 (土)・3日 (日) 9:50~18:50 早稲田大学戸山キャンパス33号館第一会議室(予約不要、オンライン配信あり)

9月2日 (土)

ワークショップ「精神分析における制度と政治」

10:00~10:50 氏原賢人「精神分析の超越論的技法論」 11:00~11:50 工藤顕太「精神分析の症状」 12:40~13:40 討議、質疑応答(司会、特定質問者:鹿野祐嗣)

研究発表「フロイトとフェレンツィの歩み」

13:50~15:00 細澤仁「フェレンツィの技法改革をめぐって」 15:10~16:20 比嘉徹徳「プロセスとしてのテクスト

――新・批判版『快原理の彼岸』について」

16:30~17:40 森茂起「確信・想起・同一化

――フェレンツィによる精神分析の再概念化」

17:50~18:50 全体討議

9月3日(日)

ワークショップ「最初期の精神分析運動をめぐって」

10:00~10:50 井上卓也「実践のひそかな変遷

――欲動理論の第二段階とその余波 (1909-1921)」

11:00~11:50 佐藤朋子「憎しみの回帰はなぜに

――フロイトとフェレンツィ、二人のユダヤ人の対話」 12:40~13:40 討議、質疑応答(司会、特定質問者:上尾真道)

研究発表「フロイトの遺産とその未来」

13:50~15:00 奥寺崇「言葉の混乱——私たちがたどった道のり」 15:10~16:20 飛谷渉「フロイトのレオナルド論と未完の

ヒステリー理論の行方」

16:30~17:40 立木康介「〈委員会〉/カマリラ

――フロイト的「対話」の夜から」

17:50~18:50 全体討議

主催:日本ラカン協会 共催:早稲田大学文化構想学部表象・メディア論系

協力:東京大学 共生のための国際哲学研究センター

Sándor Ferenczi 150th Anniversary Symposium Endless Dialogues with Freud

Introduction

This symposium aimed to reframe the theory and practice of psychoanalysis as endless dialogues with Freud. We began by addressing two key issues: "Institutions and Politics in Psychoanalysis" and "The Early Period of the Psychoanalytic Movement". If psychoanalysis consists of private dialogues with Freud, how do its institutions function? How can they publicly determine the practice of psychoanalysis and establish psychoanalyst as a profession? Our understanding implies that psychoanalysis is inherently difficult to institutionalize and psychoanalyst is an "impossible profession". Therefore, our theme not only required to examine precisely the history of psychoanalytic movement but also prompted us to address the problem of institutions and politics.

A significant aspect of our symposium was to commemorate the 150th anniversary of Sándor Ferenczi, whose remarkable contributions were brought to light by Gilles Deleuze. Often referred to as the "enfant terrible" of psychoanalysis, Ferenczi played a pivotal role in the history of the psychoanalytic movement, serving as a living witness to the endless dialogues with Freud, his "father". Consequently, we extensively explored Ferenczi's life and works, including his trauma theory, technical innovations, and his separation from Freud. Rather than simply contemplating the works of Ferenczi and Freud, we sought to engage in their dialogues, thereby reigniting the "endless dialogues" concerning the essence of psychoanalysis.

Date

September 2 & 3, 2023

Location

1st Conference Room, 33rd Bldg., Toyama Campus, Waseda University

Host

Lacanian Society of Japan

Co-Host

The University of Tokyo Center for Philosophy (UTCP)

Studies of Body, Media and Image, School of Culture, Media and Society, Waseda University

1st Workshop Institutions and Politics in Psychoanalysis

Kento Ujihara, Kenta Kudo Discussant: Yuji Shikano

Let us consider the profession of psychoanalyst—what does it entail to pursue psychoanalysis as a career? When pondering this question, the writings of Judith Dupont on the "enfant terrible" come to mind: "in the course of his quest, Ferenczi ends by undermining all the defenses whose protection had enabled Freud to construct the theoretical framework of psychoanalysis and had provided sufficient personal safeguards to allow him to continue. Hasn't it been said that the first task of the guerilla fighter is to stay alive? Freud could not renounce defending himself, and Ferenczi probably paid with his life for having wanted to relinquish his own defenses to such an extent". According to Dupont, the techniques and theories of psychoanalysis form a lifeline of those involved in it. If so, these elements are essential for psychoanalysis, whose aim is to heal the sick and enable them to survive.

However, why did new ideas and techniques often emerge in defiance of conventional theories and the institutions that authorize them? In his life-threatening experiment, Ferenczi ended up breaking away from Freud, his beloved "father", and vanished from official history for a considerable period. Approximately 30 years later, Jacques Lacan lost his position as a training analyst because his "active" technique called "variable-length session" was deemed problematic. He ultimately accepted the fate of leading the struggle against the institutions after his "excommunication" from the IPA.

In this workshop, Ujihara and Kudo attempted to delve into the birth and rebirth of analysts, starting from the issues of institutions and politics.

Transcendental technique of psychoanalysis

Kento Ujihara (University of Tokyo)

In 1947, Donald Woods Winnicott published a groundbreaking work that highlighted the crucial role of counter-transference and its interpretation. The problem addressed in this article not only was later taken over by Paula Heimann and Margaret Little, but also led to controversies between them and Melanie Klein, resulting in Heimann's separation from her. Consequently, we can observe that the issue of counter-transference has been nurtured both in clinical practice and in the personal dialogues among analysts that have shaped the history of psychoanalysis. From the perspective of analysts, as Winnicott himself asserted, the interpretation of counter-transference led them to become "different from what they were before"; it compelled them to "examine their own techniques" and "test" the psychoanalysis itself. This process involved questioning the authenticity of qualifications bestowed by the IPA and challenging institutional definitions of psychoanalysis, thereby leading analysts to rediscover the essence of the practice against the trend of institutionalization. From the perspective of analysands, however, when provided with the interpretation of counter-transference, they are empowered to depart from "the position of infant," thereby facing the challenge of "being alone" and encountering the external world.

As a pioneer of those who underwent this ordeal, we must mention Sándor Ferenczi. Fighting against the Freud's resistance to his self-analysis, Ferenczi persisted in addressing his own problem until his final years, undertaking significant innovations in analytic techniques. This way, psychoanalysis as a "theater of cruelty" confronts the problems of life and death or encounter and farewell, and engages both analysts and analysands in a journey of emotions. This indeed embodies the potential of psychoanalysis as "véritable théâtre" that Gilles Deleuze suggested in "Difference and Repetition".

Interpreting desire of Freud

Kenta Kudo (Waseda University)

In 1953, when the first organizational split in the history of French psychoanalysis occurred, Jacques Lacan wrote a letter to Michael Balint, stating "I have always attached great importance to the spiritual lineage of Ferenczi in my teaching." Lacan and Ferenczi share an interest in training analysis, more precisely, in the termination of psychoanalysis, after which an analyst is produced. For Ferenczi, this subject is indissolubly entangled in his conflicting relationship with his master and analyst Freud. In order to elucidate this relationship, Ferenczi pursued a self-analysis of his own transference to Freud on the one hand, and attempted to "interpret" desire of the father of psychoanalysis on the other hand (Freud, as is well known, never accepted to be analyzed by others in order to maintain his own authority). Thus, Ferenczi's original work was prevented from being adopted by the establishment of psychoanalysis, represented by IPA. However, this proves that Ferenczi's questions challenge the fundamental assumptions on which Freud's practice was based. This can be better understood when one recalls "the spiritual lineage of Ferenczi" as stated by Lacan. It was no coincidence that Lacan, when he was "excommunicated" from the IPA and lost his institutional guarantee as a training analyst, called for the need to question "never-beforeanalyzed" desire of Freud, that is, the historical foundation of the practice of psychoanalysis itself. In this contribution, we aim to show that interpreting Freud's desire is an attempt to reinvent the practice and doctrine of psychoanalysis and to breathe new life into it.

On Ferenczi's technical innovations

Jin Hosozawa (Fermata mental clinic)

Ferenczi was the most beloved disciple of Freud, the founder of psychoanalysis, and has been regarded as his legitimate successor. However, he was the "enfant terrible of psychoanalysis". Through his daily practice of psychoanalysis, he has stirred up the issues, "What is psychoanalysis?" and "Who is a psychoanalyst?". Ferenczi, who had been reproached by Freud as a "furor sanandi," pushed on technical innovations in the course of psychoanalysis with difficult patients.

Ferenczi's technical innovations first developed into the "active technique" and then the "relaxation therapy". However, as Ferenczi himself admitted, each technique had its own clinical significance, but it became clear that each had its own problems. Ferenczi's technical innovations then took the form of "mutual analysis" and "grand experiment". However, these techniques are difficult (one might even say impossible) to implement, and their clinical significance has not yet been fully explored.

In this presentation, I will review the history of Ferenczi's technical innovations and discuss the clinical significance of "mutual analysis" and "grand experiment" in particular.

Text as Process: on the new critical edition of Beyond the Pleasure Principle

Tetsunori Higa (Lecturer at Senshu University)

Ulrike May and Michael Schröter published a New Edition of Freud's Beyond the Pleasure Principle (Jenseits des Lustprinzips, hereafter PP) in LUZIFER-AMOR, a journal of history of psychoanalysis, which meets the contemporary criteria of the critical edition (kritische Ausgabe). Based on a careful and painstaking editorial elaboration, they built a visually comprehensive text which represents not only additions but also corrections made directly at Freud's hands from the first manuscript to the last revision of 1923.

Making a thorough comparison between the first manuscript and the second typewritten version which contains the present Chapter VI introducing "death drive," May follows the process of the text-genesis of PP and argues that Freud de-radicalized his idea in "the third step" of his drive theory.

My presentation gives a brief introduction of this new critical edition of PP and examines May's thesis, as briefly mentioned above, and takes up the topic which has been drawing a lot of attention in the history of psychoanalysis, that is, the introduction of the death drive was triggered by the death of Freud's daughter. However, May denies the connection between the death drive and the incident in a persuasive manner.

I also provide an overview of the publication of Freud's oeuvre from Gesammelte Schriften that appeared while alive to the recent Sigmund-Freud-Gesamtausgabe from the viewpoint of the present textual scholarship. In order to review several editions of Freud's work, I refer to the writings of Ilse Grubrich-Simitis who is the editor of several of Freud's oeuvre and, more noticeably, was no one but the first discoverer of the PP manuscript at the Library of Congress. She is also skeptical about the newness of May/ Schröter's edition of PP. I conclude that the history of publication of Freud's works is in transition from the "true" texts endowed with Freud's authorization to the documentation of the texts by means of a close examination of manuscripts by the editors.

Conviction, Remembering, and Identification: Ferenczi's reconceptualization of psychoanalysis.

Shigeyuki Mori (Konan University)

For Ferenczi, "conviction (Überzeugung)", "remembering (Erinnerung)", and "identification (Identifizierung)" were concepts that had long guided his clinical practice. They were reconceptualized and integrated in the understanding of trauma he reached in his later years, including the statement that the termination of analysis necessarily requires the treatment of recalled traumatic subjects. Identification originated in the understanding of the process of adaptation to the outside world and to the other, which has continued since presenting the concept of "introjection" in his first psychoanalytic paper, and culminated in the concept of identification (Identifizierung) with the aggressor". It is the ultimate procedure of preserving a relationship based on "tenderness". The process, however, involves a regression to the primal stage of the self, Identifikation, and sacrifices the unity of the self. Ferenczi sees the origin of the trauma reaction in a stage prior to the emergence of the self as an individual. "Conviction" was first used to refer to the patient's voluntary cognition of the correctness of the analyst's interpretation by being independent from the analyst. But, in his late trauma theory, it is used to refer to a belief in the existence of a traumatic event, which is a prerequisite for remembering the whole scene of the event. For him, analyst's presence as a sympathetic person at the remembering plays a key role to resolve the splitting of patient's personality. The process to the theoretical and technical development coincided his remembering own traumatic experience in his mutual analysis with Severn and the understanding on his relationship with Freud, both contributed the concept of "identification with the aggressor".

2nd Workshop

The Early Period of Psychoanalytic Movement

Takuya Inoue, Tomoko Sato Discussant: Masamichi Ueo

The knowledge that characterizes the various fields of psychoanalysis is accessible and communicable only through "lived" experiences in relation to others, involving transference and resistance. No one but Ferenczi would have gained such an insight into this characteristic of knowledge so early on, and "lived it out" (ausleben). Consequently, in order to reassess Ferenczi's legacies, it would be necessary to reconstruct the network of analysts and analysands who have contributed to the development of psychoanalysis and place him within it. In this workshop, Inoue and Sato endeavored to capture the respective aspects of the psychoanalytic movement and shed light on Ferenczi's achievements.

A clandestine shift in psychoanalytic practice: The second phase of the drive theory and its consequences (1909-1921)

Takuya Inoue (University of Tokyo)

Although Freud's technical papers written in the early 1910s are commonly considered a classical canon in psychoanalysis, it is now well-known that Freud himself did not always adhere to the prescriptions within them. In fact, a thorough reading of his texts and various other sources reveals Freud's continuous efforts to improve therapeutic techniques, especially in his analysis of obsessional neurosis and anxiety hysteria.

This study aims to offer an overview of the transformation of psychoanalytic practice from Freud's analysis in the late 1900s to Ferenczi's "active technique," while also considering its relation to theoretical advances during this period, particularly the development of the theory of narcissism and ego development. Our examination demonstrates that although Freud and Ferenczi shared some technical concerns, they differed, even at this time, in their attitudes toward what would later be called ego analysis, probably because of their varying views on the analyst's authority.

Why the Return of Hate? The Freud-Ferenczi Dialogue Sato Tomoko (Institute of Liberal Arts and Science, Kanazawa University)

This presentation investigates the density and continuity of the dialogue between Freud and Ferenczi on the phylogenesis of the types of neurosis and psychosis. It aims to demonstrate that their dialogue sustained beyond the commonly acknowledged timeframe of the 1910s to the mid-1920s (during which their correspondence evidences a keen shared interest in the subject) into the 1930s, and even after Ferenczi passed away in 1933.

Initially, in 1911, Freud's analysis of the Schreber case echoed Carl Gustav Jung's idea on the archaic traits commonly found in dreams and neuroses. However, Ferenczi's 1913 critique of Jung's redefinition of the libido aided Freud in his 1914 study of the Wolf Man's case in properly contextualizing the difference between the two conceptions with respect to the resurrection of traces, which could occur organically according to his hypothesis.

Two perspectives on the prehistoric experiences of mankind were drawn from that time by Ferenczi and Freud; the former's article on the "Stages in the Development of the Sense of Reality" (1913) centered on ego drives, while the latter's essay presenting the "Overview of the Transference Neuroses" (1915) focused on sexual drives. Narcissism as the investment of libido in the ego, which was introduced into psychoanalytic theory in 1914, could imply their possible synthesis. Around 1920, the dualism of drives was redefined to address the issue of trauma. Thus, Ferenczi, in his work Thalassa (1924), described the origins and evolutions of living beings as they underwent catastrophic events and trauma. On the basis of his analysis, which he named "bioanalysis," he presented a description that was similar to the theories of biologists E. Haeckel and J.-B. de Lamarck. Interestingly, it also differed from the biologists' theories as it raised the question of "Coenogenese," usually rendered in English by the word "perigenesis," alongside Haeckelian "ontogenesis" and "phylogenesis." Additionally, it developed the ideas of adaptations and the transmission of acquired characters, taking up Lamarckism but in opposition to its finalism. Further, it went beyond Freud's thought framework in Beyond the Pleasure Principle (1920) regarding original catastrophes.

Although implicit, the dialogue between the two psychoanalysts continued even in the midst of their growing differences after 1924, especially regarding technical and practical innovations. During this period, Freud gradually renewed the question of repetition. Under the domain of individual psychology, articulating the specific force of the repressed, called "Auftrieb" (upward drive), rendered possible a new approach to the return of the repressed, and the question of the negative transference dynamics was redefined and restated. Freud's essays on Moses Man and the Monotheistic Religion, written between 1934 and 1938, attempt to make a breakthrough into collective psychology. It is in his questioning of the monotheistic

tradition and the deep-rooted motives for hatred of the Jews that we find Freud's response to Ferenczi, reflected in the following three moments: a possible reference to Ferenczi's Coenogenese, a reservation about it on account of the Auftrieb, and the resumption and reformulation of the idea of transmission of acquired characters.

The Confusion of tongue -Where we came from-Takashi Okudera, M. D. (Private Practice, Japan Psychoanalytic Society)

In this paper, the author began with taking up his experience on presenting a paper about psychoanalytic reflection on WW2 at the international conference. The author mentioned Japanese invasion to Asia Pacific nations since 19th century and discuss as following,

This paper's point is, in what way the concept of self-sacrifice, whose extreme figure is symbolized as Kamikaze (equalized to self-bombing attack, now we hear this term in world news every day, everywhere) was idealized and incorporated in Japanese culture, politically, religiously and academically by intention which was far from original usage. I think that the driving force of self-sacrifice was just to stick to their omnipotence, combined with fear and disdain. From psychoanalytical point of view, it could be understood as primitive defensive organization. I'm wondering if it could be overcome, worked through. Sadly, not yet.

"From the mythology, the fate to the destiny" Okudera (2023)

As a kind of après-coup, differed action after its presentation and discussion, one proposition came to the author's mind which is, if the perpetrator could identify its victim's state of mind. According to his experience on participating experiential group in U. S., the author deducts that if one tries to identify oneself with its victim, it might provoke a kind fury on a victim's side against its perpetrator.

Then, the author discusses that this dyad relation between a perpetrator and a victim could be applied to comprehend child-adult relationship in terms of an introduction of language. Referring to S. Ferenczi's paper 'Confusion of Tongue", where a therapist (an adult) encounters to a patient (a child), the therapists often squeeze in his view without self-cognition and see things not as a response against his squeezing action, but as a symptom of the patient, i.e., a problem on a child's side.

In a sense, a baby is destined to survive 'a kind of huge struggle', while sacrificing its emotions such as a wish to depend on the object(amae) and a kind of aggression with the outcome of having aggressive feeling onto other, a sense of guilty. Once these emotions were repressed in depth in the process of 'acquisition' of language, this phenomenon constrains one's emotional growth. Here, what should be emphasized is if this acquisition of language succeeds in elaborating 'one's own tongue' with its internal emotion in depth, or it ends up copying the tongue of the object without any creative encounter between the subject and the object. Furthermore, at the point of copying, which is not appropriate, but the invasion and forced identification with the object, the emotion of the object is also squeezed in the subject unconsciously. This episode becomes the origin of enactment

between a patient and a therapist, which was first addressed by S. Ferenczi in his paper on 'Confusion of Tongues' with S. Freud's undigested reply in 'Analysis Terminable and Interminable'.

Freud's Leonardo paper and his unfinished theorization on hysteria
Wataru Tobitani, M.D.,phD (Osaka-Kyoiku university health care centre)

Freud's Leonardo paper, published in 1910, has crucial significance for the subsequent development of his psycho-analytic concepts. One of the main values in this paper is a conceptualization of the psychic mechanism of homosexuality, in which Leonardo loved boys as he was loved by his mother. Namely, this novel idea was a concept of homosexuality in the view of unconscious identification with mother. In this paper, Freud attempted to explore Leonardo's infantile 'vulture fantasy' using his method of dream interpretation. This fantasy is the image in which vulture is putting its tail in and out to the infant's mouth, which one can easily be able to associate penis with nipple. In these imaginary links between bodily organs, that is nipple and mouth, penis and vagina, in the breast-feeding experience vis-à-vis fellatio fantasy, would naturally lead us to the hysterical fantasy in which the breast-feeding couple(baby-breast) is hijacked by the sexual couple in copulation (sexual parental couple) in the subject's unconscious fantasy. However, instead of taking that association, Freud only focuses on Leonardo's obsessive feature regarding with inhibition of emotion as if he avoids thinking of Leonardo's hysterical trend.

This evasive attitude toward recognizing any hysterical trends in Leonardo is quite puzzling. The idea of homosexuality as derived from identification with his loving mother should presuppose narcissism as dynamics in the internal object relation. This means that Freud in 1910 had already been intuitively aware of the psychic dynamics of projective identification which, 35 years later, Melanie Klein was to discover and to coin as it is. Instead of creating object relational conceptualization, Freud elaborated narcissism in the mechanical fashion through building up complicated pseudo physics, that is the libido theory, which emerged in the 1914 paper, called 'On narcissism: an introduction'. This direction of thought he followed seems to be strange again. At this point where he published the Leonardo paper, he had discovered the psychic mechanism of homosexuals in which a homosexual subject is in identification with mother and projects his self into boys. Then he was about to grasp the importance of projective identification in narcissistic individuals. It seems as if he deliberately let go of his valuable discovery of the identificatory process in structuring one's internal world. And he was kneading the complicated energy circuit of libido theory just as if he could treat human mind in a quantitative manner. Fortunately, Freud had been able to grasp object relational concept at another chance when he tackled with the problem of object-loss in 'Mourning and melancholia (1917)'. However, there remained a theory that he should have discovered. I would say it was his theory on hysteria, which he left unfinished just like Leonardo left almost all his work unfinished, including famous 'Mona Lisa'.

Committee/Camarilla: From the night of Freud's "dialogues"
Kosuke TSUIKI (Kyoto University, Institutes for Research in the Humanities)

It's not the dialogues with Freud's legacies, but some cross-sections of the dialogues that took place between Freud and his disciples during his lifetime, that we'll try to uncover here. Each of Freud's individual dialogues with Abraham, Ferenczi and others was always crossed or doubled by the shadow of the Committee, and thus ended up being broken or distorted. Freud, who didn't shy away from multiple communication circuits that were sometimes incompatible with one another, came not only to take advantage of them in a political way, but to try to maneuver some of them in a curiously clumsy way, before failing and attributing the reason to others. In his last letter to his Master, Abraham was obliged to give him an "interpretation" of his inconsistent behaviors. This leads us to wonder whether all the conflicts and fissures that arose and developed in these "dialogues" were not symptoms of the Master himself. But isn't there a camarilla structure underlying all these relational complications around Freud? It was no coincidence that later, after the famous "excommunication" he suffered in 1963 from the IPA, as an organization perfectly concentric with the Committee, Jacques Lacan envisaged building a "school" that had nothing to do with this camarilla structure.