

10TH. DELPHI INTERNATIONAL PSYCHOANALYTIC SYMPOSIUM

ABSTRACTS

ABRAM Jan*, *The origins of psychoanalytic authority: the analytic paternal integrate and the mutative interpretation*

"Essentially...the [psychoanalytic] cure is effected by love"
(Freud 1906)

*"Hello Object! I destroyed you. I love you...While I am loving you, I am all the time
destroying you in (unconscious) fantasy"*
(Winnicott 1968)

Psychoanalysis, as a body of knowledge, constitutes an authority on how the human being functions intrapsychically, interpsychically and interpersonally. The praxis of psychoanalysis depends on the analyst's authority in matters of the psyche. To gain an inner Self-authority the analysand is required to trust the analyst's authority. Thus, the process by which analysts transfer their interpretive authority to analysands – enabling an internalisation and utilisation of psychoanalytic insights – shapes a range of international psychoanalytic clinical paradigms.

How do we understand what Freud meant when he wrote that the analytic cure is effected by love? Tracing the content of his letter to Jung in 1906, it is clear that he was referring to the power of the transference as the '*only unassailable proof that neuroses are determined by the individual's love life*' (Freud 1906). And the individual's love life, for Freud, refers to the fundamental core theory of psychosexuality and the Oedipus complex at the centre of the psyche.

Winnicott, who did not entirely dismiss Freud's formulations on psychosexuality, advanced the Freudian classical paradigm through his detailed findings of very early psychic phenomena in the family environment. Thus, the early mother and father emerged as concepts that precede the Oedipal dimension. To begin with the infant is merged with the mother during the phase when there is only the existence of Me.

Winnicott's extensive work as a paediatrician, combined with his

immersion in psychoanalysis from the late 1920s, profoundly shaped his understanding of infantile emotional development. He observed that psychic development could not occur without the mother's dedicated attention. The father, equally important for the infant's growth, could only be effective through the mother's introduction of the father to the infant. The infant's father, integrated in the mother's *body-psyche*, would thus be psychically transmitted to the infant as '*the first glimpse of father as a whole object*' (Winnicott [1969] 1989)

The 'paternal integrate', as I have proposed, is a psychoanalytical construct that represents the father's presence transmitted through the mother's emotional and physical presence. It is not yet a fully formed internal object. Thus, the paternal integrate is a subjective object, or a seed-object in the nascent psyche, inaugurated through the mother's holding in her *body-psyche* at her deepest level of being and identification. Thus Winnicott shows that Freud's concept of transference love actually has its roots in the mother-infant relationship. The good enough mother's 'ordinary devotion' to her newborn constitutes maternal/parental love long before sexual love is ready to evolve (Winnicott 1956). The mother is only able to psychically survive in her devotion if she has the infant's father in her mind. The early transference relationship, in Winnicott's clinical paradigm therefore, is dyadic, and the analytic paternal integrate will evolve through the analyst's *psychic survival-of-the-object* (Abram 2022).

James Strachey, steeped in the nuances of Freud's clinical paradigm, showed that the therapeutic action of psychoanalysis came about through the mutative interpretation that emerged at the 'point of urgency' (Strachey 1934). His advances correlated with Melanie Klein who identified the importance of recognising intense anxiety in the analytic session (Klein 1932). At the critical moment in the session (the 'point of urgency') the analyst's transference interpretation may become effective, provided it is delivered genuinely and at a time when the patient is emotionally engaged in psychic work. The attuned interpretation would thus become mutative and effect psychic change. The main feature of this mutation was that the patient could spontaneously experience the difference between their analyst and their archaic object. In other words, the transferential delusion

could be changed through the mutative interpretation. This constitutes the 'therapeutic action' of psychoanalysis.

The above formulations will be illustrated in reference to the case of K whose violent acting out in the transference led to the analyst's paralysis in the countertransference. The turning point in the analysis emerged through the analyst's psychic work with a third. This psychic event was effected through the analytic paternal integrate (Abram 2022).

Winnicott added to Strachey's proposal of the mutative interpretation by identifying an incremental process of five moments in the parent-infant relationship that facilitated the infant's move from apperception to perception; from object relating to object usage. Key to this process is the mother's ability to psychically survive. This process constitutes psychic *survival-of-the-object*. The infant's experience of the mother's ability to receive their ruthless love, thus, inaugurates an intrapsychic surviving object. Here, I will propose that the intrapsychic surviving object - by which I mean the internalised psychic representation of the mother's capacity to endure psychic challenges - is at the heart of the Self's authority.

In the analysing situation, the analyst's authority, essentially has to include the ability to receive the powerful layers of the transference at all developmental stages that allow the analysand to distort the analyst's personhood. The analyst must live with the analysand's psychic distortions in the transference, especially when the transference becomes delusional. The analyst's authority will necessarily include failure to survive as the non surviving object appears in the work, from whence an authoritarian super-ego attempts to take over the internal world. This authoritarian turn does not emanate from the death instinct but rather from a relational phenomenon I identify as *non-survival-of-the-object*, that refers to the failure of the mother's ability to psychically survive.

The analytic paternal integrate evolves from the analyst's analytic *third-in-mind* akin to, and connected with, the analytic paternal imago. This will stimulate the analysand's unevolved paternal integrate that may be revived through the analysing situation. Once the interpsychic relatedness in the analytic relationship is ignited, through the mutative interpretation, there is a good chance for an experience of authentic psychic

survival-of-the-object. This process has the potential to lead to the Freudian 'momentous step' that may move into the Oedipal dimension.

The origins of psychoanalytic authority in the psychoanalytic treatment, I argue, is thus inaugurated through the analytic paternal integrate. This refers to the process of internalisation in analysis, that reinforces the analysand's intrapsychic surviving object. This means that beyond the analytic treatment the analysand could sustain a continuous Self-development that will enhance an ever-evolving internal authority on all levels of relating.

References

- Abram, J. (2022) *The Surviving Object: psychoanalytic clinical essays on psychic survival-of-the-object* New Library of Psychoanalysis, Routledge
- Freud, S. (1906), Letter dated Dec. 6, 1906, *The Freud/Jung Letters*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974.
- Klein, M. (1932) *The Psychoanalysis of Children: The Writings of Melanie Klein*, Vol. 2. London: Hogarth Press, 1975
- Strachey, J. (1934) The Nature of the therapeutic action of psychoanalysis, *Int J Psychoanal.*, 15: 127 - 159
- Winnicott, DW (1958 [1956]) Primary Maternal Preoccupation in *Through Paediatrics to Psychoanalysis*. London Tavistock.
- Winnicott, DW (1969) The Use of an Object, *Int J Psychoanal.*, 50: 711 - 716

*Training and supervising Analyst of the British Psychoanalytical Society, member of the IPA, President of the European Psychoanalytical Federation; former director of the Squiggle Foundation; member of the Board of the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*.

PLENARY SESSION

ALOUPI Panos*, *Authoritarianism and the ideal*

Freud in the 32nd lecture in the *New introductory lectures on Psycho-analysis* (1933a) includes as the third function of the Superego (Super-ego in the German text) that of the Ideal. Already in *On Narcissism: an introduction* (1914c) he had referred to a psychic agency (Instanz) whose task is to observe the real ego and compare it with an ideal ego. At the same time, in relation to the ideal, the subject traverses a whole course between an ideal that is analogous to the pleasure principle and one which, although it responds to the search for a narcissistic satisfaction, integrates the dynamics of superego prohibitions.

For Pierre Marty, the ideal ego represents the excess, the hubris, and its existence testifies to an incomplete evolution of primary narcissism. In this context, the impossibilities of separation and mourning can create a tyrannical version, which imposes its demands by disavowing castration and otherness.

Michel Fain respectively enriched and described a clinic where the arbitrariness of the ideal is a defensive strategy against the terror of passivity and trauma. It is often a sign of a premature ego with psychic fields of dichotomy, where the unbound death drive with its inherent destructiveness imposes its action.

The ideal ego as a form of ego involves fantasies of omnipotence, precisely where ideal identifications have not contributed to a transformative process of mourning and an acceptance of the sexual otherness of the object. It is imposed as a requirement on the subject for his or her psychic survival and in this way through projection can become a weapon of power and arbitrariness on the other and on society.

In short, the ideal ego is a part of the ego and in relation to the quality and quantity of its participation it is capable - if it does not undergo the consequences of repression - of dominating the ego's mechanisms defensively. This dominance has effects on the one hand on the character and lifestyle of the subject (character neurosis, psychogenic anorexia, borderline cases, psychosomatic disorders) and on the other hand in his/her interactions with the society, where dogmatism in the name of principles and authoritarian and arbitrary positions prevail. On the other side, when the ideal becomes a project of the ego, patience, passivity and a masochism with solidly bound drives are integrated into a course of psychic life, where authority is a source of sublimation and authoritarianism a source of conflict.

Authoritarianism, as a sign of narcissistic fragility and deficit masochism, can certainly concurrently or structurally appear either in the clinical or institutional life of psychoanalysts. In the clinic, it is a phenomenon that is related either to the character of the psychoanalyst himself or to his countertransference in contact with clinical materials that unconsciously or consciously through projective mainly identification raise such positions. In psychoanalytic institutions, personal characteristics can become involved in phases of institutional dysfunction, making authoritarianism a narcissistic way out of a community denial.

The conference will be enriched with patient material and examples in a collective context.

*Full member of the Paris Psychoanalytical Society (SPP) and of the IPA, correspondent member of the Hellenic Psychoanalytical Society, training member and Head of the Paris Institute of Psychosomatics (IPSO Pierre Marty), training member of the Athens Psychosomatic institute (IPSA); member of the *Revue française de Psychosomatique* editorial board.

PANEL

ASSER Ariella*, *The structural role of the concept of ‘authority’ in the analytic Process and in the transmission of psychoanalysis within institutions and within culture*

“Hannah Arendt writes: ‘Authority implies an obedience within which people retain their freedom.’”

Authority is not power, but a force that imposes itself rather than through violence. It is a capacity that structures, as it is by definition in the service of the other. Moreover, for authority to be accepted, the subject who recognizes it must be able to imagine themselves claiming it at some point. Authority is part of a learning process.

We will approach the role of authority within the psychoanalytic process, but also in the transmission of psychoanalysis as both a practice and a code of ethics, and in its dissemination in society, where the notorious “crisis of authority” generates unresolved phenomena of violations and distortions in the social bond.

In Freud’s work, “authority” has been linked from the beginning to the paternal function, which Freud elaborates on in a series of texts until the end of his life: *Leonardo*, *Totem and Taboo*, *Moses*, *Civilization and Its Discontents*, etc. Freud himself is recognized as the founding father of psychoanalysis. We will examine this perspective on authority, synonymous in a way with the paternal function, which separates the child from fusion with the mother and inaugurates culture, prohibitions, and permissibility, ensuring the necessary dimension of transgression. This stands in contrast to authoritarianism, which is a perversion of this function, where order is arbitrary, imposed by impulse or illegitimately by violence, creating submission and fear rather than creative internalization. Authority inspires and guides, whereas authoritarianism commands and represses.

Psychoanalytic work is based on the authority that the analysand grants to the analyst. A grant—or, alternatively, a fantasy—that, over the course of each analysis, will follow the vicissitudes of transference in a transformative process. Authority is approached in psychoanalysis as a psychic process connected with the Oedipus complex and the superego, where the child internalizes the law and paternal ideals, moving from maternal dependence to autonomy and social bonding, highlighting the tension between real authority (power) and legitimate authority (knowledge/symbolic function).

*Member of the Hellenic Psychoanalytical Society and of the IPA

PANEL

**BELL David*, “*Anything is possible and everything is permitted*”.
Psychoanalytic reflections on Hannah Arendt’s “Elements of
totalitarianism”**

Hannah Arendt is perhaps best known for her report of the trial of Adolf Eichmann, Arendt’s book on that trial is subtitled ‘The Banality of Evil’ to draw attention to the idea that these acts were carried out not by passionate monsters who we can think of as extreme and outside ordinary experience but by a mentality that is in many respects frighteningly ordinary, quotidian, in her telling phrase ‘banal’. The administrative machine that designed and managed the concentration camps was, as she saw it, staffed by men whose minds were empty of thought and devoid of passion. The character of Eichmann the bureaucrat provided Arendt with a model of a devastating pathology of the mind - and she insists that such a mind must be appreciated and understood for what it reveals to us of the processes that underlie totalitarianism.

In ‘The Elements of Totalitarianism’, Arendt traces the various historical currents that lead to totalitarianism. Further she carefully examines the elements that constitute what might be called a ‘Totalitarian state of mind’. In this paper I will attempt to show that Hannah Arendt’s analysis of totalitarianism is rich in psychoanalytic content. Her work gives centrality to a process she calls ‘thinking’ a process that acts as a brake on totalitarian states of mind. Her conception of thought and thinking, of the factors that support or oppose it, has a deep kinship with certain contemporary psychoanalytic ideas

principally derived from the work of Bion - this will be further explored in the paper.

*Training and supervising analyst of the British Psychoanalytical Society, former President of the British Psychoanalytic Society; he served also as Director of a specialist service (the Fitzjohn's Unit) at the Tavistock Clinic.

PLENARY SESSION

BLASS Heribert*, *Authority and the psychoanalytic institution*

This lecture begins with an exploration of the concept and definition of authority. It makes sense to start with the ancient Roman distinction between *auctoritas* and *potestas*. *Auctoritas* referred to the dignity and recognition of a person or institutional group (such as the Roman Senate) that was not tied to an office but arose from experience and competence. The influence deriving from recognised knowledge or tradition is exercised without coercion and without formal power. *Potestas*, on the other hand, referred to the authority of an office and the formal, legally binding power associated with it. Authority can thus be attributed both to an individual person and to supra-individual groups of people, institutions, and committees.

Authority is not a common psychoanalytical term, but on closer inspection, the basis for the recognition of authority lies in the outcome of the Oedipal conflict situation.

The resolution of Oedipal conflicts moves between the possible poles of admiration, rebellion, submission or recognised identification with parental figures and images. For the generational hierarchy between parents and children established in the Oedipal situation, the differentiation between authority and power continues to be meaningful.

Analogous to the various possible outcomes of the Oedipal situation, which range from rebellion or acceptance to identification with parental and cultural laws, different attitudes toward authority can be found in politics and the history of ideas. One school of thought sees authority as more closely linked to power and coercion, as well as to restrictions on personal freedoms. This can then lead to the negatively connoted equation of authority with "authoritarianism". Adorno et al.'s (1950) research project on the "Authoritarian Personality" comes to mind.

Another school of thought, represented by Max Weber (1919-1920) and Hannah Arendt (1956), among others, sees authority in a more positive light, e.g. when Max Weber links it to formal legitimacy, or when Hannah Arendt

speaks of "authority in general", which she clearly distinguishes from authoritarianism. "Authority in general" refers to recognition of basic facts of life, such as that a child cannot survive on its own, but needs relationships with both parents and must be able to trust in their authority in order to ensure its own survival. Arendt opposed the equation of authority with coercion, instead placing at the centre of her understanding a hierarchy based on tradition, which also has protective characteristics. Parents who prevent their child from spontaneously running across the street use their authority to protect their child's life and freedom.

In a positive sense, authority and recognition are mutually dependent, as seen in the relationship between generations, for example. The younger generation may rebel against authority it perceives as too powerful, yet at the same time it recognizes and trusts the competence gained by the older generation through experience. This context also includes the connection between authority and the assumption of responsibility. The respective individual characteristics depend, not least, on unconscious Oedipal constellations.

Freud himself had an ambivalent relationship with authority: On the one hand, he considered blind submission to authority detrimental to development, and anti-Enlightenment to follow authority as if under a yoke. On the other hand, when he founded the IPA in 1910 on Ferenczi's advice, together with other psychoanalysts, he himself became an authority, since the IPA was intended to define what psychoanalysis is and what it is not. The tension between encouraging people to question or even reject authority and exercising one's own sometimes powerful authority with a sense of responsibility, runs throughout the history of international psychoanalysis.

The main area of conflict for this tension lies in all psychoanalytic institutes and societies, including the IPA, particularly in the field of psychoanalytic training, which is closely linked to generational responsibility. More than a hundred years after the IPA was founded in 1910 and the Eitingon model was first introduced in 1925, we are faced with the question of whether the authority claimed at that time by a small group of leading figures to define psychoanalysis can still be upheld today. The global spread of psychoanalysis and the IPA has increased cultural diversity, which has tended to reduce the sense of commonality among individual societies while increasing the pursuit of local autonomy. At the same time, there is still a desire for a generally binding orientation regarding the conception of psychoanalysis and training standards, which calls for a central authority to assume responsibility for the elaboration and preservation of the basic principles of psychoanalysis. The question is

whether unity can be achieved amid the diversity of psychoanalytic concepts.

Consequently, we now find ourselves in a field of tension and potential rivalry between local and central authority within the IPA. This tension includes the issue of power. In this lecture, the relationship between central and local authority and the associated question of power will be discussed further. Among other aspects, the following play a role: in conceptual-clinical work, there are still highly respected psychoanalysts and authors who, as individual authority figures, have an influence on the psychoanalytic community. However, they have no formal power. At the institutional level, psychoanalytic bodies should have exclusively democratically legitimised authority. Such authority includes recognition of psychoanalytic tradition, but also openness to new ideas. Mutual recognition between central and local authority in the sense of mutual influence is necessary to enable new developments in clinical practice and theory in psychoanalysis, as well as in the institutional structure of the IPA. At the same time, it is part of the IPA's democratic constitution to grant democratically elected central decision-making bodies, such as the IPA Board or the Psychoanalytic Education Committee, a temporary authority that is essential for cohesion within the IPA.

* Training analyst for adults, children and adolescents of the German Psychoanalytic Association (DPV) and of the IPA. President of the International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA). Former President of the European Psychoanalytical Federation (EPF).

PLENARY SESSION

BOURNOVA Klio*, *The Authority of the psychoanalyst and the meaning of the third*

The international development of psychoanalysis, its theory, and subsequently its institutions, has brought multilingualism to the forefront. Translation gradually becomes not only a vehicle for mechanical transmission and communication but also a field of processing that has taken on the character of a transitional space, from which both questions and difficulties in understanding arise, as well as paths of creativity. The journey of words, of theoretical terms, between languages and cultures, with 'loans', 'counter-loans', or 'translation loans', sometimes leads us down paths toward Babel, and

sometimes to bright, new routes. This is also evident with the term “authority,” which is part of the conference’s theme.

Unfolding in Greek the various aspects of the term authority (or “autorité” in French): power, principle, authority, I chose the word “κύρος” (prestige/validity). “Κύρος” (power, validity...) is the quality of “κύριος,” which in ancient Greek means one who has power, who imposes, who is recognized as sovereign, as the legitimate holder. The origin of the term connects power with law, legitimate possession, and ownership. Thus, the question arises: holder of what object, according to which law, and with what form of power? As the conference’s argument highlights, the concept stands at the crossroads of the subjective and social fields, especially relevant in our times where, on one hand, we observe the decline of the authority of parents, educators, politicians, psychoanalysts, and on the other, we note the increasing tendency not only for the imposition of authoritarian power but also for the demand for authoritarianism from large masses of people. The desire to shake off the authority of the other is intertwined with the need to be ruled. In the subjective field, we can examine the issue of the psychic process toward acquiring authority and its recognition by the object(s), the other, others. This applies to the psychoanalyst both in the context of their work and in the institutional framework.

Freud wrote about the child’s need for the parent to impose authority, linking authority especially with the father, the paternal law, with the ambivalence it raises and the threat of punishment, whose primary, deeper form is the loss of love and protection. Within the framework of the asymmetrical parent-child relationship, the “no” is experienced as an attack and participates in the identification with the aggressor. The oscillation between “no” and “must” expresses the two sides of prohibition and the ideal, which will be invested through the formation of the Superego-Ego Ideal. The fear of losing love will be translated into the fear of losing the love of the Superego. “The credulity of love is an important, if not the deepest, source of authority” (Freud, 1905). This leads us to the relationship between analyst and analysand, where transference is a form of love, and not only that. What is the difference?

If, however, the process of internalizing prohibitions and ideals is intertwined with love and the “overestimation” of the father, the parents, and on the other

hand with the fear of threat, the gradual subjective acquisition presupposes the external but mainly the internal critical conflict and the ability to recognize the father, the parental object, both as “enviable” for what they possess and for their ability to recognize lack, mortality, and law. Thus, the paternal figure—who is symbolically killed and survives—is transformed from the narcissistic father of the primitive horde to the post-Oedipal father who transmits and recognizes the law, representing the symbolic Third and inscribing the offspring into the difference of genders and generations. However, “what you have inherited from your parents you must conquer in order to possess it,” Freud emphasizes, referring to Goethe. Ownership is therefore the result of a psychic process that, paradoxically, does not end even after its completion, as the popular expression for knowledge “to possess letters” suggests. Whether material or symbolic property, the legacy must be conquered within the process of subjectivation, which presupposes the symbolic sacrifice of narcissistic omnipotence and incestuous desire and fascination for the acquisition of self-esteem and self-respect.

The Third, as a psychoanalytic concept, has been developed in various ways by significant post-Freudian analysts. It is associated with the boundaries of the framework, abstaining from sexual relations with patients, the method, theory and rules, reference to the analyst’s analyst, colleagues and trainers, psychoanalytic societies and institutions. It is also defined from another perspective (Ogden) as a creation, each time unique, of the analyst-analysand relationship. Symbolic ancestor or offspring of analysis, “supervisor above” as superego (Donnet) or transitional field, the Third appears as a bearer of separation, connection, and creativity, but also as a container and guarantor of the process in the analyst-analysand relationship.

For the psychoanalyst, the process of “conquering” the Freudian legacy for the recognition of their authority is codified by psychoanalytic societies through the so-called “sufficiently advanced personal psychoanalysis,” through various forms of supervision, theoretical education, and symbolic “exposure to Cithaeron” as initiation, which rekindle regressive movements, transference investments, positive and negative, and test the basic supports of the ego, with the risk of raising narcissistic defenses with corresponding anti-analytic resistances such as fixation on idealization, mass projections, or creation of

pseudo-ego adaptation. Despite Lacan's fundamental differentiation regarding the training model, his position was "the psychoanalyst receives approval from themselves and from a few others," certainly not from themselves alone.

In the session, the authority initially credited to the analyst by the analysand is largely the result of transference; it does not personally belong to the analyst. Theory may nourish, in the form of theorization, the continuous repression of primary processes, but the analyst's unconscious psychic function is involved, in any case, in the analysand's unconscious function.

The session is the field where the analyst "conquers" the legacy of their personal psychoanalysis and training through the capacity for symbolization, tertiary processes (Green, 1972), where, as with transference, what hinders the process becomes a basic tool for its development. A clinical example of a critical moment during a session allows us to process these hypotheses.

There is no analytic process without critical moments and turns in the transference and countertransference relationship. The authenticity of the immediate and current experience of the two protagonists tests the analyst's capacity for symbolization. In these crisis situations, the recognition of the validity of the method and the authority of the analyst is tested.

* Member of the Société Psychanalytique de Paris (SPP), of the Groupe Lyonnais de Psychanalyse Rhône-Alpes (GLP-RA), and of the IPA, active member of the European Society for Psychoanalysis of Children and Adolescents (SEPEA); member of the Editorial Board of the *Revue française de psychanalyse*; teaches at the École Psychanalytique de Paris (EPP).

PANEL

CHERVERT Bernard*, *Transference of authority and psychic growth*

Any request for analysis is driven by a transference that it puts into action. The notion of transference is generally conceived as a repetition of relationships to the objects of early childhood, these cathexes having two destinies, that of direct sexual satisfactions and that of identificatory constructions, the two being able to combine or substitute for each other.

Such a conception of transference is relevant and restricted. In fact, everything that takes place within the psychic functioning from birth is transferred to the

external world according to different lineages, directly sexual, identificatory, but also anti-traumatic. The efficiency of psychic processes requires such a detour to the outside. The potentiality of psychic processes to become efficient must first be transposed to tangible objects of perception. This time of psychic animism is essential for this efficiency to occur. In a second step, they will carry out the various modalities of psychic work in which they are involved, no longer using perceptions of the external world but the representations forged from them.

This complexity is present in any request for psychoanalytic treatment, each of these lineages being privileged according to the clinical state of the patient turning to a psychoanalyst. This plurality of vertices present in any request for psychoanalytic treatment is implied within the notion of *Nebenmensch*, this *other close human*, close in his physical proximity and in his mental functioning. This other close human being offers himself to the child from birth as a transposition support essential to his growth. An enigma concerns this transposition mechanism and the varying ability of children to transpose their own potential processuality onto an adult transposition support. These present themselves to him and encourage him to use them, to carry out such a transposition. This dynamic also unfolds during psychoanalytic treatments, and is then designated by the term transference.

In every child, there is a real quest for transposition that brings together the three vertices mentioned above found in the very definition of the *Nebenmensch*, an object of satisfaction, an object of hostility, and a power that helps.

The introduction of the notion of "power" refers to a relationship to the psychic instances of the persons who support transposition. It announces the future instance of the superego, which is in fact involved from the beginning in the form of an imperative of transposition and inscription, indispensable for "growing" and for developing. This power emanating from the psyche of this other close person is offered to the child and attracts to it the latter's quest.

It defines the function of parent fulfilled by characters who are in authority for the child insofar as they promote the initial transposition essential to the child's psychic growth, and allow him to grow by raising him, to follow his psychic growth. These powers respond to the negating tendencies that exist within the psyche, tendencies designated by Freud by the expression *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, and which designate the most elementary quality of all drives, their tendency to return to a previous state, even to the inorganic, to the lifeless. This extinctive regressivity specific to drives is at the origin of traumatic experiences.

This aspect is taken up by Freud when he approaches collective psychology as a necessary regressive solution for the treatment of traumatic experiences, or even as a distortion of psychic functioning seeking to dodge them. The process necessary for growth can be interrupted along the way and follow such a distortion. Identification then becomes an alienation.

Taking into account extinctive regressiveness and the imperative of inscription modifies the way of thinking about the three previous vertices. These are the consequence of a function whose mission is to use extinctive tendencies in the service of the inscription of mentalization. They therefore remain concerned by these negative tendencies which risk at any time limiting the growth and development of the psyche according to the three lineages, objectal, narcissistic and anti-traumatic.

Freud approached this aspect through the *primary identification with the father*, with the parents, *of personal prehistory*, a direct and immediate identification that takes place before any cathexes of objects.

This founding inaugural transposition can be approached in terms of a transference of authority. Newborns, and then patients as reminiscences, have the intuition that a transposition onto another, to which they attribute and grant the ability to counter negative tendencies, is capable of supporting the immobilization of these tendencies, and of allowing access to a psychic growth integrating these tendencies for their benefit. The transference of authority therefore consists in mutating a potentiality into an actuality thanks to such a transposition of this potentiality onto the psyche of another who has been attributed the ability to promote this growth. This primary dynamic is therefore more than an identification, it is a use of a tangible perceptible reality, of a psychic functioning whose efficiency is transmitted by tangible acts, early care and interpretation. This transference of authority takes place under the aegis of an imperative of inscription that allows the restraint and integration of instinctual motions and the construction of identifications resulting from the desexualization of a part of the sexual investments of the body and objects.

This primary anti-traumatic identification is therefore primitively primary and secondary and is defined by this constraint of transposition, by this imperative of inscription which responds in a vital way for the psyche to the extinctive regressivity proper to drives, tendencies to extinction even before any inscription.

We can therefore envisage that there is a conflict between the transference of authority as we have defined it, such as a grant to an external person having a tangibility, to whom is granted the value of a power that helps the psyche to develop and settle, and the distortions of the identificatory dynamic, the main

one being that of the authoritarianism found in everyone's collective psychology, which tends to take root in groups in the form of totalitarianism.

*Training and supervising analyst, and former President, of the Paris Psychoanalytic Society (SPP), former Director of the Congress of French-Speaking Psychoanalysts, former representative to the IPA Board and to the Executive Committee (ExCom) of the IPA.

PLENARY SESSION

GKORINIS Andreas*, *Rumors and gossip: the hidden dynamics of authoritarianism in psychoanalytic institutions*

The transition from authority to authoritarianism passes through power and, quite often, violence.

The space of psychoanalytic institutions is marked by the creation of highly emotional and dense relations among their members of a brotherly and oedipal nature.

This context paves the way for the development of intense transference and countertransference bonds as well as of identification and regressive movements, which promote the emergence of authoritarian tendencies.

The expected obedience to authority, the intolerance towards anything that deviates from what is deemed the accepted norm, and the distrust and disbelief towards critical thinking are some of these tendencies.

Within the psychoanalytic institutions, authoritarianism is often openly manifested. A classic example would be the marginalization and exclusion from psychoanalytic education and training of a theoretical school of thought based on the assumption that 'this is not psychoanalysis'. More often, however, the dynamics of authoritarianism are hidden.

In this paper, we shall attempt to show that gossip and rumor-spreading are hidden practices of authoritarianism within the psychoanalytic institutions. Gossip, although considered a benevolent way of social bonding, may take on a malignant turn, intending to harm someone's personal reputation or discredit and belittle a group of people.

When gossip gets out of hand and beyond the boundaries of a small group of people and is spread indiscreetly as rumors, it can assume uncontrollable dimensions. Its original content can be distorted, and it may lead to the creation of a new reality, a neo-reality.

The study of gossip and rumor-spreading within big groups of people like the psychoanalytic institutions, concerns not only the singularity of the individuals involved in these processes but also the group dynamics that evolve within the

institutions, which are especially vulnerable to any attempt at disturbing their established balance.

A main feature of the function of the psychoanalytic institutions is the management of the phantasy of the primal scene.

The peculiarity of the analyst-analysand relationship marked by abstinence and confidentiality and the hierarchical structure of the psychoanalytic institutions contributes to the creation of conditions wherein the forcing open of the closed door, that is, the enactment, becomes possible thanks to the seduction exercised by the authority figure which possesses the secret (real or intentionally invented) and the voyeuristic preparedness of the person who receives the disclosure of the secret.

Gossip and rumor-spreading take place in an atmosphere of perverse excitement which is promoted by the sender of the rumors, who aims at belittling individuals or groups of people within the psychoanalytic institution, as well as by the receiver-target of the rumors.

Of particular importance is the role of the bystanders who follow from a short distance the evolution of the sadomasochistic relationship between perpetrator and victim, contributing through their silence or even more rumor-spreading, to the maintenance of the aforementioned pathological relationship, thus becoming additional indirect perpetrators.

Rumor-spreading and malignant gossip result in affirming established beliefs within the institution they reinforce among the members the feeling of belonging together through the marginalization and exclusion of those who are unwanted and solidify the power of the dominant group.

This results in psychoanalytic institutions deviating from their mission.

The seeking out of truth and the transmission of psychoanalysis to the coming generations are disrupted, and the institutions are led to repeated crises and, quite often, to splitting along sectarian lines.

*Member of the Hellenic Psychoanalytical Society and of the IPA.

PANEL

HADJIANNI-STEPHANATOU Tessa*, *Alienation to the desire and thought of the other*

In my presentation, I will explore the condition where authority ceases to be something that is bestowed, attributed, and recognized — something necessary for the psychic development of the subject but also for the formation of a society

— and is transformed into a process where power over others is sought and demands submission rather than recognition, often resulting in the alienation of the individual. My main reference will be the thinking of Piera Aulagnier, who in her book *Les destins du plaisir* (1979) devotes a section to the subject of the psychic alienation of the subject through the idealization of an "authority," thus sacrificing their own personal thoughts and desires. Aulagnier borrowed the concept of alienation, a primarily philosophical concept (Hegel-Marx), from Lacan in order to explore it in a psychoanalytical way, broadening its meaning. Alienation concerns both the social and the individual spheres. It is a process that primarily concerns thought and can lead to various clinical forms, mainly "passionate states" but also various addictions. What is the goal of those who desire alienation, what psychic conflicts lie hidden and are marginalized when one person's desire for alienation meets another's desire for self-alienation? Alienation appears initially as a failure of the subject to perform the work of desidealization with regard to the childhood image inherited from parental narcissism and parental ideals. We will also examine the common elements between the various forms of alienation and perversion, which mainly concern the defense mechanisms of splitting and denial. I will also refer in this presentation to M. Aisenstein, who has dealt extensively with the subject of "obedience" and "conformism" (*De l'obéissance*, 2001) and in some respects, in my opinion, it coincides with Aulagnier's thinking. Aisenstein also believes that "submission" to the desires of others mainly concerns the elimination of thought and representational work and the destruction of mental work more generally, something which, in her opinion, cannot be explained by reference to the death drive alone, but requires, in order to be understood, reference to the splitting of the ego introduced by Freud in 1938 in his text *An Outline of Psychoanalysis*. Aisenstein considers that early splittings of the ego are the main factor leading to denial, submission to authority, loss of the ability to think in terms of "ego," as well as the loss of the mental ability to use negation. Finally, the issue of the alienating relationship or the relationship of submission (conformism) will be addressed in the analytical relationship, where the forced asymmetry of the analyst-analysand relationship may favor such phenomena.

References

- Aisenstein M. (2001). *De l'obéissance. Libres Cahiers pour la Psychanalyse* 2001, 4, 93-97.
 Αϊζενστάιν-Αβέρωφ Μ. (2014), Η καταστροφή της σκέψης, στο *Επιθυμία, Πόνος, Σκέψη*, εκδ. Αγρα, σειρά «Ρουζ», σσ. 157-197
 Aulagnier P. (1979), *Les destins du plaisir. Aliénation, amour, passion*. Paris, PUF, coll. « Le fil rouge »
 Freud S. (1938) *Abrégé de psychanalyse, Négation*.
 Freud S. (1921), *Ψυχολογία των μαζών και ανάλυση του Εγώ*, εκδ. Πλέθρον

* Full member of the Hellenic Psychoanalytical Society and of the IPA, member of the Society for the Psychoanalytic Study of Adolescence “ENIVOS”; co-editor of the *Hellenic Psychoanalytical Review* of the HPS.

PLENARY SESSION

HATZOPOULOS Thanassis*, *Beyond knowledge and its enforcement*

Knowledge constitutes a basic issue at stake in the psychoanalytic treatment. It isn't merely that many patients come along referring to the sessions as “lessons”, but that from Freud to Lacan and Winnicott the references to ignorance and knowledge are steady. Moreover, Freud's hysterical patients taught him how much they suffered from the passion of ignorance and transferred to him in this paradoxical manner a knowledge and, indeed, one which involved the unconscious. As, therefore, the analyst finds himself in the position of a quasi-authority who “supposedly knows” and the transference develops based on this, he needs to abstain from any form of identification with such a position, while at the same time needing to accept it, though as a knowledge of his ignorance and the approach of the unconscious, where only that, the Id, together with the unconscious sides of the Ego the and Superego, can know. Whatever knowledge, therefore, needs to remain in part as a possibility, otherwise the dangers of authoritarianism and its enforcement in the analytic framework are present, with analysts being particularly vulnerable towards it. But a similar position of infliction in a social environment increasingly traversed by authoritarian tendencies can easily lead to a constitutional famine also set into motion by the blindness of the authorities who are transformed into modern-day Oedipus's preparing catastrophes

*Member of the Société de Psychanalyse Freudienne (SPF), President of the Association Greek Psychoanalytic Space D. W. Winnicott and member of the International Winnicott Association (IWA).

PANEL

JACKSON Dimitris- James*, *The authority of the analyst. The question of the power within the psychoanalytic encounter*

This paper explores the nature of authority in the psychoanalytic encounter, distinguishing between genuine analytic authority and authoritarian power. It traces the evolution from Freud's one-person psychology to contemporary two-person perspectives that emphasize mutual influence and shared creation of meaning. The analyst's authority is understood as a reflective, containing function rooted in awareness of his countertransference rather than control. The paper examines how asymmetry within the analytic relationship can be misperceived as domination but serves the analytic process when used appropriately. Drawing on object relations, Kleinian, and post-Kleinian thought, it reframes authority as the capacity to sustain the analytic function during breakdowns. The oedipal framework is revisited through Steiner's concepts of paranoid and depressive solutions, leading to the image of the "benevolent father." A detailed clinical vignette illustrates the interplay of envy, dependence, and authority in the transference. The paper concludes that true analytic authority arises from the analyst's capacity for containment, truthfulness, and 'learning from experience'.

* Training and supervising analyst at the Hellenic Psychoanalytical Society, Guest member of the British Psychoanalytical Society, member of the IPA; former board member and European representative of the IPA, currently Co-chair of the Int. New Groups of the IPA; former Editor the *Greek Annual of the IJP*.

PLENARY SESSION

KADYROV Igor M.*, *Super-ego tyrannus*

The title of this paper "Super-Ego Tyrannus" alludes to the original title of Sophocles' play – 'Oedipus Tyrannus' – better known by its Latinised, though generally accurate, but not entirely precise, version – 'Oedipus Rex'. The terms *rex* and *tyrannus* are closely related and applicable to Oedipus, particularly in their dramatic/tragic dimension. Both of them are referring to a supreme ruler

(chieftain, overlord, king, etc.) in the era of the ancient poleis and beyond. However, the key divergence lies in the ways this supreme position and its power are acquired and maintained: - grounded on legitimate within a particular *politeia* foundations (e.g., election or heritage) for the former; and illegitimate – extending from mildly extra-legal to outright criminal and violent coercion - for the latter. These two modes of ascending to and retention of the supreme position and power—one based on legitimacy and the other on tyrannical coercion—may offer various implications for the two later subjects and the two core foci of our conference - authority and authoritarianism.

In the *inner world* (Riviere, 1952) or within what Freud called "the anatomy of mental personality" (Freud, 1933) the supreme seat and the role of judging and governing institution, located 'in a higher region of the mind' (Freud, 1923), have been assigned to the psychic "institution" known as the super-ego. That is to the "psychical agency" which, in Freud's words, "observes the ego, gives it orders, judges it and threatens it with punishments... We call this agency the super-ego and are aware of it in its judicial functions as our conscience" (Freud, 1938). However, under certain unfavorable situations, this supreme position can become usurped by hostile and murderous internal objects. Having seized the seat of moral and other forms of judgment, this configuration of extreme and dangerous internal objects (Klein, 1958) —described as the Ego-Destructive Super-Ego (Bion, Britton), the abnormal Super-Superego (O'Shaughnessy), or in this paper as the *Super-Ego Tyrannus* (Kadyrov)—imprison and mercilessly crush the creative and reparative capacities of the ego. Drawing on clinical material from analytic work with various patients, this paper will offer a detailed examination of the formation and functioning of this malignant structure (the Super-Ego Tyrannus), some defensive organisations it instigates, its various manifestations in the transference-countertransference, and the difficulties and possibilities inherent in understanding and interpreting them within the analytic session. The paper will additionally touch upon some manifestations and offer an initial understanding of certain social counterparts of this type of super-ego as they get manifested and operate within the current social domain.

* Training and supervising analyst of the Moscow Psychoanalytic Society, president of this Society, guest Member of the British Psychoanalytical Society, member of the IPA; Director of the Han Groen Prakken European Psychoanalytic Institute – EPI; Associate Professor at the Lomonosov University.

PLENARY SESSION

KAPSAMBELIS Vassilis*, *Authority and authoritarianism in psychoanalytically oriented psychiatric institutions*

The psychiatric reform movements of the 1950s and 1960s in the Western world were actively supported by psychoanalysts of the time, especially in countries like France. This support led to the creation of numerous therapeutic institutions (inpatient units, day hospitals, community consultation centers, etc.) that were more or less inspired by psychoanalytic theory. Many of these institutions are still operating today, allowing for a broad view of how they have evolved after several decades of practice.

The Beginnings

Historically, these reformist initiatives were deeply rooted in an anti-authoritarian logic (giving patients a voice, freeing up the speech of caregivers, etc.). In the context of psychiatric hospitals in the 1950s and 1960s, the reforms brought significant improvements in the condition of mentally ill patients and in the thoughtful participation of the entire caregiving staff in the collective effort. However, in practice, these reforms were themselves carried out under a new kind of authority—embodied by psychoanalysts—and tended to create a new “ideology.” Despite the risks associated with this, which we will explore further, the reforms were accompanied by substantial training efforts for caregivers (seminars, courses in psychoanalytic psychopathology, supervision of clinical practices, and exchanges between caregivers and patients, etc.).

Several practitioners became what were referred to as “psychoanalysts without couch”, according to the title of a well-known book of the time by Racamier and al. These orientations gave rise to a generation of caregivers who could hold an important role in treatment, different from and complementary to that of the physician. This shift was decisive: for the first time, psychiatry—thanks to psychoanalysis—recognized the importance of moving beyond dual

relationship with psychotic patients, and the therapeutic value of “being-two” (otherness) in front of the psychotic patient (Kapsambelis).

The Theory of Practice

Institutional practice was obviously very different from classical psychoanalysis, just as the patients (psychotics, borderline cases, etc.) were quite different from those who typically seek out psychoanalysts in private practice. Thus, the psychoanalysts involved in these settings had to emphasize previously overlooked aspects of psychoanalytic practice. These aspects mainly concern the role and place of the object, making authors like Ferenczi (for classical references) and Winnicott (for the second half of the 20th century) key influences on these practices.

Several key concepts emerged, such as “speaking action” (Racamier), “shared reality” (Cahn), “institutional third” (Green), and others, sometimes as extensions of Ferenczi’s “active techniques.” Gradually, the “care institution” ceased to be defined by its building or physical walls, and instead became embodied in the caregiving staff itself. This transformation renewed reflections on the relationship between setting (frame) and process, and on distinctions between “care” (a concept inspired by Federn’s work) and psychoanalytic therapy proper. The therapeutic team community was seen as the “container” of patient’s anxieties and psychotic projections (Bion), this containment allowing more specific treatments.

However, many institutions failed to overcome issues of chronicity and inseparability with psychotic patients, revealing the limits of psychoanalytic treatment (as any therapeutic approach) with these pathologies.

Governance and Issues of Authority

In these psychoanalytically-oriented institutions, psychoanalysis held a position of authority. However, naturally, this authority could only be exercised by individuals—psychoanalysts or at least psychiatrists adhering to psychoanalytic thought. Consequently, this authority often slid into authoritarianism, in much the same way that a theory can degenerate into ideology.

In the 1970s, the term *psychanalysm* emerged to describe this drift of psychoanalysis into a dominant ideology. Several authors (Racamier, Hochmann, Castel) described how a psychoanalytically-oriented care

institution could slip into practices of power, influence, or even control and mastering over its members and patients. These phenomena were particularly common in institutions created in the 1960s and 1970s by a single individual (or a small group of founders), who considered themselves to be missionaries. Their principles gave the institution its coherence—principles that, retrospectively, could be seen as a kind of original violence (Kaës).

The Institution's Objects

Psychiatric reform and the innovations introduced by psychoanalysts significantly increased the institutional staff's investment (cathexis) in its work. But what was the object of this investment? The patient, certainly—but not without the risks of dependency or even mastering. More precisely—and in the best cases—the care itself was the main object of this investment. But also, the institution itself, thanks to the important developments required for its transformation.

Viewed as a living organism, the institution had to balance its investments between an *objectal pole* (its patients, its work) and a *narcissistic pole* (investment in the institution itself) (Kapsambelis). This narcissistic pole manifested in an increase in meetings, sometimes excessive elaboration of team dynamics, care techniques, and detailed indications and contraindications. Without renewal—whether in therapeutic techniques or in the patient population—there is a tendency for the narcissistic pole to absorb more and more of the institution's investments. This shift contributes to institutional decline and eventual death.

The Death of Institutions

If institutions are “organisms”, it is reasonable to expect them to undergo birth, peak, and death. But what are the causes of death for these psychoanalytically-inspired institutions of the 1960s and 1970s?

A study of this question leads to three types of institutional death: murder, mummification, and euthanasia (Kapsambelis). These various deaths reflect the current situation of psychoanalytically-oriented care institutions that emerged from the major reform movements of the 1950s and 1960s.

In an era where psychoanalysis no longer holds the cultural hegemony it once did, the psychoanalytically-oriented institutions that continue to live and evolve are those that have managed to overcome the legacy of their founding

fathers—essentially performing a symbolic “*murder of the father*”—and the authoritarianism inherent in their “mission” concerning psychoanalysis in psychiatry and mental health care.

* Full member of the Société Psychanalytique de Paris (SPP) and of the IPA; editor-in-chief of the *Revue française de Psychanalyse*.

PANEL

LEONOFF Arthur*, *Reflections on the IPA authority*

IPA authority is the stitching that holds together the coat of many colours that is the IPA. Preserving this core identity is deemed existential in the organization and a sacred trust. Problems in governance can often be traced to IPA authority itself. The purpose of this paper is to examine IPA authority: its history, nature, evolution, and relation to the IPA “standard” for training new analysts. The specific challenge of the IPA to represent this standard while simultaneously encompassing all of the social, cultural, political and economic realities of its members is examined. Two vectors are highlighted: psychoanalysis as method and psychoanalysis as identity. The author differentiates between training requirements and standards and perceives a confusion between the two that underlies much of the governance conflict extant in the IPA today. There is a need to move beyond requirements as a singular focus to a deeper understanding of the IPA standard, including the formative process, and how these can be addressed across the diversity of theoretical schools, regions and traditions within the IPA. Protecting IPA authority is deemed an essential goal and gateway to organisational consensus.

* Training and supervising analyst of the Canadian Psychoanalytic Society, member of the IPA, Honorary member of the American Psychoanalytic Association; former Chair of International New Groups in the IPA.

PLENARY SESSION

MANOLOPOULOS Sotiris*, *Oedipus Tyrannus*. "The human tragedy of knowledge"

1. Sophocles, with his tragedy of *Oedipus Tyrannus*, has placed in our polis and in our thinking the unthinkable: the fusion and confusion of the boundaries of time and space, of fantasy and reality, of ignorance and knowledge, of omnipotence and its loss, of chance and necessity. He presented the impasses, the misfortunes, the coincidences, the daemonic ambiguities of fate, and the tragic paradoxes of the outcome of the emerging subject's course, as he struggles to know his self. Charles Segal called it the human tragedy of knowledge. Mortals, caught up in mortal time, are desperately seeking for meaning: they try to unravel the mysteries of the past, and comprehend the present. The sophist Gorgias, who taught rhetoric, said that in tragedy, the deceiver is more just than the non-deceiver, and the deceived is wiser than the non-deceived. Aristotle defines tragedy in terms of the effects (fear and pity) it brings upon the spectators. Tragedy is an emotional, authentic experience that is interpreted (given meaning to) by the spectator through his fantasy. There is always in tragedy a tension between meaning and emotion, illusion and reality, authority and authoritarianism. Tragedy makes the world real. It is not a narration, it is a staging of the myth – with action and words of real people with felt bodies – that unravels on stage, in real time and space. We extract meaning from the experience we live, with the interpretations we give. Thus, reality becomes a human finding.
2. When man has not achieved the tragic position, he creates a real "tragedy" in the external reality, as a defense with which he splits (at the same time recognising and denying), the painful knowledge in his actions and his body. Time, ultimately, caught up with Oedipus (revealed him), as the Chorus said. The tragic position begins with the emergence of the subject that is integrated and also integrates the knowledge of the finite human space and time (the knowledge of mortality). The tragic position is an integration (of painful conflicts, drives, phantasies, emotions, object relations) of psychic life. It lies beyond the depressive and the schizoid-paranoid position, and much like them it generates experience. The tragic position becomes dramatically clear in adolescence, when the subject emerges with a new sexual and aggressive body

that can make the childhood fantasies reality. Also, the tragic position becomes dramatically clear in those who commit a crime in reality, in order to give substance to the vague sense of guilt that they have not adequately represented and internalised. Oedipus was an adolescent when he arrived at the forked road (*schiste odos*, *σχιστή οδός*) and fatally confronted his father. He begins to defend against, and struggle to know his self as a mortal being; he begins to give meaning, to suffer, and to discover human suffering. The suffering brought to him by Apollo. Ultimately, however, it is his own responsibility. He is the subject of his experience, of its meaning, and of its history. He had the ultimate choice: He blinded himself. He recognised that his life, up to that point, was founded in a terrible illusion. He decided to drastically alter its course. No one knows what is going to happen in the end.

3. Oedipus collided with his father in the crossroads of the *schiste odos*, where temporality (the story of the beginning of time, of the primal scene) meets the atemporal (present) on its way to the future (death, the end of time). Space is three-dimensional from the beginning of life. From the geography of the triple crossroad, Oedipus created a point of view. Henceforth things do not simply happen to him. Everything happens within an unconscious organization that renders him capable to live the experience with an awareness of its meaning, to experience it as real. Henceforth everything that happens becomes a necessity (Fotos Politis). It follows a personal pattern that is also communal. No life in Greek tragedy is only private. Henceforth recognition means self-knowledge, where with every emergence of new meaning, the self painfully emerges as a subject that thinks and assumes responsibility for its thoughts and actions. Oedipus, the bearer of “ancient evil” (*archaeon kakon*, *ἀρχαῖον κακόν*), of the ancient wound of the feet, becomes - from the helplessness of infancy – the one who knows (*oeda*, *οἶδα*) and counts the feet (*pous*, *πούς*), and who solves the Sphynx’s riddle. He is also the one who knows the place (*oeda*, *οἶδα*, *to know*) (*pou*, *που*, *where*). Mental abilities give the sovereign subject power, authority. Free choice now takes the place of necessity, of fate (Freud). The extreme negative of knowledge (*gnosis*, *γνώσις*) is despair (*apognosis*, *ἀπόγνωσις*), the stripping of meaning, the loss of purpose and of orientation. That is what fuels authoritarianism, which like the Sphynx, does not allow us to think. In contrast, authority is an element of the true self that creates and lives an authentic experience as a sovereign subject that presents it in public and thinks it, autonomously with others. Authority implies one’s passion to be

a subject, and the passion to think. Authoritarianism is an element of the false self that has not become an autonomous subject that thinks, but instead fights from the outside with omniscience (a defense against learning from experience), with stupidity and arrogance (Bion) to avoid becoming a subject of – to defend against – the painful self-knowledge. Oedipus' tragedy concerns the boundaries of the subject's knowledge and sovereignty, and the hubris that we commit when we abolish them.

*Training and supervising analyst, child analyst, member of the Hellenic Psychoanalytical Society and of the IPA, former Director of training and President of the Hellenic Psychoanalytical Society.

PLENARY SESSION

MILLER Patrick*, When Superego is in the service of the death drive

I am watching, with great concern, an evolution in our ways of thinking in our contemporary Kultur, towards more and more concreteness and a growing incapacity for metaphors, symbolization, psychic transformation, uncertainty, negative capability and reality testing. The Geistigkeit, the life of the mind, seems to be more and more dominated by convictions rather than by interrogations, an authoritarian need to warp reality in order to protect ideological certainties from being challenged. The fundamental difference between authority, based on learning from experience and scientific knowledge, and authoritarianism, based on the will to forcefully impose a neo-reality in order to forbid free thinking, fades away. Progressively the capacity to learn and to keep an open mind diminishes and totalitarian mindsets gain ground. What is now called Cancel Culture is a frightening example, all the more frightening because it thinks of itself as "progressive".

Psychoanalysis is not immune to this trend. We can observe that it is already being attacked from the inside, especially in North America, where it is deeply infiltrated by such ideologies as gender ideology, DEI (diversity, equity and inclusion), intersectionality, decolonialism, queer ideology, "wokism". The import into psychoanalytic thinking, of notions that belong to political activism are detrimental to the specificity and singularity of the psychoanalytic approach to psychic suffering and to the unique way in which the analytic method

necessitates deep transformations in the analyst's mind to be able to listen to the patient with an analytic stance.

Freud's thinking was deeply rooted in the universalism of the Enlightenment. The deconstructionist Post-Modernism, had eroded the universal values of many of Freud's concepts such that we may end up some day with a re-education therapy in the guise of psychoanalysis.

My starting point, and main focus, will be on the relation between the denial of reality, and especially of the violence of reality, as avoidance of psychic pain, and the breeding of totalitarian mindsets and what I call unthinking phenomena.

I wish to question an unconscious collective pact which, by wanting to get rid of unbearable realities, gives way to a neo-reality where the radical undoing and unthinking of historical reality and of memory traces can be facilitated by the digitalizing of the human mind and reshape our normal human madness into an intangible normality of body and mind that doesn't beg any question anymore.

* Training and supervising analyst and former president of the Société Psychanalytique de Recherche et de Formation (S.P.R.F), member of the IPA and of the Center for Advanced Psychoanalytical Studies (CAPS, Princeton).

PLENARY SESSION

PADAR Pinar*, *Daughters of God*

With the digital revolution following the industrial one, the world is once again undergoing profound change. Like the strong-willed heroine of Sophocles' *Antigone*, we are facing a transition from the old world to the new. The post-truth politics of this new era drag people into a wasteland or heaven where there is no space for critical reflection on what it means to be humane. I believe it is essential to examine the unconscious processes at work in these transitional times, when the boundaries of the psychic apparatus blur and the braid of drives eager to unravel. In this presentation, I'd like to explore how the regressive politics of authoritarian states attack the human mind, and how conservative politics have created a pathological space for the "daughters of the gods" as guardians of authority—a phenomenon I observed in my own practice.

Reference

Freud, S. (1930). Civilization and its discontents. Standard Edition. *London: Hogarth Press*, 21, 59-145.

* Training and supervising analyst of the Istanbul Psychoanalytic Association, member the IPA.

PANEL

PANAGIOTOPOULOU Ioanna*, *Authority and authoritarianism: compromise and provocation of the psychic conflict? The paradox of the object's role*

The role of the object is intrinsic to the nexus linking authority and authoritarianism with conflictuality within psychic reality. Authority, as an aspect of the object's function, operates as a process tending toward the formation of compromises in psychic conflict. Conversely, the authoritarian stance of the object constitutes an act that provokes conflict. These notions govern the functioning of the object within intersubjective and intrapsychic processes and transformations, in the transgenerational transmission of the superego, in the development of the psyche, and in the appropriation and working through of psychic pain.

* Full member of the Hellenic Psychoanalytical Society and of the IPA.

PANEL

PAPAGEORGIU Marina*, *Authority of the Superego and authenticity of the affect. Antigone's choice*

In *The Interpretation of Dreams*, Freud states that "affect is always right". However, the truth and authenticity of the affect is not immediate and given, since affect can be lied to, hidden or disguised to bypass censorship through the mechanisms of repression, displacement and transference. In the first Topography, affect as one is juxtaposed to representation, these two distinct destinies of the drive follow different paths.

In the second Topography, affect results from the complexe transformations of the drive, it is, like representation, one of the two psychic representatives of the drive. According to Green, they are initially mixed and differentiate according to the mentalization of the drive.

I argue that this differentiation and authenticity of affect is linked to the quality of the Superego that will take the place of censorship. The Superego as an authority that prohibits and protects, is perfected by the subsequent incorporation of the Oedipal paternal Superego. Like affect, it has its roots in the id, but a part of it belongs to the ego, mainly in what has to do with the legibility, recognition, and containment of affects, that is, with the quality of the psychic conflict, not as an impulse discharge but as an indicator of the quality of the psychic process. This connection is intrapsychic but also under constant questioning in the transference as to the authority of the analyst and the authenticity of the psychic constructions.

Freud describes in *Moses and Monotheism* that the victory of the Ego over the Id, as a renunciation of desire and instinctual satisfaction, requires as a price a narcissistic reward from the Superego, and here the relationship with the ideal enters. The Superego becomes the measure of the ideal that protects against tyranny, megalomania or emotional shrinkage. Antigone's tragic dilemma describes not a conflict between desire and the Superego but between the human law of the state and the unwritten law of the gods and the family, whose disconnection within the history of the Theban cycle brings about annihilation but also a final attempt at connection.

*Member of the Société Psychanalytique de Paris (SPP) and of the IPA, training analyst at the Institut de Psychosomatique IPSO–Pierre Marty; she served as an editor of the *Revue française de psychanalyse* and as editor and Editor-in-Chief of the *Revue française de psychosomatique*.

PANEL

PAPAZOGLU Eleni*, *We (almost) always know more about Oedipus than he does himself... Three starting points for a dialogue*

1. In the ancient world –a world free from the authority (and power) of the written/sacred texts– there is no such thing as the ‘authentic’ myth: the myth is its versions. Thus, an interesting dynamic between expectation and surprise is created for the ancient spectator. If knowledge is a form of power –power of the Self over the world, but also over the Self– the tragic scene invites the spectators to ‘unlearn the world’ (as the poet would say). This loss leads them to a liminality that is difficult to bear in real life. But in the theatrical context, this is precisely what fascinates them.

In *OT*, however, Sophocles sets up the plot in such a way that we know (and predict) more than Oedipus himself. This is true for most of the play. However, in the finale, we identify completely with his ignorance: Creon refuses to exile him, as Oedipus urgently (almost authoritatively) demands, trying to retain a kind of control/power/knowledge over the future/himself. Denying him even the slightest power, Creon declares mortal ignorance and seeks divine knowledge: he announces that he will seek a new oracle to see what must be done from now on.

Thus, Sophocles refuses to give a *closure* to his play. The action ends abruptly and asymmetrically, with the anticipation of a 'blind' future. Oedipus is led back to the cursed house: the most shocking sight of the theatrical spectacle is withdrawn into the darkness of the stage building. And the outcome of the dramatic myth remains pending. So does our own knowledge: what follows is beyond our theatrical experience. The play/performance offers us a 'crippled' knowledge.

2. The name 'Oedipus' means 'he with the swollen (*oidema*) feet.' At the most crucial moment of the play, Oedipus will reveal that he experienced his wound as an 'pain/trauma' (*kakon*) and 'source of shame' (*oneidos*) that has accompanied him since his infancy (*spargana*, 1035). However, by correctly counting the human 'feet' and solving the riddle of the Sphinx, Oedipus gives his name another etymology: '*oid-*' now refers to knowledge (*oida*), the knowledge of 'normal' human feet – not of his own shameful ones. By counting correctly, Oedipus *reinvents* himself – freeing himself from the trauma and the shame, freeing the Self from the body.

Not surprisingly, this is an excessive, uncontrollable Self: 'I strike them with *orge*', Oedipus recalls –not without some pride– in the confessional scene with Jocasta, 'and I kill them all' (807). The phrase is delivered in the present tense. As if the clash is repeating itself in the present, as if it is constantly repeating itself – as if constantly *present*. At the same time, this present tense indicates an experience that has not yet become a memory: an experience that the subject has not thoroughly processed so as to turn it into a *narrative* (so as to incorporate it into the narrative of the Self). Let us note, here, that the ancient *orge* includes but is not limited to anger, as it also denotes 'instinct' as well as 'mental temperament' ('character'). The word 'impulse' is perhaps a good translation of the ancient *orge*.

3. As a place of transitional identities, the split road marks the quasi-ritualistic 'passage' of the young Oedipus to adulthood. But it also marks the distortion of this 'passage.' By forbidding his son to 'pass by', the father's violence recalls –or, if you will, repeats– the violence he himself once inflicted

on Oedipus's feet, when he pierced his ankles, forbidding his 'passage' into life. By stubbornly demanding priority of passage from an elderly king, Oedipus chooses a deadly violent clash with a father figure.

Reconciling anthropology with psychoanalysis, Charles Segal sees in the conflict in the crossroad as 'truly primal scene, father attacking son with the instrument used on beasts, son slaying father with the token of the hurt that the father caused to his limbs'. If the foot is, in the ancient vocabulary, a metonymy for the phallus, then the solution to the equation becomes even more psychoanalytical. The same, of course, applies to Oedipus's *orge*.

* Professor of History, Theory and Reception of Ancient Theatre, School of Drama, Faculty of Fine Arts, AUTH.

PLENARY SESSION

PERRIS Marina*, *Analytic space: authority and authenticity*.

Introductory note:

In my presentation I will consider the concepts of authority and authenticity as I see them expressed in the work of analysis. I will focus on the following question:

How our psychoanalytic stance, the way we receive our analysand and enable the unfolding of his internal world, resonate with the notion of the psychoanalyst as an authority?

I will consider this question by exploring the life in the consulting room, where the analyst and the analysand reside. This residence progressively becomes home to "the third" (Britton 2003, Ogden 1994, de Muzan, 2013) which is borne out of the work of analysis and, which is, I believe, closely linked to the question of both the analyst's authority and authenticity, alike.

I use clinical work to explore the centrality and importance of analytic listening (Freud 1912, Bleger 1967, Aisenstein 2013) in the context of the analyst's capacity to acknowledge "not knowing" (Bion 1979). I discuss how these two interconnected processes in the analyst's functioning, shape and substantiate his authority and authenticity as expressed in the work of the analytic couple.

Lastly, I will consider the question of whether the concept of authority within the analytic relationship can, indeed be realized as a consequence of the analytic work itself.

* Training and supervising analyst of the British Psychoanalytical Society, full member of the Paris School of Psychosomatics –IPSO P. Marty, corresponding member of the Hellenic Psychoanalytical Society, member of the IPA.

PANEL

ROLNIK Eran*, *Political caesura and the analyst's freedom of thought*

This paper explores the experience of practicing psychoanalysis amid political upheaval. Although not a new theme within psychoanalytic discourse, it is too often confined to the past—as if it belonged to another era. In recent years, however, it has become an increasingly urgent concern. I argue that this question will soon present not only philosophical or ethical, but also technical challenges for analysts worldwide.

The paper examines the intersection of psychoanalytic ethics, democratic values, and the analyst's capacity for free thought within the analytic setting. It suggests that by forging links between the private and the public, the ontological and the political, the psychological and the technological, psychoanalysis can offer a space—particularly in moments of political caesura—where individual insight may transform into political awareness and vice versa.

Analysts in liberal democracies often assume that democracy simply provides the stable framework—the setting and ground rules—necessary for analysis. Yet this view overlooks the fact that assaults on democracy from without strike at the very core of the mind's struggle with attacks on linking, on psychic space, and on psychic truth from within.

The paper unfolds through a series of questions:

- Can the self truly reveal itself, even within the most rigorously held analytic frame, in an environment where individuals are denied the freedom to protest?
- Can patients “freely associate” on the analytic couch when they are deprived of freedom of expression and political association in the public sphere?
- To what extent do the “analyzing instrument” (Isakower, 1992) and the communicative process between patient and analyst depend upon the presence of a benevolent social or political Third?

These questions illuminate the intricate interdependence between psychoanalytic practice and the sociopolitical environment in which it unfolds.

*Training and supervising analyst of the Israel Psychoanalytic Society and of the Frankfurt Psychoanalytic Society, member of the IPA.

PLENARY SESSION

SULJAGIC Jasminka *, *The many facets of authority in psychoanalytic institutions*

The concept of authority initially eludes us. We recognize it either as a negative and an absence or as an overemphasized, perverted presence. Our claim is that '[t]here is no such thing as authority' (Foucault, 1980); 'we are no longer in a position to know what authority really is' (Arendt, 1961); 'the actual essence of this phenomenon has rarely attracted any attention' (Kojève, 2014). It appears as a kind of phantom that no one believes in any longer but many nevertheless fear – frightening others as well, by recalling the possible outcomes of its sudden revival, together with what is more tangible and familiar: power, violence or force.

This paper will investigate various designations of this concept and its distortion, emphasising dynamics of reverence and rebellion, of action and abstention, of freedom and its limits, as well the one-way path of the authoritarianism and dogmatism.

The institutional history and institutional life are going to be examined, from aspects of the origins and foundations of psychoanalytic organisations to their preservation, succession, and transformation. Excerpts from institutional history will be reviewed, alongside motives from literature, mythology, and sociology, situated within a broader metapsychological perspective.

In an attempt to address the theme of the birth of a social organization and the fact of institutionalization and authority, Freud considered both the concepts of individual and collective psychology, and we will follow the thinking on identification and the Superego, reflections on the primal horde, the totem feast, and the murder of the father, revealing the founding violence and denial.

The rising question of the difference between "to care for" and "to govern" will be disclosed through the etymological inquiry, which will once more bring to light the themes of the infantile, primal scene and creation. The recent and growing difficulties faced by many Societies in appointing members willing to assume positions of responsibility will also be taken into account, contributing to the theme of institutionalisation and authority, that is, of the authority we allow them to be.

* Training and supervising analyst of the Psychoanalytical Society of Serbia, former President of the Society and former member of the Executive Committee of the European Psychoanalytical Federation, member of the IPA ING Liaison Committee, Chair of the EPF Archive Committee and member of the Institutional Matters Committee.

PLENARY SESSION

TALVIC Edel*, *Authority and authoritarianism in the Oedipus myth*

This paper examines the contrast between authority and authoritarianism through the lens of psychoanalytic metapsychology, focusing on the Oedipus cycle as its primary reference. The Sphinx acts as the guiding metaphor: a creature half-beast and half-woman, she embodies the very duality under scrutiny—the primal body representing the Id's animalistic urges for control and power, while the human face signifies the Ego's ability for speech, reasoning, and symbolic interaction. This structural opposition between beast and human, drive and mediation, runs throughout the myth, appearing in each of its key figures.

Despite their superficial similarity, authority and authoritarianism originate from fundamentally different psychic economies. Authoritarianism emerges as an Id-driven demand—a narcissistic assertion of power rooted in the pleasure principle, where the individual claims dominance to manage internal tension and compensate for ego deficits. It reflects not merely instinctual pressure but a failure of sublimation.

Conversely, authority is an intersubjective achievement. It cannot be seized but must be conferred—recognised and legitimised by the Other through demonstrated ego competencies such as skill, judgment, and the capacity to mediate between reality and desire. While authoritarianism collapses into narcissistic self-enclosure, genuine authority requires an ego sufficiently developed to tolerate frustration, delay, and dependence on external validation.

* Training and supervising analyst of the Estonian-Latvian Psychoanalytic Society, member of the IPA. [PANEL](#)

VARTZOPOULOS Ioannis*, *Authority and authoritarianism*

Authority in psychoanalysis, as elsewhere, is inherent in the birth of an idea and its potential to become established. Someone conceives and presents it; for some reasons, it is accepted and is thereafter included in the history of ideas. The weight of truth an idea contains is certainly crucial for its prevalence. However, the truth of ideas depends on the conditions of their emergence, their context, and their support system. Authority will give ideas the specific weight they need to dominate over neighboring and overlapping ideas. (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1947)

Authority is necessary to define the true and the ethical where there is ambiguity or vagueness of meaning. It is interesting to ask whether there are areas of human activity where authority plays no role, areas where authority does not appear. The more human activity is connected with an immediate, visible, unquestionable result, the role of knowledge and competence supersedes authority. Authority begins to be involved the more the method and the result are subject to critical analysis and subjective evaluation. (Fromm, 1941)

The concept of the *unconscious* was ripe to emerge at the end of the 19th century. It was the *authority of Freud* that gave it its specific content and connected it with the therapeutic dimension of psychoanalysis. To the objective content of the truth of the unconscious, Freud added the necessary aura of authority needed for it to prevail in this form and direction. Authority expresses and explicitly establishes what others simply intuit. If Freud's authority offered psychoanalysis the clarity and momentum it needed, the subsequent emergence of other authorities occurs when we need something new, not only because the demands of reality press us, but also because we have the need for the *illusion of a new truth* that will help us illusionistically cope with our limitations. These are the cases where the positive function of authority is diverted, potentially into *authoritarianism*. We have authoritarianism in psychoanalysis when we recognize the limitations of our theory and clinic and are led to cover them up with arbitrary choices instead of enduring the insecurity they create. The definition of authority in psychoanalysis draws upon the political and sociological definition of the term and simultaneously

attributes to it special characteristics due to the epistemological entity and institutional life of psychoanalysis. (Freud, 1930)

One can look for the function of authority and its deviation into authoritarianism in two aspects of psychoanalytic theory and clinical practice. The relationship of the *word-representation* to the *thing-representation* is a point in psychoanalytic theory that allows us to understand where and how the conditions for the emergence and function of authority are created. The cathexis of the thing-representation with the word-representation transfers to the symbolic level what we experience as thing-representation mainly in the unconscious functioning. The word-representation assigns to the thing-representation functions and properties that allow people to manage their lives through symbolic functioning and thought. The symbol enables thought to assign to the thing functions and properties it wouldn't otherwise have. However, their relationship is not unambiguous. Which aspects of the thing-representation the word-representation assigns and develops is often a matter of logical, ethical, or aesthetic choice. A murder is alternatively a heroic act, an atrocious act, an act of cowardice, an act of bravery, etc. When this ambiguity arises, that is, a range of possibilities in the attribution of meaning, authority will determine the one that appears as more correct than the other possible versions. (Lévy, 2020)

Also, the relationship between *theory and clinical practice* in psychoanalysis creates favorable conditions for the function of authority. Psychoanalytic theory is *heuristic* in its clinical application. It highlights a framework of operation whose application depends on a subjective version that demonstrates objective claims. However, here again, their relationship is not unambiguous. The same theory is applied differently by different psychoanalysts, and today we accept that every psychoanalyst is guided in the application of their theory in light of an often unconscious *private theory*. (Bion, 1961)

Authority ensures *institutional stability* where insecurity and uncertainty are neither tolerable nor desirable.

Historically, it played a role in the formation of identity in psychoanalysis. Certain ambiguities in theory and clinical practice had to be answered so that psychoanalysis could acquire the stability and validity it needed. Subsequently, they gave birth to the different psychoanalytic schools.

Authoritarianism is the *institutional deviation* of the function of authority when the view it serves does not prevail and it now needs authoritarian mechanisms to dominate. The use of the special administrative and scientific character of

psychoanalysis to impose a viewpoint is the most familiar application of authoritarianism in our field.

It is the perverse path of securing your superiority over the other, a superiority that is questioned by your own unconscious. And then you become increasingly authoritarian. (Adorno et al., 1950)

Bibliography

Adorno, T. W., Else Frenkel-Brunswik, Daniel J. Levinson, & Nevitt Sanford. (1950). *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Adorno, T. W. & Horkheimer, M. (1947). *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. Columbia University Press.

Bion, W. R. (1961). *Experiences in Groups, and Other Papers*. London: Tavistock.

Freud, S. (1930). *Civilization and Its Discontents*. London: Hogarth Press/Norton.

Fromm, E. (1941). *Escape from Freedom*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart.

Lévy, F. (2020). *Psychoanalysis with Wilfred R. Bion: Contemporary Approaches, Actuality and The Future of Psychoanalytic Practice*. Routledge.

* Training and supervising analyst of the Hellenic Society, member of the IPA, President of the Hellenic Psychoanalytical Society; editor of the psychoanalytic journal "Oedipus".

PANEL

VASLAMATZIS Grigoris*, *From authority to commensal relationship: "For you" and "with you"*

The presenter will raise questions on the authority of the analyst as an interpreter of the transference and will discuss the shift from the position of the "analyst who knows" to the position of the "analyst who does not know" (the patient).

The analyst's unconscious communication with his/her analysand serves as the basis for the development of the emotional experience of the session. At the same time she/he has the psychic availability to contain the unprocessed, non-verbal experiences of the analysand.

This double position suggests that authority touches on authenticity and acknowledge that two people (analyst and analysand) create a space to tolerate mental pain, to think together (mainly unconsciously), without abolishing the asymmetry of the relationship.

Beginning with the concept of evenly suspended attention (Freud), the presenter elaborates on the waking - dreaming process of the analytic encounter (Bion, Ogden) and the dialogue of a commensal relationship (Bion). He will argue that the analyst's authority involves his ability to share an emotional experience in the session - without obstacles from his/her already

acquired knowledge - to process this experience and thus contribute to the development of the patient's ability to mentally process his experiences.

Brief clinical vignettes will be presented, as well as a session from the literature, from which the title of this presentation - "For you" and "with you» - emerges. The emotional experience of the session, the resonance of the unconscious of the analyst and that of the analysand, and talking (interpreting) from a position of psychical work with the analysand will be highlighted.

* Professor Emeritus of Psychiatry at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, training and supervising analyst of the Hellenic Society of Psychoanalysis and Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy he served as President for two four-year terms, member of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis and Psychodynamic Psychiatry (AAPPD).

PANEL

ZERVIS Christos*, Seeking *authority through authoritarianism*

A philological examination of the term *authority* reveals that it originally denoted increase, growth, invention, origin, and creation. Only later did it come to signify power, authority, and expertise.

In Ancient Greek, *authentēs* (αυθέντης) designates the one who acts on his own, and, in a figurative sense, denotes a master or an absolute ruler.

Thus, beginning from the notion of authentic development, we may discern two parallel conceptual axes in the semantic evolution of *authentia* / *authority*:

- power / domination / enforcement
- authority / validity / expertise

The common endpoint of these two trajectories is a sense of self-trust — whether this arises through the symbolisation of the push toward growth, which becomes recognised as authority and specialised knowledge, or through the assertion of power and dominance.

K., whose personality structure is of the borderline type, describes a childhood marked by his persistent efforts to make others acknowledge and “respect” him. He has found it difficult to defend himself, experiencing overwhelming fear in situations where his worth and authority were at stake. Under such conditions of personal helplessness, he felt an inner, disintegrative collapse accompanied by intense emotional reactions and explosive behaviours of a

self-destructive nature and/or violent aggression toward people with whom he was in a relationship.

He associates the devaluation he experienced at school with his father's disparaging attitude — a man he could not look in the eyes until very recently. His refuge was his mother, with whom he shared everything, even well into adulthood. Yet this attachment also engendered ambivalence toward her, as he felt she dominated him, intruded upon him, and alienated him from himself, nullifying his attempts to find an authentic expression of his own being.

What characterised his psychic structure was the undifferentiated and the unintegrated, which became evident in any situation involving closeness to the other, including, notably, the analytic relationship.

From another perspective, it appeared that he lacked the symbolic organisation necessary to symbolise excitations, and thus to form a stable sense of identity capable of structuring desire, prohibition, and ideals — the very foundations of communication and exchange with the other.

From the standpoint of a broad metapsychological assessment, the lack of authority or self-assuredness he experienced seemed related to his limited capacity for separation and autonomous existence, his insufficient narcissistic investment, the weakness of his ego, and the failure of both the superego and the ego ideal to confer esteem upon the ego.

Regarding the origin of these deficits, the insufficient symbolisation and the undifferentiated quality of his psyche point to very early fixations. If maternal *holding*

— as the space for the creation of representations and symbolisation — appears to be implicated, the paternal function seems, from the very beginning of life, to play a central role in the formation of psychic organisation and the sense of authority, as emphasised by various psychoanalytic perspectives.

According to Freudian thought, the newborn's earliest identifications possess great intensity, a general character, and enduring duration. The first and most fundamental among them concerns the infant's identification with "the father of his own personal prehistory" (Freud, 1923). This refers to the unconscious, fantasised image of the father — not only as a familiar figure, but also as a cultural archetype that provides an organising psychic structure, establishing

both law and desire within the child, while embodying forms of authority and social hierarchy.

Freud acknowledges that these early identifications may contain mutually incompatible elements that can lead to conflict and to a problematic compartmentalisation of the ego; yet he also notes that they may possess a valuable structural function.

In a related yet distinct manner, Winnicott also posits an early paternal contribution to the formation of the child's ego. This concerns the introjection of the father as an *integrate* element in the organisation of the ego and in the infant's capacity for psychic meaning-making.

It is Jan Abram who develops the notion of the *paternal integrate*, interpreting and extending Winnicott's thought. Abram conceives this early *integrate* as a proto-representation of the father, mediated through the mother, within the infant's psyche. It constitutes a kind of unformed paternal presence that precedes the superego, the Oedipal triangulation, and the symbolic law. The paternal integrate may later evolve into paternal functions — authority, law, and mediation.

Laplanche's concept of *intromission* refers to a different process, whereby a very early, psychically untranslatable foreign element is actively implanted into the infant's psyche by an external agent. This may become a structuring factor in the formation of the superego type, yet it may equally generate a psychotic enclave within the psyche. It thus bears a closer resemblance to Freud's *primary identification*, in contrast to the *paternal integrate*, which has a positive structural contribution.

Adolescence is psychologically recognised as a "second chance" for the establishment of an adequate psychic organisation when earlier ruptures have occurred. If the principal element being reconstituted is the ego, the process necessarily involves the reorganisation of its "masters": the id, the superego, and the ego ideal. Hence, the pursuit of new ideals becomes essential for the emergence of a renewed psychic structure — one that allows the adolescent to attain a sense of self-worth derived from outside the family constellation and childhood universe.

Within such a perspective, K., toward the end of his adolescence, sought political and ideological ideals that could inspire him, express him, provide a social

space, and allow for the recognition of his own value. He turned to Nazi beliefs, which he regarded as representing an “ideological aristocracy” in opposition to the “mediocrity” surrounding him.

Such positions of political activism served multiple psychic functions: to integrate a fragmented psychic structure, to differentiate the self from others while simultaneously belonging to a community, and to channel un-symbolised libido energy into a pseudo-sublimatory mission that would confer authority.

Freud refers to civilisation’s need to resort to elevated moral ideals in order to protect itself from the destructive forces inherent in its individual members: “The satisfaction which the ideal affords to those who participate in civilisation is therefore of a narcissistic nature...” (Freud, 1927, p. 13).

Considering Freud’s theoretical mirroring between the collective and the individual, extreme authoritarian ideological positions can be understood as defensive, compromise formations aimed at maintaining psychic cohesion in the face of internal disintegration, also in the individual. They function as equivalents of reaction formations against an unconscious feeling of insufficiency, such as in the case of K. Here, the “ideology” of authoritarianism attempts to be recognised as the equivalent of authority.

Indicative Bibliography

Abram, J. (2022). *The Surviving Object: Psychoanalytic Clinical Essays on Psychic Survival-of-the-Object*: Routledge.

Freud, S. (1923). The Ego and the Id. *SE* 19:1-66.

Freud, S. (1927). The Future of an Illusion. *SE* 21:1-56.

Laplanche J. (1992). Implantation, intromission. *La révolution copernicienne inachevée*, Paris, Aubier : 355-358.

Winnicott, D. W. (1969/2013). Chapter 13. The Use of an Object in the Context of Moses and Monotheism. *Donald Winnicott Today* 78:293-301

* Training and supervising analyst of the Hellenic Psychoanalytical Society, member of the IPA, former president of the HPS; member of the EPF board.

PANEL

ZERVOS Kostas*, *The Impossible Professions, Authority and Perversion*

In “*Analysis Terminable and Interminable*”, Freud suggests that psychoanalysis may be conceived as a third impossible profession - the first two being education and governance - each characterized by an inherent and structural insufficiency. One can be certain in advance, Freud observes, of their inevitable failure to attain full efficacy. He enumerates a series of reasons for this: the fluid

and unstable nature of the human psyche, the defensive distortions inherent in the subject's relation to so-called truth, the phenomenon of the negative therapeutic reaction, and the inevitable human limitations of the analyst. These are constraints which, *mutatis mutandis*, operate across all three professions.

A further commonality among them lies in the structural position they entail: the educator, the ruler, and the analyst all occupy the place of the one who is presumed to know—the locus of *supposed knowledge*. In other words, each is situated within a relation of authority. This position both enables and obliges them to establish continual hierarchies and make evaluative decisions in response to the ever-shifting realities they must manage. Yet the act of hierarchization is inseparable from evaluation, and thus from the risk - or even the inevitability - of engaging in the management of falsehood.

When this management of falsehood - essentially, the articulation of a collectively sustained reality - ceases to serve the process of maturation of the child, the group, or the analysand, and instead functions to perpetuate the authority of the educator, the leader, or the analyst, the path toward perversion is opened.

To what extent, then, is it realistic to posit the avoidance of a perverse resolution? Can the possibilities of abuse, antidemocratic deviation, or corruption be genuinely foreclosed?

* Full member of the Hellenic Psychoanalytical Society and of the IPA; co-editor of the *Greek annual International Journal of Psychoanalysis*.

PANEL