



HAL
open science

Psychoanalysis in Franco's Spain (1939-1975). Crónica de una "agonía" anunciada

Anne-Cécile Druet

► **To cite this version:**

Anne-Cécile Druet. Psychoanalysis in Franco's Spain (1939-1975). Crónica de una "agonía" anunciada. Joy Damousi, Mariano Ben Plotkin Psychoanalysis and Politics. Histories of Psychoanalysis under Conditions of Restricted Political Freedom, Oxford University Press, 2012, 9780199744664. hal-01573076

HAL Id: hal-01573076

<https://hal.science/hal-01573076>

Submitted on 8 Aug 2017

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Psychoanalysis in Franco's Spain (1939-1975). Crónica de una "agonía" anunciada

Anne-Cécile Druet

In 1936, Juan José López Ibor – soon to become one of the leaders in the psychiatric field in Franco's Spain – published an essay initially entitled *Lo vivo y lo muerto del psicoanálisis*, which would be reprinted without significant changes until the 1980s under the name *La agonía del psicoanálisis*¹. In this work, López Ibor announced the death of psychoanalysis – in his opinion, a system radically inadequate to comprehend humanity – and pleaded for a psychotherapy with a new anthropological basis. Due to the power of López Ibor (and a few others' who shared his views) this theoretical position regarding Freud and psychoanalysis became one of the most defining aspects of the official discourse on psychotherapy in the Spanish psychiatric domain during the dictatorship. Basically he believed that Freud should be regarded as little more than a figure of historical interest, for although his theories had initially offered promising perspectives for the understanding of the human "soul", he had eventually produced nothing but a mechanistic system that was now dying from its internal contradictions. Hence the term *agonía*, used by López Ibor in its etymological sense of *struggle*. Freudian psychoanalysis was thus in his opinion, obsolete and there was no need to re-examine or discuss theories that had proved to be a dead end. The omnipresence of these claims in any discourse on psychotherapy was such that historians have identified anti-Freudianism as one of the main ideological and theoretical characteristics of Spanish psychiatry during Franco's regime.

¹ Juan José López Ibor, *Lo vivo y lo muerto del psicoanálisis* (Barcelona: Luis Miracle, 1936), and *La agonía del psicoanálisis* (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1951).

Nonetheless, it was during the dictatorship that the first Spanish psychoanalytical society was created and officially recognized, by both the International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA) and the Spanish government. Moreover, at that time, analysts were not only able to practice, but also to participate in official meetings of the psychiatric community and, in Catalonia at least, to hold university posts. This chapter focuses on this apparent contradiction between the undeniably anti-Freudian stance of the almighty psychiatric establishment and the concomitant possibility for the diffusion of psychoanalytic discourse in Spain. What were the limits, if any, of this diffusion? Under what conditions and to what extent was this discourse tolerated by the ultra-conservative psychiatric establishment? In other words: which features of psychoanalytical discourse and/or the way it was diffused by Spanish analysts allowed it to be tolerated by psychiatry under Franco?

In order to answer these questions, I will analyze in some detail the ideological and theoretical tenets of post-war psychiatry. Next, I will examine the foundation of the Spanish IPA circle, its history, its evolution and the features of its policy and its role regarding the circulation of psychoanalysis. Finally, I will address the changes that characterized the diffusion of psychoanalysis in the last years of the regime and, most particularly, the early history of the Lacanian movement during this period.

Historiography

With the exception of a handful of brief essays published during the dictatorship, historic works on psychoanalysis under Franco's regime did not start to appear until after 1975². These works can be classified in three main groups, each one of them representing a historiographical tradition, focusing on different aspects of history and reaching different conclusions.

² For a more detailed historiographical review, see Anne-Cécile Druet, "Historiografía del psicoanálisis en España (1975-1985)", *Archivos de Psiquiatría* 69, n° 3 (2006): 197-217, and "La psychanalyse en Espagne : un bilan historiographique", *Mélanges de la Casa de Velázquez* 37, n° 2 (2007): 223-241.

Soon after Franco's death, two historic works were published by psychiatrists Carlos Castilla del Pino and Enrique González Duro, which not only engendered an interpretative tradition but remain an essential reference today³. These strongly politicized essays were published by physicians who had themselves experienced professional repression for political reasons, and sought to define and demonstrate the conceptual poverty and the ultra-conservative ideological orientation of the psychiatric establishment. Within this framework, they studied the rejection of psychoanalysis as one of the main characteristics of this ultra-conservatism, and reached the conclusion that Freudianism, because it was seen as a threat, had simply been banned from official psychiatric discourse.

These works present an indisputable analysis of the global anti-Freudian orientation of this discourse and its ideological motivations. However, the way they both express the rejection of psychoanalysis, that is, in radical terms such as banishment, prohibition or censorship, does not reflect a reality that was – as we will see – somewhat more complex than these essays would lead us to believe. The global anti-Freudian stance of the psychiatric community is certainly not to be questioned, but it does not mean that the position of this community towards Freudian theories was always as radical as these initial works claimed it to be. It is also important to underline that González Duro's and Castilla's essays – especially the latter – are the only historic works on psychiatry in Franco's Spain that are known and referred to outside the relatively small circle of specialists in this area, which explains why their theses on the situation of psychoanalysis are those most commonly known by the general public.

³ Carlos Castilla del Pino, "La psiquiatría española (1939-1975)" in Carlos Castilla del Pino et al., *La cultura bajo el franquismo* (Barcelona: Península, 1977), 79-102; Enrique González Duro, *Psiquiatría y sociedad autoritaria: España, 1939-1975* (Madrid: Akal, 1978).

Another historiographical tradition is that of the works published by the IPA circles on their own history. Even though there have been some works produced by non-members⁴, most of the institutional history studies belong directly or indirectly to the category of what we can call “official history”⁵. These works, especially when published directly by analysts, provide selected historic data and archives, as well as, obviously, an interpretation of their own history. The key word of this particular interpretation is *resistance*, that is to say that analysts try to explain the Spanish situation within the generally unfavorable global context, and with an analytical reading of the situation. The role played by IPA analysts in this context, according to this history, is clearly that of the guardians of Freudian orthodoxy. Given the relevance of this interpretation for the purposes of this chapter, we will return to it later for a more detailed analysis.

A new narration of history finally appeared in Spain when members of the Lacanian movement started to publish historical works⁶. The diffusion of Lacan’s ideas in Spain was not only a turning point in the history of psychoanalysis in itself, but it also meant the appearance of a new historiographical tradition. The members of the Lacanian movement showed, at a surprisingly early stage of its existence, a profound interest in historical issues,

⁴ The most important works on the IPA-affiliated groups written by non-members are two PhD dissertations: Vicent Bermejo Frígola, “La institucionalización del psicoanálisis en España en el marco de la API” (PhD diss., Universitat de València, 1993) and Carmen Llor, “El Psicoanálisis en España en el periodo 1936-1968” (PhD diss., Universidad de Murcia, 1998), published under the title “El movimiento psicoanalítico en España” in Francisco Carles et al., *Psicoanálisis en España (1893-1968)* (Madrid: Asociación Española de Neuropsiquiatría, 2000), 225-295. Bermejo provides extremely useful historic data and presents primary sources of great interest, but his analysis sticks to the official IPA circles’ history, while Carmen Llor addresses more directly controversial issues in a wider analysis that includes the situation of psychoanalysis in the psychiatric domain and the development of what she calls “heterodox psychoanalysis”. In that sense, Llor’s work does not belong to this “official” historiography.

⁵ The most important essays published by IPA analysts are : Pere Bofill, “Aspectos históricos de la relación entre el psicoanálisis y la psiquiatría en España hasta 1978”, *Informaciones psiquiátricas* 108 (1987): 99-108; Pere Bofill and Jorge L. Tizón, “Notas históricas sobre el psicoanálisis en el Estado español”, in *Qué es el psicoanálisis. Orígenes, temas e instituciones actuales* (Barcelona: Herder, 1994), 263-269; Manuel Pérez-Sánchez, “Inicis del moviment psicoanalític a Barcelona”, *Revista Catalana de Psicoanàlisi* 1, n°1 (1984): 229-246; María Luisa Muñoz, “Contribución a la historia del movimiento psicoanalítico en España: formación de la Asociación Psicoanalítica de Madrid”, *Revista de Psicoanálisis de Madrid*, n° extraordinario (1989): 121-152.

⁶ Those works are numerous and continue to appear on a regular basis. For those that established the Lacanians’ historiographical tradition, see: Germán García, “Psicoanálisis: ¡Fuera de España!”, *El Viejo Topo* 62 (1981): 52-53 and in *Psicoanálisis dicho de otra manera* (Valencia: Pre-textos, 1983), 53-63; Alejandro Sáez Pons, “Apertura para una historia”, *Sinthoma* 1 (1981): 116-122; Elvira Guilanyà, “Datos para una historia”, *Otium Diagonal* 7 (1984): 88-102.

and they published a significant number of works that brought a completely new interpretation of the country's psychoanalytical past. In these works, everything that happened in the psychoanalytical field during the period of dictatorship – and this means especially the foundation and development of the Spanish institutions affiliated to the IPA – is systematically undermined, not only from a theoretical point of view but also because of what is considered a compromising policy toward the psychiatric establishment. There is no recognition whatsoever of the Spanish IPA-related activity, and Lacanians reject even the possibility of a genealogical relationship with Spain's most recent psychoanalytical past. This view, of course, implies a specific evaluation of Oscar Masotta's role as the initiator of genuine psychoanalysis in Spain. This historiographic school – even if there are notable exceptions – globally aims to offer an openly partisan interpretation of history rather than to provide a thorough analysis of facts in their historic context. However impressionistic it may be, this historiography and the personal testimonies it contains bring very relevant material to our study when it comes to understand the situation of psychoanalysis in the last years of the dictatorship and the prehistory of the Lacanian movement during this period.

The history of psychoanalysis in Franco's Spain begins a few decades earlier, in 1939, just after the end of the Civil War.

Psychoanalysis and post-war psychiatry

Spanish psychiatry did not create a discourse on psychoanalysis during the dictatorship. The basis of the anti-Freudian discourse that prevailed during Franco's regime had been created before the Civil War: López Ibor's *Lo vivo y lo muerto del psicoanálisis* had been published in 1936 and Ramón Sarró – the future leader of Catalan psychiatry during the dictatorship – had expressed similar ideas before the war⁷. Sarró, as well as López Ibor, invoked Freud

⁷ Ramón Sarró, "La renovación del psicoanálisis por la nueva antropología", *Revista Médica de Barcelona* 20, n° 115 (1933): 252-257; Ramón Sarró, "Valor de las nuevas orientaciones antropológicas para la psicoterapia", *Archivos de Neurobiología* 16 (1936): 405-433.

constantly and praised his role as a pioneer, as it was he, they believed, who had initially unveiled the mysteries of the human mind. However, they considered that he had then taken the wrong path: psychoanalysis' focus on instincts, causes and the past, its obliviousness to the true essence of human personality that can not be reduced to mechanistic laws, its arbitrary generalizations and its overestimation of the role that sexuality plays in psychic life were not acceptable and had led to a dead end as far as psychotherapy was concerned. Freudian psychoanalysis was therefore seen as an obsolete system and Sarró advocated a renewal of psychotherapy on the philosophical basis of phenomenology and existentialism. This position became the official discourse on psychoanalysis when those who held it came to power in the psychiatric world. Thomas Glick traced the origins of this discourse to the early 1930s and underlined the elements of continuity between the pre-war conservative reception of Freudian theories and the predominant commentary on psychoanalysis during the dictatorship:

What began as the introduction of a modest teleological component and as a philosophical justification for avoiding certain of the therapeutic consequences of Freudianism as a psychological system became [...] the basis for a radical, religiously motivated antagonism to Freudianism. Such an exaggerated turn of events could not have happened without the mandatory closure of civil discourse and the concomitant application, after 1940, of the repressive powers of the state to psychiatric practice and medical education⁸.

Before 1936, psychoanalysis had been widely debated in Spain, becoming a cultural reference as well as a recurring topic among psychiatrists. In the medical field, although all kinds of opinions were represented, the introduction of Freud's ideas had led a majority of physicians to a critical approach and to an often eclectic acceptance of different aspects of his theories. At the time, a scientific debate on psychoanalysis was in full swing and Ángel

⁸ Thomas F. Glick, "The Naked Science: Psychoanalysis in Spain, 1914-1948", *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 24 (1982): 568-569.

Garma, the first Spanish member of the IPA who had been trained in Berlin in the 1920s, attempted to initiate an orthodox movement in the country. However, after the Civil War, a great majority of the psychiatrists who had been the main supporters of Freud's ideas were forced to leave the country or to abandon their professional activity due to their political positions. Most of them had supported the Second Republic, sometimes playing an active role in its institutions. Ángel Garma, whose orthodox movement was still in the very early stages of formation, emigrated to Argentina and was never to return. After the war there were consequently no IPA analysts in Spain.

When Franco came to power leadership roles in the psychiatric field, were completely reorganized and filled by physicians who supported his regime. A typical example of this was Antonio Vallejo Nágera, who had been the coordinator of Franco's army's psychiatric services⁹. Most of the institutions created during the Second Republic were dismantled and the extremely fruitful research and institutional activity that had been previously instituted was curtailed. In 1940, the Sociedad Española de Neurología y Psiquiatría was created and its first president, López Ibor, celebrated in his inaugural speech Franco's victory and the "new spirit" that was going to define the psychiatric domain from then on. This "new spirit" was characterized by the rejection of the pre-war Spanish psychiatry and its foreign influences, which were to be replaced by a national psychiatry rooted in a Christian tradition.¹⁰

Nationalistic and religious exaltation impregnated the new psychiatric discourse, in keeping with the regime's ideology. If Spain was to revive its tradition of greatness in the area of Christian faith, psychiatry would play a role in this project. Ideology would be the first priority in the development of any theory, scientific plausibility coming as a distant second –

⁹ On Vallejo Nágera's political and psychiatric ideas, especially regarding racial issues, see Raquel Álvarez Peláez, "Eugenesia y fascismo en la España de los años treinta" in *Ciencia y Fascismo*, ed. Rafael Huertas and Carmen Ortiz (Madrid: Doce Calles, 1997), 77-95 and Rafael Huertas, "Una nueva Inquisición para un nuevo Estado: psiquiatría y orden social en la obra de Antonio Vallejo Nágera", *ibid.*, 97-109.

¹⁰ Juan José López Ibor, "La Psiquiatría en España en la hora presente", *Actas Españolas de Neurología y Psiquiatría* 3, n° 1-2 (1942): 15-18.

if considered at all. For instance, it was said that the mental health of the “authentic” Spain – that of Franco’s army – had been preserved due to the great spiritual values that it fought for, while “the other” Spain suffered mass war neurosis. In other words, the ideas that the national army stood for were able to prevent psychiatric disorders. Moreover, these values and their representatives had therapeutic virtues: according to some people, institutionalized patients suddenly recovered when Franco’s troops entered their city.¹¹ Furthermore, biological theories reigned absolutely in post-civil war psychiatry. From a theoretical point of view, Kraepelin’s nosography, which had been introduced in Spain before the war, was used as a convenient way, devoid of any ideological implications, to classify abnormal social behavior without any further investigation.¹²

Since the war had put an end to the neurological and psychiatric research that had characterized the pre-war period, psychiatrists directed their attention to the psychotherapeutic area. In the ideological framework of Franco’s Spain, psychotherapy, like any other theory or practice, could not be separated from religion. Vallejo Nágera stated:

A great majority of the Spanish people... professes Catholic faith, and it is the first condition of our psychotherapy that it does not contradict Catholic dogma and morality if we want to prevent transferences that would be detrimental to the patient’s health.¹³

The concept of mental health was directly linked to the respect of national and Catholic values, and the purpose of psychotherapy was to bring the patient back to these values.

The best mental health is indeed thinking and acting at all times as a Catholic [...]
As physicians, we must therefore know that in this utmost important work of

¹¹ González Duro, *Psiquiatría y sociedad autoritaria*, 12.

¹² See, e.g., Ángel González de Pablo, “Sobre la génesis del orden psiquiátrico en la posguerra española: la implantación de la psiquiatría de Heidelberg en España”, *Revista de la Asociación Española de Neuropsiquiatría* 7, n° 23 (1987): 640, and Ángel González de Pablo, “La escuela de Heidelberg y el proceso de institucionalización de la Psiquiatría española” in *Un Siglo de Psiquiatría en España*, ed. Sociedad de Historia y Filosofía de la Psiquiatría (Madrid: Extra Editorial, 1995), 229-249.

¹³ Vallejo Nágera cited by Carles et al., *Psicoanálisis en España*, 232.

hygienization of our race, we can never take our eyes off God, and that everything we do we must do it for Spain.¹⁴

The psychotherapist's role was also redefined according to the new mission of psychiatrists: they had to “teach the patient how to be sane”.¹⁵ This concept of psychotherapy implied that one of its main features was its anti-Freudianism.¹⁶ Either psychoanalysis was rejected *a priori* for moral and religious reasons or it was criticized on the basis of anthropological objections, in which case the philosophical debate on psychotherapy was always credited with having Freud's mistaken vision of mankind as a starting point. Both López Ibor and Sarró, – followed by a number of colleagues – worked on the establishment of a new phenomenologically inspired psychotherapy, reviewing each and every Freudian concept and rejecting all of them, “absolutely all of them” as Sarró stated, in their original sense.¹⁷ As for the theoretical basis of the new psychotherapy, they found them in Jaspers, whose *General Psychopathology* became the “bedside book” of Spanish psychiatrists.¹⁸

This discourse on psychotherapy set the context of the circulation of psychoanalysis in the psychiatric field until the end of the 1960s. The permanence of this discourse over decades can be partly explained by the very hierarchical structure of Spanish psychiatry and the hegemonic authority of the *catedráticos* – the heads of the psychiatry departments in the universities. Psychiatric power was concentrated in the hands of a few men – starting with Vallejo Nágera, Sarró and López Ibor, who were the new leaders of a psychiatric community in which nothing could happen without their consent. The ideological control of the

¹⁴ Francisco Marco Merenciano cited by Castilla del Pino, “La psiquiatría española”, 90.

¹⁵ López Ibor, *La agonía del psicoanálisis*, 137.

¹⁶ In this respect, it is interesting to note how historians stress the importance of anti-Freudianism amongst the characteristics of the psychiatric domain during the 1940s and devote a significant part of their analysis to it, when similar historic studies about this domain during the pre-war period address the acceptance of psychoanalysis as a subject of secondary importance compared to the research in the neurological field.

¹⁷ M. Dalmau Ciria, “El profesor Sarró y el IV Congreso Internacional de Psicoterapia”, *Revista de Psiquiatría y Psicología Médica de Europa y América Latinas* 3, n° 7 (1958): 576.

¹⁸ Diego Gracia Guillén, “El enfermo mental y la psiquiatría española de la posguerra”, *Informaciones Psiquiátricas* 120 (1990): 167. On Jasper's influence in Spain, see González de Pablo, “Sobre la génesis” and “La escuela de Heidelberg”.

psychiatric discipline was insured by its dependence on the academic discourse and, within the academy, by a co-optation system¹⁹. Guardians of the ideological orthodoxy, the chairs of psychiatry, offered a university education whose shortcomings and inadequacy with respect to clinical realities would soon convince a few medical students to consider psychoanalytical theories; theories taught outside of any academic framework.

The Foundation of the Sociedad Luso-Española de Psicoanálisis

In 1939, two young Catalans both named Pere – Pere Folch Mateu, born in 1919 and Pere Bofill Tauler, born in 1920 – registered as first-year medical students at the University of Barcelona. The academic discourse on psychoanalysis was the one described above, and Folch and Bofill recall the psychological “knowledge” that students were forced to learn in the “Medical Deontology” course – a subject created by the authorities and usually taught by priests. Here is what Folch had to say to pass his final exam:

The “Medical Deontology” subject was taught by a priest. When I took the oral examination, he asked me the following questions: “How would you counsel an engaged couple? What limits would you recommend in terms of eroticism?” Obviously we had to repeat what we had learnt in class, namely, for instance, a classification of kisses. There were bucco-dermal kisses, that could be tolerated, and bucco-mucous kisses, which were considered a perversion... We sent the class notes to Uruguay, where they published them. They certainly must have had a good time reading them.²⁰

After graduation, in 1946, Folch was awarded a grant from the Barcelona French Institute. He went to Paris, worked with Jean Delay at Sainte-Anne Hospital and took a course at the Société psychanalytique de Paris (SPP), which he considered the most promising aspect

¹⁹ Josep Maria Comelles, *La razón y la sinrazón. Asistencia psiquiátrica y desarrollo del estado en la España contemporánea* (Barcelona: PPU, 1988), 158-159. In his memoirs, Carlos Castilla del Pino addresses this question and gives a bitter – albeit humorous – account of the academic appointments and the way their outcome was manipulated. See Carlos Castilla del Pino, *Pretérito imperfecto. Autobiografía* (Barcelona: Tusquets, 1997) and Carlos Castilla del Pino, *Casa del Olivo. Autobiografía (1949-2003)* (Barcelona: Tusquets, 2004).

²⁰ Pere Folch, interview with author, July 5, 2005.

of his training in France.²¹ On returning to Barcelona, he and Bofill, along with a few other physicians, founded a cultural circle they named “Erasmus”. Within this circle, which also included non-doctors, Freud and psychoanalysis were recurrent topics.

The Erasmus circle became a precursor to the IPA-affiliated Catalan movement, although Erasmus had not been founded with that in mind. It appears no archives from this group were kept; however, from the recollections of its members, we have been able to gather the following information. Erasmus was a cultural society, informally led by an inner circle that went by the name “MAGOF” – the initials of its leaders. Its members, who came from medical or cultural backgrounds, shared common political positions and opposed Franco, but neither this resistance to the regime nor Catalan identity issues were their main interests. Their meetings were not clandestine and were held in either a member’s house or, later, in a rented apartment.

All members shared an interest in Freud and discussed his theories, but this interest was particularly pronounced amongst psychiatrists. To these young psychiatrists, who faced a professional landscape of devastation, psychoanalysis appeared as a promising alternative to both the biological orientation that reigned in psychiatric hospitals and the psychiatric establishment’s philosophical meditations that were of no use for their clinical work²². In spite of the lack of training, all the psychiatrists who were member of Erasmus gave a psychoanalytical orientation to their psychotherapeutic practice. As the interest in that orientation kept growing, some of them started to think about the possibility of undertaking an orthodox IPA formation. Bofill was in contact with Chilean analyst Ignacio Matte Blanco, who strongly advised them to do so. Given the obvious difficulties of achieving that project – starting with the necessity of leaving Spain to find an IPA analyst – only three Erasmus members carried it out: Folch, Bofill and Júlia Corominas, a young psychiatrist who had

²¹ Ibid.

²² Bofill, “Aspectos históricos”, 102.

joined the circle after a period of training at the Tavistock Clinic in London. In 1950, all three attended the Premier Congrès mondial de psychiatrie held in Paris and took the opportunity to apply to the SPP, where they were accepted as candidates. It is however in Switzerland that Bofill and Folch did the most part of their training, as they were offered work at a local psychiatric clinic directed by Charles Durand, who was a friend of Folch's.²³

Meanwhile, in Madrid, another group of people interested in psychoanalytical training was formed, independently from what was happening in Barcelona. There too, its leaders were two psychiatrists : Jerónimo Molina Núñez, who had been in analysis with Ángel Garma before the Civil War, and Ramón del Portillo, a psychiatrist who had been trained in France.²⁴ Probably at Garma's suggestion, Molina and Portillo went to Berlin in order to initiate or resume their training there, with members of Carl Müller-Braunschweig's circle.²⁵ Soon after, the idea arose of having a training analyst from the Berlin association move to Madrid to start a group there. Portillo's analyst, Margarete Steinbach – one of Müller-Braunschweig's close collaborators – who had resided in Spain before and spoke fluent Spanish was offered the mission. She accepted and settled in Madrid in 1951, becoming the first IPA analyst in Spain since Ángel Garma left the country in 1936. A small group of candidates, most of them Portillo's or Molina's acquaintances, gathered around her. In 1953, according to her own account, she had sixteen training analyses in progress.²⁶ The following year, her group created a short-lived Asociación Psicoanalítica Española, although this had no formal status within the IPA at such an early stage.

In addition to the obviously undesirable situation of having only one person fully capable of undertaking training analyses and supervisions, the Madrid group soon

²³ Back then, Charles Durand's clinic was frequently advertised in Spanish psychiatric journals and the presence of Spanish physicians in the institution – amongst which Bofill – was underlined. See, e.g., *Revista de Psiquiatría y Psicología Médica de Europa y América Latinas* 1, n° 6: 422-423.

²⁴ Muñoz, "Contribución a la historia", 131.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Steinbach cited by Muñoz, "Contribución a la historia", 135.

encountered serious difficulties. First of all, the relationship between Molina and Steinbach's circle deteriorated to such an extent that Molina took every opportunity he had to publicly debunk Steinbach's work and discredit her. This engendered a very unpleasant atmosphere within the psychoanalytic circle and did nothing to enhance its public image.²⁷ Secondly, in 1954, only three years after her arrival in Spain, Steinbach died in mysterious circumstances.²⁸ For the Madrid group, this death meant not only the loss of its one and only training analyst, but also the end of the process that was supposed to lead to the official recognition of the association by the IPA. From the original group led by Steinbach, only a handful of members decided to leave Spain and resume their training abroad: Portillo and two other members went to Buenos Aires, and three others to Paris or Switzerland. Three years later, in 1957, two members of the Asociación Psicoanalítica Argentina (APA) – Jaime Tomás and his wife Pola – settled in Madrid and started a new group there.

During this period, the Madrid and the Barcelona groups, although developing independently, kept in contact. Both were interested in the same thing, namely the creation of a Spanish association officially recognized by the IPA. However, instead of leading to a form of permanent collaboration, those contacts rather seem to have created a mutual mistrust. On the Catalan side, these feelings were confirmed during a conference held in Barcelona in 1955, in which members of the Madrid group as well as Argentinian analysts from the APA participated. This conference impelled Bofill to dedicate all his efforts to the rapid formation of an IPA group in Spain that he would lead himself. According to his own account, when he heard his Madrid and Argentinian colleagues' papers, Bofill was struck by what he considered a lack of rigor in their interpretations which were, in his opinion, all too symbolic – something

²⁷ See, e.g., A. Gállego Meré, "La superación del psicoanálisis", *Archivos de Neurobiología* 22, n° 1 (1959): 23. The reasons for the disagreements remain unclear. After he left the group, Molina kept working in the field of analytic psychotherapy, outside of IPA orthodoxy. In 1962, he founded Peña Retama, the first therapeutic community in Spain, and a few years later the Asociación Española de Psicoterapia Analítica. On these institutions, see Carles et al., *Psicoanálisis en España*, 274-295.

²⁸ See Castilla Del Pino, *Pretérito Imperfecto*, 493.

he even told Garma himself while discussing his paper.²⁹ In her study of that period, Carmen Llor underlines the importance of the psychoanalytical debate that took place during this conference. It was indeed the first time that IPA-trained analysts debated in Spain on a psychoanalytical matter, and what came out of the discussion were two different theoretical positions, reflecting two different schools.³⁰

As we've seen, the Madrid group had always been very close to the Argentinian Psychoanalytical Association, in particular with Garma, while Catalan analysts mostly came from a French and Swiss background. In this first theoretical discussion between IPA-affiliated professionals in Spain, Bofill clearly identified the direction of the Argentinian school as being one he did not want the future Spanish association to take. Bofill therefore intended to accelerate the process of the creation of a structure that may guarantee the training of analysts in Spain as he deemed appropriate – and to do so before the Madrid group and its Argentinian influences occupied the psychoanalytical field. As Bofill wrote, quite explicitly, to one of his French IPA contacts:

We would like to be able to put our projects into operation as quickly as possible [...] in order to avoid psychoanalysis getting off to a bad start in Spain.³¹

Bofill and Folch officially became members of the Société suisse de psychanalyse in 1956. Bofill's idea was to create not a Spanish society, but a Luso-Spanish society with a Portuguese analyst also trained in Switzerland, Francisco Alvim. The reason for including Portuguese members, according to Bofill, was that the associations between Spain and Portugal were well thought of by the government, and that such an association would therefore help the process of obtaining its approval³². The society was officially accepted as a

²⁹ Pere Bofill, interview with author, July 11, 2005.

³⁰ Carles et al., *Psicoanálisis en España*, 259-260.

³¹ Letter written by Bofill to M. Bouvet in 1956, cited by Bermejo Frígola, "La institucionalización del psicoanálisis en España", 216.

³² Ibid.

study group by the IPA in 1957 and, two years later, it became a component society under the name Sociedad Luso-española de Psicoanálisis. The society had 13 members at that time: nine of them were physicians, six of them were women, and five of the members came from the Madrid group that had initially been created around Steinbach, which means that both of the original Spanish psychoanalytic circles were represented within the society.

A psychoanalytical association in Franco's Spain

On September 26th 1959, the Sociedad Luso-española de Psicoanálisis (the Luso-Spanish Society of Psychoanalysis) was officially registered in the Registro de Asociaciones, and its rules were approved by the Ministerio de la Gobernación, the Spanish Interior Ministry³³. In the process of acquiring official legitimacy, the members of the IPA did not encounter insuperable obstacles. Firstly, there was no legal impediment for the creation of a psychoanalytical society: no official prohibitions against the circulation of psychoanalysis had been enacted. Additionally, the psychoanalytical association created by Steinbach had also been officially registered in 1954, psychoanalysts themselves had been participating in a number of official activities within the psychiatric field, and the circulation of psychoanalytical essays by Freud, Melanie Klein or Argentinian analysts from the APA had been authorized by the authorities in the previous years³⁴. An investigation on the prospective psychoanalytical association was carried out and reports were required³⁵, with an authorization being eventually granted.

Secondly, the all-mighty psychiatry leaders could probably have made the institutionalization process difficult had they wanted to, but they did not. López Ibor is said to have asserted on one occasion that “it would be easy for [him] to annihilate the

³³ Archivo General de la Administración, Registro de Asociaciones, n° de orden 9424.

³⁴ Those essays (with the exception of Freud's) were imported from Argentina, where they had been translated and published. The list includes authors such as Arnaldo Raskowsky, Marie Langer, Telma Reca and León Grinberg.

³⁵ Bofill cited by Bermejo Frígola, “La institucionalización del psicoanálisis en España”, 215, 223.

psychoanalytical group³⁶”, which was in all likelihood true, but he made no attempt to do so; on the contrary, according to Bofill’s account, López Ibor supported and even helped the foundation of the society by providing advice and favourable reports³⁷. What happened was that psychoanalysts anticipated the problems that might have arisen. Pere Bofill explained the “tactical plan” that the society had decided to take, from their inception, in regard to the Spanish authorities and the psychiatric establishment:

I had a very clear idea, and with great cautiousness we were able to get around the difficulties. Don’t be confrontational because they are going to turn you down, no question about it, and we really wanted the institution, it was worth it, it had taken us more than two years to get there, it was worth the trouble if it gave us the possibility to work silently³⁸.

I thought that we had to be very careful if we wanted to come back to Spain, we had to make contacts very carefully, and avoid confrontation with the Church and with the establishment. We had to make contacts, discreetly, without making much noise³⁹.

The main idea was thus to establish contacts, avoid confrontation and be careful not to attract too much attention. Although the psychoanalytical circle had initially been created because its members rejected the tenets of the psychiatric establishment, their ambition was not to become an opposing force. What Bofill wanted was an official institution that would allow psychoanalysts to work “silently”. This tactical position led to consequences that would define the coordinates of the circulation of psychoanalysis until the end of the dictatorship.

³⁶ Carles et al., *Psicoanálisis en España*, 254.

³⁷ Bermejo Frígola, “La institucionalización del psicoanálisis en España”, 214-215.

³⁸ Bofill cited in Carles et al., *Psicoanálisis en España*, 262.

³⁹ Bofill cited in Bermejo Frígola, “La institucionalización del psicoanálisis en España”, 214. Years before, when Margarete Steinbach talked about the possibility for a Spanish movement to develop in her report for the IPA, she suggested the same approach: “We have not had to face any opposition so far, although this may be explained by the fact that we work discreetly and we do not have any public activity [...] I believe that in this country the best course of action is to avoid controversy.” (Steinbach cited by Muñoz, “Contribución a la historia”, 137.)

Bofill has always taken responsibility for his choices and admitted that this policy did not come without negative effects, that he listed as follows:

The development [of the society] was not very spectacular. [...]

During those years, we did not have any publication. Works circulated within our group only. We just worked within the group and discussed our works with each other⁴⁰.

Many colleagues from all over the world asked us how we could start our work, not to mention our organization, under a dictatorship that was both politically and morally repugnant. I believe that this situation had consequences for us in many situations: some things did not work out, our public activity was limited, our internal development was limited and slow, we had very few publications... But we – the few psychoanalysts that were there – did not try particularly hard or make concessions in order to be accepted or integrated. What we did was progressively gaining some space and some freedom, cautiously, without unnecessary provocations but firmly and sensibly, focusing on what was more important without giving up what we considered essential in psychoanalysis.⁴¹

Let's examine the development of the society in more detail. In terms of members, its evolution was indeed extremely slow. According to the IPA Roster, the society had 20 members in 1975, all categories taken together (they were 13 in 1959). The Portuguese members left the group in 1966 (at which time its name changed to the current, Sociedad Española de Psicoanálisis or SEP) and the Madrid members left in 1973. This exodus – along with most probably a limited number of candidates – partly explains such a low number of members. However, even if we add the Madrid analysts, the total number of IPA members in Spain was less than 30 in 1975.⁴²

⁴⁰ Pere Bofill cited by Bermejo Frígola, “La institucionalización del psicoanálisis en España”, 244.

⁴¹ Bofill, “Aspectos históricos”, 105.

⁴² Roster. The International Psycho-Analytical Association, 1959 to 1975 editions.

The slow development of the society had another cause: the extremely strict implementation of the rules to accept and train new candidates.⁴³ As we know, IPA rules are quite precise in this matter, but all component societies are allowed a certain freedom to add or adjust requirements regarding certain aspects of it, such as the background and previous training of the candidates. One particular point of the SEP rules had to do with the society's position towards applications from IPA analysts from other societies. Rules specified that the SEP would require from these analysts, in all cases, a "period of adjustment" and, in some cases, an additional period of training that might apply to all aspects of training, including personal analysis⁴⁴. This means that the SEP made a rule that it would not necessarily recognize an analyst's training from another IPA society, in spite of both being component societies of the same international association. This rule must be understood in the context of the immigration of Latin American, and especially Argentinian or Argentinian-trained analysts in Spain. The foundation of the SEP itself had been accelerated by Bofill's mistrustful reaction towards the Argentinian school, and this question would present itself again in the following years when IPA analysts coming from Argentina would apply for membership of the SEP.

A good example of this is the situation of the Tomásés, one which eventually led the Madrid members to leave the SEP. Jaime and Pola Tomás – members of the APA who had previously lived in Madrid for a time and analyzed members of the Madrid group as we've seen – returned to Madrid from Argentina in 1973 and applied to the SEP. While the Madrid members of the SEP were willing to admit them as training analysts without further delay, the Catalan members refused to make an exception to the rules and to hurry the normal process of

⁴³ A detailed study of these rules, as well as a comparison to those of other IPA societies, can be found in Anne-Cécile Druet, "La psychanalyse dans l'Espagne post-franquiste" (PhD diss., Université Paris IV – Sorbonne, 2006), 131-135.

⁴⁴ The possible requirement of additional training is specified from the first edition of these rules, while the compulsory « period of adjustment » appears in later editions, after the foundation of the Institute, and still applies today. See Sociedad Española de Psicoanálisis, *Normas para la formación de psicoanalistas*, unpublished, SEP Archive.

admission⁴⁵. This situation led to the foundation of an autonomous study group in Madrid, which later became the second Spanish component society of the IPA⁴⁶. The very strict admission policy of the SEP therefore explains, at least partly, its low membership, not only because it made it difficult for candidates to become members, but also because this policy seems to have been the main reason for both the Portuguese and the Madrid groups to leave the society.

Aside from this very selective policy, the SEP had another characteristic that Bofill also acknowledges in the statements cited above and that appears to be particularly important in terms of circulation of psychoanalysis: during those years, its members barely ever published their works. They did participate in and organize IPA meetings and sometimes published in IPA reviews abroad, they also disseminated the psychoanalytical perspective in some universities and medical circles as we will see, but they published very few works in Spain, and what they did publish was almost exclusively limited to articles in the psychiatric and psychological press. Furthermore, although the society founded a psychoanalytical institute in 1971, it did not produce a journal until 1984. Aside from the activity reports that the SEP, as any other component society, sent to the IPA, and occasionally to the Spanish psychiatric and psychological journals, there was not much communication on its activities, which went unnoticed by the general public. The SEP simply did not seek to diffuse psychoanalysis in Spanish society; thus its socio-cultural visibility was fairly low in Barcelona, and virtually non-existent elsewhere in the country.

⁴⁵ Muñoz, “Contribución a la historia”, 147-148.

⁴⁶ Although the Madrid group initially welcomed training analysts applicants from other IPA societies, since their presence helped the process of obtaining the status of IPA component society, things changed after this process was completed. In the 1980s, if all training analysts candidates from foreign societies had been admitted as such in the Madrid association, they would have outnumbered the locals. Situations similar to the Tomases’ then also happened in Madrid. On the particular case of Argentinian analysts in Madrid, see Marina Auerbach and Luis Teszkiewicz, “Psicoanalistas argentinos en la salud mental española” in *La psiquiatría española en la transición*, ed. Sociedad Europea de Historia y Filosofía de la Psiquiatría (Madrid: Extra Ediciones, 2001).

This absence of publication and the admission policy can both be explained by what the SEP considered its mission: to focus on internal training and to ensure the strictest orthodoxy in that matter. This policy reflected the absolute foundations of the society and the psychoanalysts who were a part of this remained faithful to their initial goal. Their determination and faith in their project never diminished. After a new period of training in England in the 1960s, the theoretical orientation of the Spanish IPA analysts became almost exclusively Kleinian and the society proved to be very stable – indeed, the SEP still exists today.

The circulation of psychoanalysis

In spite of the anti-Freudianism of leaders within the psychiatric field, psychoanalysts were able not only to found their society without significant opposition, but also to work in public institutions, to participate in official meetings of the psychiatric community and – at least in Barcelona – to teach university seminars on a regular basis. In order to explain this apparent contradiction, let's return to the world of psychiatry where we left it earlier.

By the end of the 1950s, the position of psychoanalysis within the psychiatric field had changed. It certainly was not a drastic change but some signs of a slow evolution were perceptible. This evolution was in line with a slow process of progressive reincorporation of pre-war cultural trends: the regime's most moderate sectors, without questioning the power in place, advocated the retrieval of part of the knowledge that had been banished during the post-war period. In the psychiatric domain, institutions that had been dismantled were reinstated, the number of professional journals increased, and the Spanish psychiatric community began to emerge from its isolation and to resume its participation in international events. Even if this evolution did not imply any changes in the predominant discourse on psychoanalysis, the circulation of Freudian theories was no longer subjected to the harsh religious and philosophical criticism that it had been in the post-war period. The broader – relatively

speaking – diffusion of psychoanalysis, however, continued to depend on this discourse. A few events related to this diffusion are particularly representative of this situation.

Chronologically, the first one of these events has to do with Freud's work itself. In 1948, a new edition of Freud's complete work was published in Madrid. In 1922, Spain had become the first country ever to initiate a translation of this complete work, but the publication had not resumed after the Civil War. The new edition of Freud's work is important in a number of respects, not the least of which is the censorship question. As with all publications, Freud's had to be approved by the authorities – and eventually it was. The whole process and the publisher's careful course of action can be retraced by examining the file opened by the censors and kept at the Archivo General de la Administración. Freud's censorship file contains a first document dated 1946, which bans one of his essays, *Moses and Monotheism*⁴⁷. This work was not included in the volumes released in Spain before the Civil War, but thanks to its publication in Argentina, a Spanish translation did exist. The banning of the importation of the book proves therefore that there was indeed a formal censorship of Freud's work, even if it seems to have applied only to this one essay. The other documents in Freud's file are about the publication of Freud's complete work⁴⁸. The publishing house submitted a first request in 1947, for which the authorization was apparently postponed at that stage of the process since it bears a "pending preface" indication. The second request, dated 1948, was submitted along with a preface and was finally authorized.

The characteristics of this preface are particularly interesting, especially since, as it seems, they were a decisive factor in the process of obtaining the authorization for the publication. The text is anonymous – in the published edition as well as in the censorship file – but there is very little doubt his author is psychiatrist José Germain, who was the director of

⁴⁷ Expediente n° 773-46, Archivo General de la Administración, (3)50 21/7784.

⁴⁸ Expediente n° 4834-47, Archivo General de la Administración, 3 (50) 21/8097.

the publication⁴⁹. During those years, Germain was the most active promoter of scientific psychology in Spain, and a man of dialogue, whose journal, the *Revista de Psicología General y Aplicada* (1946) would open its pages more than once to psychoanalysis during the 1950s⁵⁰. The preface stressed the necessity of knowing Freud's ideas – if only to better justify their rejection – urged the reader to distinguish between psychoanalytical theories and their practical applications, and claimed that the latter were compatible with Catholic values. In this matter, the author appealed to Father Gemelli's authority, to defend the publication in spite of “the rejection, from a higher level and, primarily, for moral reasons, of a theory and a technique that do not fit properly within our Christian trajectory”.

On [this] specific question, we turn to the authority of Father Gemelli, Rector and Professor of the Milan Catholic University and president of the Vatican Academia Scientiorum. This distinguished professor and man of science considers that psychoanalysis must be studied by psychologists with a clear and impartial spirit and interpreted in a Christian sense. The same way Scholastics made Aristotle a Christian philosopher, we can today apply with careful moderation what is useful in Freud's doctrine to a better understanding of the human mind. By doing so we will help the progress of science and it will be of benefit to the sick⁵¹.

The publisher was careful to claim, firstly, that psychoanalysis was compatible with a Christian interpretation. Secondly, from a practical point of view, it was decided that the publication of Freud's work would be as an exclusive edition, which, being expensive, made it less likely to fall into the wrong hands. This latter argument was stressed quite explicitly by the publisher during his meeting with the censorship authorities: Freud's complete work was not intended to become a bestseller⁵².

⁴⁹ In 1950, Germain's journal, the *Revista de Psicología General y Aplicada* identifies unequivocally Germain as the author of the preface [*Revista de Psicología General y Aplicada* 5, n° 14 (1950): 433]. See Vicent Bermejo Frígola, “Freud y el psicoanálisis en la psicología española de los años cincuenta”, *Revista de Historia de la Psicología* 14, n° 3-4 (1993): 256.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ El Editor, “Prólogo” to *Obras completas* by Sigmund Freud (Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 1948), vol. I, 13-14.

⁵² Bermejo Frígola, “La institucionalización del psicoanálisis en España”, 125.

Similar characteristics of measured assessment and religious references can be found in the double issue of Germain's journal devoted to Freud in honor of the hundredth anniversary of his birth. Germain justified the tribute, paid "to the man rather than to his doctrine", urging the readers to refrain from partisan judgments⁵³. In spite of the almost apologetic tone of this tribute, Germain's journal reflected his efforts to reintroduce Freudian theories in the Spanish psychological field during the 1950s.

Meanwhile, the world of psychiatry itself was also undergoing changes, especially in Catalonia. From the 1950s on, the schools of psychoanalysis in Barcelona and in Madrid started to diverge. Those members of the psychoanalytic movement who lived in Madrid, like their Catalan colleagues, were able to work in public institutions and participate in conferences or activities organized through official psychiatric circles. Nonetheless, all of these analysts have given the same account of the difficulties they faced; there was no official policy of exclusion in place, but their theoretical positions and their work were systematically undermined⁵⁴. Relatively speaking, Catalonia was a more fertile ground for the circulation of Freudian theories than Madrid. In 1950, Ramón Sarró became *catedrático*, or the head of the Department of Psychiatry at the University of Barcelona. Despite his anti-Freudian approach of psychotherapy, as we've seen above, and despite the fact that he would never stop opposing Freud and psychoanalysis in the strongest terms, Sarró accepted or even welcomed the debate and allowed IPA analysts to express their ideas in the many professional and academic activities he organized⁵⁵.

⁵³ José Germain, "Freud. 1856-1939", *Revista de Psicología General y Aplicada* 12, n° 41-42 (1957): 5-6. These issues include an article by Pere Bofill, "El autoanálisis de Freud", *Revista de Psicología General y Aplicada* 12, n° 41-42 (1957): 207-214.

⁵⁴ Carles et al., *Psicoanálisis en España*, 253-254.

⁵⁵ On Sarró and the Barcelona chair, see José Sánchez Lázaro, "El Dr. Ramón Sarró y la historia de la Psiquiatría", *Revista de la Asociación Española de Neuropsiquiatría* 5, n° 12 (1985): 23. Sarró had initially been very interested in psychoanalysis. During the 1920s, he went to Vienna where he met Freud and began an analysis with Helene Deutsch. The whole experience within the psychoanalytical circle disappointed him and he became highly critical of Freudian psychoanalysis.

In 1956, Sarró organized a seminar on Freud and published the papers in the journal he edited⁵⁶. His own contribution to these issues devoted to Freud is a good example of his ambivalent position. While Freud was the author most frequently cited in the journal during those years⁵⁷, Sarro's article was a diatribe against Freudian psychoanalysis. Referring to psychoanalysis in Latin America, Sarró predicted its decline claiming that Latin-American "soul" was too great to be reduced to Freudian unconscious.⁵⁸ In the same text, Sarró recalled that Freud had based his theories on his clinical experience with "Semitic" patients. (He would later call psychoanalysis a "neo-Zionism", explaining that he was not an anti-Semite but did not see any reason to become a philo-Semite either.⁵⁹) Nevertheless, the following year Sarró created a weekly seminar on psychoanalytic therapy in his psychiatry department and invited IPA analysts, starting with Pere Bofill, to participate; this seminar became the first to be taught in a Spanish university by an IPA member⁶⁰.

Sarró also called on Bofill when the 4th International Congress of Psychotherapy was hosted in Barcelona in 1958. This was the first psychiatric event of this magnitude to be held in Spain since the Civil War. Sarró, who was the chairman of the conference, put Pere Bofill in charge of the organization of the psychoanalysis section. At Sarro's request, Bofill wrote an essay on the history and then current situation of psychoanalysis in Spain. What Bofill always described as a prudent way to avoid confrontation, as we've seen above, is particularly noticeable in this presentation. The names of the physicians who had been the most active diffusers of Freudian theories before the Civil War – with the exception of Ángel Garma –

⁵⁶ Revista de Psiquiatría y Psicología Médica de Europa y América Latinas 2, n° 7 and 8 (1956).

⁵⁷ José María Peiro and Helio Carpintero, "Historia de la psicología en España a través de sus revistas especializadas", *Revista de Historia de la Psicología* 2, n° 2 (1981): 157-158.

⁵⁸ Ramón Sarró, "El ocaso del psicoanálisis ortodoxo en Sudamérica", *Revista de Psiquiatría y Psicología Médica de Europa y América Latinas* 2, n°7 (1956): 636.

⁵⁹ Ramón Sarró, "Impresiones sobre el porvenir de la psiquiatría argentina", *Revista de Psiquiatría y Psicología Médica de Europa y América Latinas* 7, n° 5 (1966): 311, 309.

⁶⁰ Carles et al., *Psicoanálisis en España*, 262.

were left out of the historic review. Instead there was a carefully worded tribute to the role of the psychiatric establishment's leaders:

An eager generation of psychiatrists – most notably Professors Sarró, López Ibor, Laín Entralgo, Vallejo Nágera, etc., soon came into contact with Viennese and German psychoanalytic circles; with their critical works, they made fruitful contributions to the better understanding of Freud's legacy⁶¹.

Needless to say, all the physicians mentioned in this text – with the arguable exception of Laín – were highly critical of psychoanalytical theories, but by paying tribute to their participation in the debate, regardless of their position, Bofill managed to handle the question carefully and to avoid any potentially problematic reference.

During this conference, once again, religious objections to psychoanalysis received a lot of attention. As we have already seen in the case of the publication of Freud's complete work, the omnipresence of religious references represents one of the most striking aspects of the circulation of psychoanalysis during the dictatorship. Whenever psychoanalysis was addressed in a context not strictly limited to the medical or psychological field, that is, in a context that involved the general public and was likely to give psychoanalysis social visibility, religious objections were always mentioned and they framed all possible debate. The international congress of psychotherapy held in Barcelona was one of these events that led the general press to circulate information about psychoanalysis: such a huge event certainly was uncommon and Spanish newspapers published abundant and extensive reports on the conference. Some aspects of it were given a lot of publicity by the organizers, who issued daily press releases.

While psychoanalysts never made headlines at the conference, the “psychotherapy and religion” section became the main focus of the press's attention, especially with regard to the

⁶¹ Pere Bofill, “Psicoanálisis”, *Revista de Psiquiatría y Psicología Médica de Europa y América Latinas* 3, n° 7 (1958): 609.

church's critical position towards psychoanalysis.⁶² Psychoanalysis was thus addressed in the general press, but almost exclusively through religious-based criticism. The compatibility with Christian dogma was the yardstick by which Freudian theories were judged, and even those who supported the diffusion of these theories beyond the boundaries of the medical domain could not ignore this fact and alter the terms of the debate. As I have mentioned, the trepidation around the publication of Freud's complete works illustrated this situation. Psychoanalysts themselves – at least some of them – when speaking publicly in Spain, claimed that the psychoanalytical therapeutic method wasn't incompatible with religion,⁶³ which seems to have been a well-known characteristic of the way they represented their movement.⁶⁴

For many years, López Ibor and the leaders of Spanish psychiatry continued to criticize psychoanalysis on the basis of a never-changing anti-Freudian discourse, the main themes of which had been drawn decades earlier. The republishing of *La agonía del psicoanálisis* proves that the debate – if there really was ever a debate as such – did not require updating and that what had been said in 1936 was still relevant and did not need elaboration. In this context, one of the most plausible explanations for the lack of a more radical opposition against the psychoanalytic movement is that the psychoanalytic movement never posed a threat to the psychiatric establishment. But why was this?

The members of the psychoanalytical movement had initially embraced Freudian theories as an alternative to the tenets of general psychiatry, which they opposed and considered hugely inadequate to address mental health needs. Psychoanalysts had worked

⁶² See Anne-Cécile Druet, “La psychanalyse dans l’Espagne post-franquiste”, 183.

⁶³ Speaking about the relationship between psychoanalysis and religion in 1962, Bofill underlined “the current favourable evolution, based on the separation between the psychoanalytical method and Freud’s philosophical doctrine [...] A large number of Catholic psychoanalysts are currently working using psychoanalysis to better understand religious difficulties”. Carles et al., *Psicoanálisis en España*, 270.

⁶⁴ In his historic study on the psychiatric domain in Franco’s Spain, González Duro writes: “The very few psychoanalysts working in Spain felt compelled to justify their therapeutic method by declaring its compatibility with the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman doctrine”. Enrique González Duro, “Psiquiatría ‘nacional’” in *Orígenes y fundamentos de la psiquiatría en España*, ed. V. Aparicio Basauri (Madrid: ELA, 1997), 258.

hard to become IPA members in foreign countries, and then worked hard to create their own institution in Spain – a place where practicing psychoanalysis was certainly not the easiest way for young psychiatrists to achieve professional success. Yet, the official recognition of their institution depended on the consent of the all-mighty leaders of psychiatry, and psychoanalysts did what they deemed necessary to obtain it, in terms of contacts as well as in terms of institutional choices. Psychoanalysts' decision to focus on their institution and on its internal training process went hand in hand with a certain withdrawal that ruled out social visibility – not to mention social protest – and made it more likely for them to be tolerated by the psychiatric establishment. In that sense, there was no cause for alarm since psychoanalysts themselves were very careful not to make waves.

On the other hand, the leaders of the psychiatric domain were not threatened by the psychoanalytic movement, but nor were they by any other school, group or individual until the last years of the dictatorship. Those who, like Carlos Castilla del Pino or other left-wing psychiatrists, openly opposed them were systematically marginalized. The choice of psychoanalysts not to take this chance would trigger virulent criticism after the end of the dictatorship, especially among Lacanian circles. It is, however, a policy for which they have always taken responsibility; their institution was their first priority.

The overall situation of psychoanalysis as described so far was not to change until the end of the 1960s. The efforts of a new generation of psychiatrists influenced by anti-psychiatry theories would then bring changes to the theoretical and ideological orientation of the psychiatric domain, in the larger political and cultural context of the last years of Franco's regime. An interest around the psychological and social aspects of mental diseases developed during this period, bringing in its wake a new debate on psychoanalysis. In 1967, a new edition – this time less expensive – of Freud's work was published by Alianza Editorial and in 1972 Biblioteca Nueva republished this work with a new preface whose tone and contents

clearly differ from that of the previous edition. Times were changing and it was now possible to introduce Freud's work paying a tribute to his "tremendous, undeniable and unlimited fecundity"⁶⁵ without quoting religious authorities. It was also during those years that Jacques Lacan's theories started to make in-roads in Spain.

The prehistory of the Lacanian movement in Spain

Jacques Lacan had been almost completely absent from the psychiatric debate before the end of the 1960s, and IPA circles had showed no interest in his theories.⁶⁶ From the end of the 1960s, Lacan began to be mentioned on a regular basis in psychiatric journals.⁶⁷ In 1970 a first translation of his work was published in Spain, in a series directed by Ramón García, one of the leaders of the anti-psychiatric movement. The volume also contained Althusser's essay *Freud et Lacan*.⁶⁸ A new generation of students or young professionals became interested in psychoanalysis. This had arisen in different ways: some of those interested had studied abroad, mostly in France or Belgium, where Freud and Lacan were taught in academic programs; others came to psychoanalysis via the framework of psychiatric or cultural protest movements.

Some of this generation, especially young psychiatrists and psychologists, began to look for a proper psychoanalytical training in Spain. Logically, they first turned to the Spanish IPA associations, which were the institutionalized psychoanalytic institutions. However, their reaction to the IPA groups was often that of complete rejection: these young men and women

⁶⁵ Juan Rof Carballo, introduction to *Obras completas* by Sigmund Freud (Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 1972), t. I, xvii.

⁶⁶ Lacan gave two lectures in Spain, both times in Barcelona. In 1958 he participated in the 4th International Congress of Psychotherapy and in 1972 he was invited by Sarró. Both lectures went unnoticed in Spain. The 1958 paper was later published: Jacques Lacan, "La psychanalyse vraie et la fausse", *Freudiana* 4-5 (1992): 11-21 and *L'Âne* 51 (1992): 24-27. A summary of the unpublished 1972 lecture can be found in Anne-Cécile Druet, "La psychanalyse dans l'Espagne post-franquiste", 192-194.

⁶⁷ See Anne-Cécile Druet, "Jacques Lacan en la prensa psiquiátrica española antes de 1975", *Freudiana* 49 (2007): 91-101.

⁶⁸ Jacques Lacan, *El objeto del psicoanálisis* and Louis Althusser, *Freud y Lacan* (Barcelona: Anagrama, 1970). Lacan's text is the translation of "Réponse à des étudiants en philosophie", originally published in *Cahiers pour l'analyse* 3 (1966): 5-13.

came out of protest movements, they sought a “subversive” Freud that could become emblematic of the opposition to the established order. What they found when they approached IPA circles was a strict hierarchic structure, highly regulated training, and analysts whom they viewed as being both a part of the dictatorship’s psychiatric world and guardians of a paternalistic, bourgeois and conventional system. Here is how Carmen Gallano, one of the young psychiatrists who approached the Spanish IPA circle in those years and would later become a prominent Lacanian analyst, describes her initial contact with this circle:

In Barcelona, I made contact with the IPA to undertake an analysis. When I saw the procedure, I gave up. We came from the left, from the opposition to Franco’s regime, from cultural criticism, from family criticism... And in the IPA I see a secretary who tells me: “We need a handwritten cover letter”. I thought: what? They do graphology too? And I realised that I couldn’t write this letter addressed to an anonymous stranger. The bureaucracy seemed awful to me. And then they asked me: Are you a psychiatrist? In this case, go see Dr So-and-so. Dr So-and-so appeared to me as a bourgeois, conservative, conventional person... It was out of the question. What I was interested in was the subversive side of psychoanalysis. Those IPA analysts, it seemed like they didn’t really understand who we were, as young psychiatrists committed to the protest against the system.⁶⁹

Even if Lacanians are critical of the IPA everywhere, the depth of the criticism in Spain goes way beyond the point of theoretical or institutional differences. This is because of the political context in which the IPA Spanish societies developed, and because of their strictness and inflexibility, which were greater than those of other countries. During the last years of the dictatorship and the transition to democracy, IPA groups could in no way represent a form of opposition to the establishment. This was a consequence of their policy towards conventional psychiatry during the dictatorship, of their admission and training policy, and finally of their inability or unwillingness to adjust to the new historic circumstances and to the new generation of men and women who were approaching psychoanalysis from a completely

⁶⁹ Carmen Gallano, interview with author, March 24, 2006.

different ideological background. The incomprehension between IPA analysts and young candidates was complete and mutual. For a majority of the latter, joining IPA circles rapidly ceased to be an option. Another era of the history of psychoanalysis in Spain began when these men and women started joining the private study groups founded by Argentinian analysts in Barcelona and Madrid a few years later.

Epilogue

Amongst the most paradoxical aspects of the history of psychoanalysis in Spain are the consequences that the IPA groups' history would have on the development of the Lacanian movement. Had the characteristics of these groups been different, it is very likely that, from the end of the 1960s, the increased interest for psychoanalysis in medical and cultural areas would have led young candidates to join IPA circles, if not in large numbers, at least in greater proportions than they had before. But being what they were, those characteristics contributed to create a situation that was a very favorable ground for the development of a Lacanian movement. The rejection of IPA groups by the new generation engendered a demand for a psychoanalytical training of with very different characteristics; one that could turn psychoanalysis into a subversive reference. Lacanism and, more specifically, Lacanism taught by Argentine analysts, some of whom had suffered political persecution for opposing a dictatorship in their country, would appear as a very different way of understanding psychoanalysis.

Among the features of IPA groups that Lacanians would later criticize was the absence of social visibility. As we have seen, this was a choice that IPA leaders made, a choice that greatly determined the circulation of psychoanalysis in Franco's Spain. Since their priority was to focus on internal training and to ensure an orthodox transmission of psychoanalysis, giving social visibility to their activities was not part of the agenda, nor was participating in the country's cultural life. This ruled out the possibility for psychoanalysis to become a tool

against social established order, as well as for psychoanalysts to become public figures. In contrast to what would have happened in other countries such as France or Argentina during the same years, it is very likely that a great majority of Spaniards, if asked, would have been unable to name one Spanish psychoanalyst, while psychiatrists like López Ibor, for instance, were very well known by the public. From an international point of view, even if Spanish analysts like Bofill are known in IPA circles and made important contributions to the institution, the Spanish school was never able to achieve a distinctive theoretical identity and the names of its members remain largely absent from international histories of psychoanalysis.