

TRIGANT BURROW, PIONEER OF GROUP ANALYSIS

by Juan Campos Avillar

Introduction



The world capital of Psychiatry at the beginning of the twentieth century was not in Vienna but in Zürich, and its Papa was Professor Bleuler of the Burghölzli Clinic. It is from there and through students of Bleuler that the interest in psychoanalysis was spread and even arrived at the other side of the Atlantic. After the first meeting of Freudian Psychologists in Salzburg, Freud, Jung and Ferenzci, invited by Stanley Hall, travel to America. From there they bring the first native American who decides to go to Zürich to be analyzed and to train with Jung: Trigant Burrow. The latter, also a 'man of the laboratory', is a physician from Baltimore, with a doctorate in experimental psychology from Johns Hopkins, and who in that year of 1909 had just arrived at the New York Psychiatric Institute to do his training in Psychiatry with Adolf Meyer, in turn student of Bleuler emigrated to the United States. It is during the stay of Trigant Burrow in Switzerland that the International Psychoanalytic Association is founded, admitting individual members as well as local societies.

Upon his return to the States, Trigant Burrow, with a small group of colleagues spread over the American continent, founds in 1911 the American Psychoanalytic Association, first organization of national character which includes in turn local societies. In 1925 Burrow, then President of that Association, presents at the Congress of Bad Homburg of the International Psychoanalytic Association his "Laboratory Method in Psychoanalysis", also coined by him as "Group Method of Analysis". We dedicate this chapter to this psychoanalyst, unknown because of being hidden, occult.

1. Burrow's relationship with Freud

*"Of course I remember you very well from the time of your first visit at Hammerstein's Roof Garden until that of your contribution to the Internationale Zeitschrift, and it will give me satisfaction to be able to assist you through an analysis. I am much honored by your confidence in me."*¹ This is how on November 6, 1913, Freud starts his correspondence with Trigant Burrow who had asked him to be analyzed by him. After commenting the difficulties of this type of analysis and rejecting the idea of analyzing him together with his wife as Burrow asked him to, Freud adds: *"I would like very much that, apart from the personal benefit you could derive, you arrived at clarifying and seeing confirmed through your analysis many psychoanalytic questions. With the highest esteem of a colleague, (signed) Freud"*. That's how he terminates, after commenting², in not too kind a manner, the details of the possible analysis.

It is clear that Freud remembered September 2, 1909. How could he forget that day in New York and the dinner in Hammerstein's Roof Garden? In the morning Brill had shown them the Psychiatric Clinic of the Columbia University where he had studied and then worked as clinical assistant, and at night he had taken them to Hammerstein's Roof Garden of the Victoria Theatre, where in the intermezzo of the vaudeville "Paradise Roof" he had presented them to Dr. Trigant Burrow. Two days later Jones, coming from Toronto, met up with Freud, Jung, Ferenczi and Brill to attend the conferences of Clark University. The trip to the United States meant much to Freud. With Burrow, there arrived the first native American prepared to join up with them, to follow them to Europe and become a psychoanalyst. For the rest, Meyer, the chief of Burrow in Wards Island, has told them about his excellencies: he was a psychopathologist, twice doctor, not only in medicine but also in experimental psychology. The fact that he went to study with Jung in Zürich instead of Vienna, then still was not of great importance. After all, Freud still maintained his hopes that Jung would be his worthy heir. What is more, the seminar in psychoanalysis which Jung gave in Zürich was the only formal training of which they disposed. Other four Americans, between them Dr. Hoch, the future

¹ **Correspondence Freud-Burrow: November 6, 1913, Yale Archives.**

Dear Dr. Burrow:

Of course I remember you very well from the time of your first visit at Hammerstein's Roof Garden until that of your contribution to the Internationale Zeitschrift, and it will give me satisfaction to be able to assist you through an analysis. I am much honored by your confidence in me.

The trouble with such analyses of colleagues trained in psychoanalysis usually is that there is too little time available for this. I know that various matters have to be considered, but nature is not concerned with them and in such a case of restriction withholds her favors. It would therefore be of advantage if you would allow as much time for the treatment as is at all possible. I would have to know some time in advance about your arrival so that I could arrange the hour for you. The charge is 50 kronen an appointment. - The work six times a week.

I would under no conditions analyze your wife at the same time with you: it would make the work extremely difficult for me. If she comes to Vienna with you and wants an analysis, she can have it (cheaper) with one of our colleagues. Of course the reverse could be arranged I could analyze your wife and you yourself could go to someone else in Vienna, although you do not seem to have this in mind.

It will please me very much if, in addition to your personal benefit, you derive clarification and confirmation of many psychoanalytic questions through your analysis

With the high esteem of a colleague, (Signed) Freud

² By then, on October 27, 1913, Jung had resigned as director of the Jahrbuch and withdrawn his name from front page of the Zeitschrift. In his correspondence with Jones, who had sent him a copy of Burrow's letter in which he announces his intention of analysing himself with Freud, on November 17, Freud comments: "The letter of Burrow is also interesting. I have accepted him [in analysis], not too tenderly. I never show much happiness when a patient is offering himself".

successor of Adolf Meyer in Wards Island, had made the same than Burrow that same year. From Zürich, and through Jung, had come to Freud also Eitingon, Abraham and Ferenczi; and from there came Brill and Jones when he met them in Salzburg the year before in that first encounter of Freudian Psychology also organized on the initiative of Jung. It had been due to this meeting that it occurred to them that a good instrument of diffusion of the Freudian ideas could be to meet every year with the objective of establishing a network of groups like the ones that had already emerged, almost simultaneously, in Vienna and in the Burghölzli in Zürich. With this purpose, under the presidency of Freud and Bleuler and the direction of Jung, a journal was created: *Jahrbuch für psychoanalytische und psychopathologische Forschungen*.

What is not so clear is why Freud remembered so exactly the first article sent by Burrow to the *Internationale Zeitschrift* at the end of 1913 and, still less, why this peculiar way of remembering—from such a date to such a date. The article to which Freud referred, “The Psychological Analysis of so-called Neurasthenic and Allied States —A Fragment”, is not at all memorable. What was memorable for Freud, however, were the circumstances in which Jung had sent it to him, recommending him to include Burrow in the list of habitual correspondents of the *Internationale Zeitschrift*. The letter of December 21, 1912³ in which he recommends this follows the famous letter of December 18, which Freud still had not answered and with which Jung declares his independence, which takes to the break-up of the personal and political relationship between the two. Rosenzweig (1992) who in 1951 interviewed Jung in reference to the trip to America, considers that the first step towards the break-up—the Rubicon in the relationships between Zürich and Vienna—took place precisely on the aforementioned September 2, 1909, on occasion of the analysis with Jung which Freud undertook due to the incident which had taken place that very morning at Columbia University. *De aquellos polvos habían salido estos lodos*. (That dust had produced this mud).

In effect, by the time Freud receives the letter of Burrow at the end of 1913, things had changed a lot. Upon return from the trip to America, and while Burrow studied with Jung in Zürich, the International Psychoanalytic Association had been founded and Jung had been elected its president. The Wednesday Group of Vienna and the Group of Freudian Physicians of Zürich had been converted into affiliate societies of the IPA and, what is more, new branches had sprouted in Berlin, Munich, New York and, in Baltimore, a Pan-American association.⁴ This growth on the international level had meant tensions for the original groups. To start with, Freud tried to appease the anger of the Viennese about the predominant role given to the Suisse by naming Adler president of the Vienna Society and Stekel editor of the new international journal, the *Zentralblatt*. Even so, he could not avoid split of Adler in 1911 and the expulsion of Stekel when he wanted to take possession of the journal. Not only Freud was having problems at home with his Viennese, but this impossible matrimony with the people from Zürich, a political matrimony, was destined to last not much. By 1913 the differences with Jung had become an open war. Taking advantage of the conjugal discord of Freud and Jung, in the summer of 1912 Jones proposed to create with the most loyal disciples of Freud a secret committee for defending the cause, in reality a palace revolution, a confabulation focused to decapitate the Prince Heir. The idea was received

³ McGuire, W. ed. (1974): *The Freud/Jung Letters*, (London: Hogarth Press & Routledge Kegan Paul), pp. 536-538.

⁴ There is no mention of Trigant Burrow being—as Jones says—“the only American present” in the foundation of the International Association of Psychoanalysis in Nuremberg on Easter 1910. What we do know is that, upon his return from Zürich, he had been one of the eight physicians who in Baltimore founded the American Psychoanalytic Association in May 1911, and at that moment he was secretary of the American Psychopathological Association.

with great enthusiasm by Freud who for sealing the pact of this parricide made the present of a ring to everyone of them —from there the name of the Committee of the Seven Rings by which it passed into history. That Committee turns into THE group of reference, like the ones of the philosophers of Plato, to which Freud and Ferenczi had to renounce under the pressure of the Viennese in the moment of the foundation of the International Association in Nuremberg. Now, with this Committee, the leaders of the Movement —including Freud himself—promised to submit themselves to mutual censorship of the theoretical and technical developments they advanced. Precisely, the first objective centered on getting rid of Jung, president of the International accusing him of deviationism, something they did not achieve in the congress of Munich in September 1913 due to lack of votes. What had to be defined was the strategy. Two alternatives were considered. One was for the loyal groups —Vienna, Berlin and Budapest, and perhaps Munich— to drop out from the International and create a new one. This seemed not very practical, however, since it implied to leave the association in the hands of Jung and the Suisse. Another, more prudent one, was to declare a war of nerves on Jung and give him sufficient rope so as to eventually hang himself. This is the one that prevailed and made that Jung first resigned as editor of the journal and then as president of the association. In one case as well as the other, the preoccupation was the repercussions this split could have in America where Jung had many friends. The hostilities became fierce upon the return of Jung that autumn where he had ventilated his theoretical differences with Freud in Fordham University of New York, in Johns Hopkins University of Baltimore where he had been the host of Adolf Meyer and Trigant Burrow, and in Saint Elizabeth's Hospital in Washington, all three forts of psychoanalysis in America.

The truth is that Freud never arrived to understand too much nor cared much about how the Americans functioned. Jones took care of them. In opinion of the latter, Americans, with the exception of Brill, had difficulty in understanding the situation in Europe and, more still in taking part in the conflict. They thought of it as a purely personal question and did not consider that the scientific differences were sufficient motive to split up.⁵ With Brill one could be sure, even if not with the rest of the members of the New York Society. The group which Hoch had just formed with people from Wards Island was neither approved and, what is more, one did not know towards who they would lean since, if scientifically Hoch well was a Freudian, the same than Burrow he had analyzed himself with Jung and was a good friend of his. The situation in the American Psychoanalytic Association was much more complicated. Putnam, one of the men of most prestige, was in a sea of doubts. White of Washington, Jeliffe of New York, and Adolf Meyer y Burrow were considered staunch supporters of Jung.

Freud receives Burrow's petition of analysis a few days after Jung resigned as editor of the *Jahrbuch* on October 27, 1913. But, that Burrow —university professor in Baltimore and one of the key men of Adolf Meyer, founder with the latter of the APA and actual secretary of the American Psychopathological Association— asked Freud to be analyzed by him was not only an honor. The gesture of doing so at the moment that Jung had just resigned as president of the International meant a respite for "the cause". When, for personal circumstances, Burrow is forced to renounce to his project of analysis in Vienna, he without doubt reiterates his loyalty to Freud as can be deduced from the more friendly answer of June 1914:

⁵ Letter 149 of November 4, 1913. Report on petition of Ferenczi, who in the *Rundbriefe* of November 2, 1913, urged the "secret committee" to take action in managing the situation with which Jung confronted them with his resignation as editor of the *Jahrbuch*.

“Very honoured colleague: I send you my heartfelt thanks for your friendly letter. I do not believe I have ever disappointed anybody who has given me his confidence. I see from your letter how earnestly you are concerned with the matter of psychoanalysis, and how little you are ready to make concessions which might win the favour of the crowd for a while but would be untenable in the long run because they depart from the truth.

If you find it possible to come to me for analysis, you will certainly be more important for me than any patient. Each additional student is to me a guarantee for the future, and an assurance for my own lifetime. Sincerely yours, Freud.”
(The underlined is ours)

Burrow did not renounce easily to his wish. Already started the First World War, preoccupied by the situation in which Freud could find himself in Vienna, at the end of 1914 he offers him to take refuge in his house in Baltimore, with the hope, naturally, of finally analyzing himself with him. In his letter he informs Freud of the situation of psychoanalysis in America and of the complications that on an international level could suppose the desertion of Jung. Freud, who then still is full of patriotic ardor, responds January 3, 1915, declining the invitation in the following terms:

“Dear Dr. Burrow,

Your letter, warm as always, has doubly moved me in this time of isolation. I thank you for your kind offer but I cannot avoid the impression that you are under the grossly erroneous interpretations of the American press. Here nobody thinks of leaving the city or that the enemy will pay us a visit. Some of the confidence that inspires Germany also dominates our feelings and we are using all our forces to come successfully through this trial. What 1915 has in stock for us, nobody can foresee.

Your commentary regards the situation of psychoanalysis in America I consider completely well-aimed. I never deceived myself as to that psychoanalysis goes against the general inclinations and, for this reason, dilutions and smoke screens like the ones of Jung have great possibilities of success during some time, so that I hope that in all parts there be people like you prepared to defend the truth in all its extension and austerity.

The communication with Jones unfortunately has become very difficult. Our international scientific situation has become much affected by the war and probably will by its sequelae. This should not be a preoccupation for our science, although it is for somebody who is not young anymore as is my case. If it happens that someday you can analyze yourself with me, I hope we can enjoy it and enrich ourselves with our passionate work. Naturally, there are very few possibilities that I go to America. These are not times when one can leave ones family alone. The petition would have to be very urgent and backed by a generous reward. I see few possibilities for this.

Hoping to hear again from you and with my warmest wishes, sincerely,

(signed) Freud.”⁶

Neither Burrow went to Vienna nor did Freud go anew to the United States. In spite of the praise of Burrow’s loyalty which Freud offers in this letter, as we will see afterwards,

⁶ Correspondence Burrow -Freud, p. 74, letter of January 3, 1915.

he never got to trust him. If he had succeeded to analyze him, perhaps Burrow could have dissipated the phantasm of Jung which always was between them. We don't know the reasons why Burrow wanted to analyze himself with Freud at that time and neither why in the end he did not. The situation, in which psychoanalysis found itself in America in reference to the splits in Europe, could have been one of the motives; perhaps Burrow had a rescue phantasy. Another possible reason is that at that time Burrow started to theorize about the primary identification with the mother, a new concept in psychoanalysis and possibly he would have liked to contrast it with Freud so as to avoid misunderstandings. Or, simply, it was a question of marital problems as could be deduced from the answer of Freud of November 6, 1913. The forceful and not at all friendly refusal to analyze him simultaneously with his wife that Burrow proposed to him in the first letter⁷, has less to do with Burrow than with the experience of analysis that had taken place in previous years with Sabina Spielrein, Elma Palos and Loe Kann, women friends of Jung, Jones and Ferenczi respectively (Grosskurth 1982)⁸.

You will ask yourselves why we insist so much in the personal analysis of Burrow with Jung in 1909 and his intention of analyzing himself with Freud the moment of the final break-up between both founders of the IPA. The reason is simple. This was the turning point when the destiny of the organization of psychoanalysis was decided, not only in America but in the whole world. What would have happened if Burrow had analyzed himself with Freud, winning his confidence, or if Burrow were to become addicted like the rest of the Committee of the Seven Rings? This is a possibility that could have been but was not. There is no turning back, but it seemed fitting to insist on it and illustrate our arguments with unpublished material, discarding simplistic conjectures like the ones made by analysts who presume to be professional historians⁹.

At this point we become conscious of the fact that we have been quoting Trigant Burrow and talking as if he was already an intimate friend when Brill introduced him to Freud in 1909, but we still had not introduced him to the reader. Freud, in his epilogue of 1935 to his Self-Portrait, says: "*Two themes run through these pages: the story of my life and the history of psycho-analysis. They are intimately interwoven. This Autobiographical Study shows how psycho-analysis came to be the whole content of my life and rightly assumes that no personal experiences of mine are of any interests in comparison to my relations with this science.*"¹⁰ We ignore if something similar happened to Burrow with groupanalysis. Kurt Goldstein, teacher of Foulkes, said to Burrow at the end of 1948 in a letter: "You are one of the few scientists who make one feel that for him life and work are closely related." In fact, it is in one of the first papers titled "Psychoanalysis and Life" where Burrow as early as 1913 exposes the newly found idea of the preconscious and primary identification with the mother, the development of which will take him to the group method of analysis. The customary dissociation between psychoanalysis and life for him will be a preoccupation which will never abandon him. However, the life which preoccupies Burrow is not so much his own as individual but the one of the whole humanity, the one of the human being as a species.

The work of Burrow, in fact, comes written like a drama and reading it is like reading a dream. In our exposition of Burrow we will put emphasis in the *dramatis personae* and

⁷ "I would under no condition analyze your wife at the same time with you; it would make the work extremely difficult for me. If she comes to Vienna with you and wants an analysis, she can have it (cheaper) with one of our colleagues. Of course the reverse could be arranged I could analyze your wife and you yourself could go to someone else in Vienna, although you do not seem to have this in mind.

⁸ Grosskurth, Phyllis (1982): *The Secret Ring. Freud's Inner Circle and the Politics of Psychoanalysis*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley. Inc.

⁹ In Peter Gay and Schindler.

¹⁰ S.E. Vol. XX p. 71.

the *peak experiences*, some of which border in what Freud had qualified as *unheimlich*, which the English translate with ‘uncanny’ and, in Castilian for lack of a better word we translate as the *‘siniestro’*. This life and work cannot be considered exclusively the one of Burrow but as pertaining to his plexus, a network of persons, their families of origin and of reproduction; further, the psychoanalytic community; and, finally, The Lifwynn Foundation. This is the account of an adventure without precedent in the institutional development of a scientific group, the prologue of which is about the determinant role played by the author and the epilogue of which will be an account of the group he left behind, decided to continue with his work.

2. Who was Burrow?

Burrow —apart from being a physician, psychologist, psycho-group-philo-analyst by profession— by inclination always was an artist. He could have been a poet, a writer, a dancer or a singer, but what he always wanted to be was a dramatic actor. He always had in mind some plot to write. His professional work once and again pushed aside these projects for as much as the theatre kept for him an everlasting fascination. As far as we know, he only finished one script. Of it he tells us in the last stage of his life, when already settled in Green Farms, Connecticut, when writing to who had been the former proprietor of his house, “Summer Hill”, the film star Richard Connell, congratulating him for the last of his productions, the film “Meet John Doe”:

“What I especially liked is the underlying idea of the whole argument. This is, I think, the story of the future. My own interest for many years has centered in what I call the social neurosis of man. My thesis lies in that primarily the life of man is unitary and integrated. (Don’t you know that all of you are one body?) As a physician interested in nervous and mental disorders (I was one of the first American psychoanalysts), I soon arrived at the position that the true conflict in these disorders of conduct —and always there is an element of conflict in these conditions— is a basic sense, even if well latent, of its structure and function originally unitary in all of us, and a feeling common to all of us, and that the true pain is due to a separation of the organism of this primary unified principle. We don’t want to be mean and competitive and centered in ourselves. This is due to a faux pas in our evolution of which we are not aware. I remember, years ago, at the very beginning of my psychoanalytic work, having written a play for the theater, “The dream interpreter”, which more or less was about this underlying theme. Mrs. Burrow and I used to work on it at night. But praxis made itself so demanding and then came the investigation and the writing, so that our play was pushed into a corner. Perhaps someday we come back to it, having found the incentive in your delicious film.”

The reminiscences that in Burrow evoke the film of Richard Connell turn out to be premonitory and emblematic of the subject he dedicated all his life to, “that unity inherent to the human species from which we start”. The sense of account of the future which Burrow gives of the film, perhaps could also serve for enunciating his own life and work.

3. The Dream Interpreter

3.1 Years of training and career choice

Trigant Burrow, the hero of this drama, was born on September 7, 1875, the youngest of four children of a well-to-do family from Norfolk, Virginia. He lived the drama of the old South right from the cradle. His mother Anastasia Devereux Burrow was a woman of great determination, devout catholic, of francophone origin, whose ancestors were on the side of the Confederation. She was educated and of lively intelligence, a trait accompanied by an indomitable obstinacy and will. Of a rather dry character, she could at times isolate herself in such a silence and distance that could freeze the most undaunted heart. Her leitmotiv was her passionate devotion to catholic faith. Proof of this is the way she chose the French name of Trigant as his Christian name. Defying the prohibition of the doctor, under the sheets she scribbled the following note to a childhood friend: “Dear Sophia, Would you and your husband be the godparents of the son I have just had this morning? Answer me by return mail. I always have them baptized before fifteen days. We will look for somebody here who can act por poderes. I pray for you. With love, Anastasia Burrow.”¹¹ No matter that Burrow, for the rest of his life, had to go on explaining to his American compatriots how to pronounce this name the French way.

In clear opposition to the interests and religious position of the mother, the father John W. Burrow, a protestant by birth but not practicing, was considered rather an agnostic. A wholesale pharmacist—a druggist—he was a man who, in spite of not having followed university studies, possessed wide scientific knowledge and was up to date on the latest progress, something not at all strange in people of his guild. It was not infrequent that “licensed physicians”, real doctors, called “doctor” Burrow for consultation asking to orient them in the medication of patients. It is significant that his inclination towards science took Mr. Burrow to be the first one in Norfolk to read the work of Darwin. These interests of the father, obviously in conflict with the ones of the mother, necessarily had to have their influence in his son. This perhaps in part explains the fact how little served all the efforts of the mother to preserve the catholic faith instilled in the child by baptisms.

Another factor of his infancy which surely played an important part was the loss of his only sister Inez, the oldest of the four, of who he was particularly fond and who died of tuberculosis when Trigant was not quite twelve years old. This was the first great loss in his life. Burrow would comment years later in reference to this bereavement that the most painful thing about it was that this pain would go away with time. William Galt considers that this reaction has a premonitory value in view of the future choice of career and the content of his investigations on subjectivity.

Trigant grew up and was educated in Norfolk until thirteen years of age. The city was sufficiently small that in spite of the strict rules of conduct demanded from the children of his class, they were not forbidden to play in the street with colored children or of a lower social class. Trigant was a noble boy, a little rough and inclined to mischief, something which put his mother in great distress.

¹¹ *A Search for Man's Sanity, The selected letters of Trigant Burrow with biographical notes.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1958, p. 10.

An excellent student, he was educated in private colleges, catholic, naturally, first on the local level and then —with thirteen, one year after the death of his sister, and perhaps due to the marital uneasiness at home— they sent him as an intern, first to Saint Francis Xavier School and, afterwards, to Fordham College, both of the Jesuits and in New York. A growing interest in the scientific field started to undermine his spiritual believes. Little by little he would find that the dogmas of the Catholic Church were losing their meaning for him, even if this never took him to adopt a depreciative or cynical attitude towards organized religion. His respect for religious insights was sincere, but he considered them like a symbolic intent of man of arriving at a more harmonic mode of experience and conduct. His religious devotion transformed itself little by little into a true “devotion for science”.¹²

In spite of the pain and the disillusion produced in the mother by Trigant’s break with her religious principles, she did not permit this to tarnish the mutual devotion. She went out of her way for the professional interests of her son, “she stood by him”¹³ and she supported him in all his projects throughout life.

The conflict between religion and science which we point out here runs parallel to the marriage conflict between the parents which became more acute during Burrow’s adolescence.¹⁴ To save appearances, the family continued to live under the same roof, even if the rift between the parents became progressively deeper. It was this way that Trigant, from an early age on, sees himself confronted with the problem of human conflict, a problem which turns for him into an object of study for life. Although his mother spent long periods of time in New York and his father frequently stayed at a hotel near the college, he did not spend the summers with the family.

In 1890, the young Burrow entered in Fordham where his older brother Allan had already been studying for two years. He followed the classical bachelor’s program and graduated at the age of nineteen with a major in Latin Verse, English Verse and History. Especially talented for rhythm and for dance, he was an excellent dancer and one of the best voices in the choir of Fordham. Another of the interests of Burrow as we already underlined was drama.

After his graduation from Fordham in 1895, Trigant spent one year in Norfolk dedicated to pre-medical studies, an arrangement probably related to the precarious state of health of his father who dies in October of the following year, another possible determinant of the medical vocation of a man of Letters. This same year he enters the School of Medicine of the University of Virginia. There his days were calm and dedicated to study. With his warm humanity and his radiant good humor, he was well liked by everybody even when, how one of his companions said, “he had no time left for our pranks”. Socially he was very likeable and had great success; he was a very pleasant young man, who liked horse riding and who did not have to be coaxed to liven up a meeting singing romantic songs which he himself accompanied on the piano; he always had a funny story to tell.

During the first semester of his studies of Medicine he became acquainted with Cornelius C. Wholey, with whom he shared the room in the dormitory of the university and a house in Baltimore once they graduated. The same than he, Wholey finishes being an eminent psychiatrist, and a friendship for life is established between them, premonitory of the one he would later initiate with his associate and collaborator Clarence Shields. Wholey had serious problems with his eyesight and always maintained

¹² “A Search...” Letter to Margaret Montague, p. 421-3.

¹³ Exactly the same words used by Clarence Shields in the description of his relationship with Burrow. “The Search...” p. 73.

¹⁴ Letter in which she responds to the question if she is married, an important point.

that if it was not for the help Burrow, he would never have graduated as a doctor. During hours and hours Burrow read to him *viva voce* the medical texts. Both were outstanding students in their studies and, once graduated in 1899, the University invited them to continue as demonstrators in biology, something they did for one course.

Following the custom that any doctor having ambitions should start his career with a study trip to Europe, the two companions inaugurated the new century in the Old World. They started in Munich, where they acted as clinical assistants of Obstetrics in the Clinic for Women of the University. In Vienna they continued their training in the General Hospital where the courses of Wagner von Jauregg and Kraft Ebbing awoke their interest in Psychiatry. There is no notice of Burrow hearing Freud speak on that occasion, and less still of assisting the classes the latter gave on Saturday afternoons at the University. Finally, after visiting important medical centers in Berlin, in what was left of the year, these youngsters toured by bicycle the British Islands and visited France and Italy.

Upon their return to America, the two doctors settled in Baltimore where, with the help of his father, Wholey bought a little house and started a practice in Medicine. In the meanwhile, he and Burrow shared the house and continued post-graduate studies at the School of Medicine of Johns Hopkins —Bacteriology with Welch, Pathology with MacCullum, making the rounds with the famous surgeon Osler, and working in the dispensary of Neurology with Henry M. Thomas. Burrow, moreover, in 1902-03 matriculated himself in English Literature: he was still looking for an interest which would absorb all his attention. The practice of general medicine did not attract him and for the moment he felt no urgency to specialize himself in the established disciplines. Various years will go by before he would not see his way clear.

It was in these circumstances when in 1902, during a dance at the Faculty of Medicine, his attention was called by a lively circle of youngsters in a corner of the hall. Curious about discovering which was the center of attention, he found it to be the enchanting student nurse Emily Sherwood Bryan with whom he will get married in 1904 and with whom he will have two children. Emily the youngest of eight children, was from Cambridge, Maryland, to where she returned once graduated as a nurse. The marriage took place in the paternal mansion and the drama of the mixed matrimony which he had lived in his infancy repeated itself with his choice of partner. The ceremony was celebrated by her father, who besides being a surgeon and educator was Episcopalian Pastor, a ceremony, out of respect for Burrow's mother, immediately afterwards was repeated in the Catholic Church. From this double wedding they escaped without delay for a honeymoon abroad of various months. Upon return they went to live in the house of Burrow's mother in Norfolk, where in May 1905 their first son, John Devereaux, was born.

At last, married and already with a son, he looked for his own house and decided himself for psychiatry. Well, this is not before dedicating three more years to prepare and finish his doctorate in psychology. This is, then, how Burrow settled down definitely in Baltimore and entered academic life. He obtained a place of Assistant in the Department of Psychology and started to work for his doctorate. Given the importance the "laboratory method" will play in the future career of Trigant Burrow and in the definition of his scientific personality, to us it seems fitting to mention here a commentary of his director of thesis, Professor George M. Stratton: "Trigant Burrow constitutes a central figure in the memory of my students at Johns Hopkins during the first decade of our century. He was anxious to learn the laboratory proceedings of psychology and dedicated himself completely to the problem agreed upon with me for this apprenticeship. I requested of him a re-examination based on repeated experiments, in different conditions carefully

controlled, using the well-known apparatus of the Laboratory of Leipzig of the *Komplikations-Versuch* of Wundt. This led him to discoveries which contributed in a considerable measure to the understanding of this so disconcerting problem of attention. But better than the excellent execution of his experiments, it was this young man himself to whose rare personality I was promptly and powerfully attracted, and for always. He then had already what I came to appreciate more and more throughout the interchange during many years, an unbiased bonhomie and force, a non-obstructive independence which enveloped and gave warmth to all that he thought and said. His mind and conduct made manifest the characteristic influence of the human environment of his infancy, an influence which he had made his own and developed with his creative power.”¹⁵

While preparing himself for his doctorate there happened to him one of these peak experiences which reveal to him his vocation for psychology. Forty years afterwards, in *Neurosis of Man* (Burrow 1949), he himself relates it to us: “One morning, many years ago, during a session of the Seminar of Philosophy at Johns Hopkins, Professor James Mark Baldwin talked to us about mental disturbances, and I remember him mentioning the names of Charcot, Janet, Forel and other prominent European psychiatrists. But he said that none of these had made the spark jump which would make possible the understanding of the fundamental cause of mental illness. This interested me and I remember that there and then I made myself the promise of dedicating my work and effort with all I could in lighting this spark necessary for throwing light on the nature of mental disturbance. At that moment I just initiated my studies for a doctorate in Experimental Psychology and immediately I decided that my doctoral thesis was to be on the theme of attention.”¹⁶ At last he had found a scientific interest which could give meaning to his life. This decision was destined to situate him on the crossroad of the three most important currents that existed in mental health in the world at that moment —experimental psychology that came from Leipzig, scientific psychiatry that came from Zürich, and profound psychology coming from Vienna. In all three of them the Johns Hopkins University was the pioneer.

If for Trigant Burrow the school of medicine of the University of Virginia was his *alma mater*, as biologist, the University of Johns Hopkins in Baltimore was destined to be this for him as a psychologist. His choice of career as an analyst cannot be understood unless we take into account the circumstances of this University during the first decade of last century —years in which Burrow debates himself about which specialty to choose and dedicate his whole life to. Harvard and Johns Hopkins University were the two first American universities to teach specific doctorate programs in psychology. The first who made a doctorate was Stanley Hall in 1879 in Harvard with William James. On the suggestion of James, he went to work with Wundt when the latter inaugurated in Leipzig the first laboratory of experimental psychology in Europe. Thanks to that, the then recently founded university of Johns Hopkins in Baltimore called him in 1881 to direct the department of pedagogic psychology. Following the German academic tradition, two years afterwards he established there the first laboratory of experimental psychology in the United States, a serious challenge for the hegemony till then retained by William James in Harvard. In 1889, once again Hall is called upon to take charge of the department of psychology of another new university, the Clark University of Worcester, of which he will eventually become President. In the only eight years Stanley Hall had stayed in Baltimore, thirty psychologist made their doctorate; more than the rest of all the American universities together. His leaving supposed a serious recession

¹⁵ “A Search...” p. 18

¹⁶ T. Burrow (1950): *The Neurosis of Man: an Introduction to a Science of Human Behavior*, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul; New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co.), p.78.

of academic psychology in Baltimore; the laboratory was literally dismantled, to the point that the following twenty-three years only Triggant Burrow did his doctorate and this perhaps because previously he already was doctor in medicine.¹⁷ It was James Baldwin called in 1903 to Johns Hopkins to recover the department. Baldwin saw in this an opportunity to “found and develop a new center... for generally promoting the philosophical studies in America”. The same than Hall, he had been trained with Wundt in Leipzig, although at that moment he already was disenchanted with the rage of experimental psychology. For Baldwin, the introspective analysis of the individual mind in laboratory conditions diverts the attention from the central fact that man is a social creature that responds to social pressure. In spite of his sarcasm and that the needs of the department were addressed fundamentally to the training of teachers, in 1904 Baldwin called J. M. Stratton from Berkeley, another disciple of Wundt, to direct the laboratory of experimental psychology, with whom Triggant Burrow initiates his doctoral thesis and which he finishes with Knight Dunlap from Harvard when the latter came to substitute Stratton at Johns Hopkins. Baldwin, however, does not limit himself to revitalize experimental psychology at the Johns Hopkins but, before he abandons this university in 1908, he brings Watson —the father of American Behaviorism— from Chicago, where they did not permit the latter to develop his studies of animal psychology. It is worthwhile taking into account that if at the end of the XIX century — under the aegis of Stanley Hall— Johns Hopkins was the place where the laboratory psychologists for the first time defended scientific psychology to liberate it from philosophic psychology which until then had been dominated by the “psychologists of the chair”, in the second decade of the XX century Johns Hopkins was the place where at the same time behaviorists —led by Watson— and groupanalysts —led by Burrow— dared to submit the theoretical assumptions of psychoanalysis to their respective “trial benches” in the laboratories of animal behavior and the ones of social behavior.

In the thesis of Burrow one can see clearly the “social influence” of Baldwin as well as the enthusiasm for the laboratory method of Stratton and Dunlap. At that time, the problem of “attention” was the focal point of interest of the psychologists, for the emphasis given to this subject by Wundt as well as the fact that it is the first “higher mental process” submitted to experimental study. The interest of Burrow in the subject maintained itself during his whole life and culminates in a new orientation in reference to the processes of attention.

It was to be Stratton himself who orients him towards psychopathology and puts him into contact with the other principal trends of the moment: the one headed and backed by Adolf Meyer in scientific psychiatry. The latter, a Suisse from Zürich immigrated to America, found himself directing at that time the recently inaugurated New York State Institute of Psychiatry of Wards Island, the most prestigious institution in this field in the New World. In the summer of 1909, Burrow moved there with his family, recently concluded his doctorate and decided to train in psychopathology with Adolf Meyer¹⁸. The latter considered more appropriate that Burrow previously dedicate a year to study in Europe. Making use of the visit of Freud and Jung to New York on the way to Clark University, he put Burrow in contact with the latest tendencies: the psychology of the unconscious. We are coming closer to another of these peak experiences in the life of Triggant Burrow. Let us see how, almost at the end of his life, he recalls it in a letter to a

¹⁷ John M. O'Donnell (1985), *The Origins of Behaviorism. American Psychology, 1870-1920*, (New York: The New York University Press), p.197.

¹⁸ Meyer is a European coming from the Burghölzli of Zürich who introduced the biopsychological orientation in psychiatry. Together with Jelliffe, they are the major promoters of the mental hygiene movement initiated by the ex-patient Clifford Beers.

fellow student from the years of the doctorate in Psychology, the Professor in Comparative Psychology Robert M. Yerkes of Yale University:

“After my doctorate in Experimental Psychology I spent a summer with Adolf Meyer in Wards Island where I came across the “Studies on Hysteria” of Freud in the library of the Institute of Psychiatry. I felt myself completely integrated with the early writings of Freud and, after consulting with Dr. Meyer, I felt compelled to go to Europe for a year or so to study Psychoanalysis. It so happened that Freud and Jung were in New York at that moment. I had the pleasure to be presented to them and in consequence I made the necessary arrangements for participating in a Psycho-Analytic Seminar of Jung the following year — a seminar conducted in English, which implied 12 hours a week in contrast with the mere three or four hours of scientific activity in German of the Vienna Society on Wednesday evenings.

It was a memorable year for me and more still through my relationship there with Auguste Hoch whom I arrived to know intimately.¹⁹ If it was not for Hoch, I think, I would have received more than enough discouragement in what seemed to me then and still seems to me the unjustified extravagances of certain aspects of the psychology of Freud.

After my stay abroad I returned to Baltimore and started a practice of Psychoanalysis for which I received great help and encouragement from Dr. Meyer. With the inauguration of the Phipps Clinic I was given the post of Assistant there. In spite of that I never undervalued the training I had received from Dr. Stratton in Experimental Psychology²⁰. As you can see I dedicated my time to very different interests. Neurosis and only neurosis was converted into my only absorbing preoccupation once I left Johns Hopkins.”

But let us not precipitate ourselves; let us not jump over this second study trip of Burrow to the Old World. To be able to understand all its importance it will be necessary that we make a stop and explain how the situation of psychiatry had changed on one and the other side of the Atlantic since his first journey. Which was the situation from which Trigant Burrow departed? To start with, even if with our exposition we could have given the impression that we were dealing with a dilettante, the question of psychiatry and of psychology he took very seriously indeed and, what is more, in America these disciplines were something serious. They carried with them a social charge of reform, of change in which the very illustrious professors in their “ivory tower” of the German and French universities and their respective academies could never have dreamt. In these, lunacy was still an academic problem of nosology or, maximum, a question of laboratory.

In Europe, the world capital of Psychiatry was still disputed by Zürich and Munich, this is to say Bleuler and Kraepelin. Paris and Berlin had lost importance. Oberndorf (1953) in his History of Psychoanalysis in America makes a distressing survey of what Psychiatry was in the Charité of Berlin and the Bicêtre of Paris. From there, as we have seen, came Brill the year before dashing for Burghölzli by recommendation of his chief at

¹⁹ C. P. Oberndorf (1953): *A History of Psychoanalysis in America*.

Auguste Hoch was destined to be the successor of Adolf Meyer as Director of the Psychiatric Institute of New York when the latter moved on to direct the Phipps Clinic as chairman of Johns Hopkins University of Baltimore. Hoch belongs to the first crop of Americans who went to Europe to learn psychoanalysis. There he coincided with Trigant Burrow and with G. A. Young of Omaha with both of whom upon his return in 1911 he founded the American Psychoanalytic Association in Washington. Under the directorship of Hoch, the Psychiatric Institute of Ward's Island was converted into one of the principal breeding grounds of psychoanalysis in America.

²⁰ “A Search...”: letter to Thomas Stratton of May 21, 1909, pp. 567-570 and 580-584.

the Columbia University, Peterson. Vienna was still more a cultural capital than a scientific one. Wagner-Jauregg still had not discovered the treatment of general progressive palsy for which he shall win the Nobel Prize. Sigmund Freud, however, was now much more known since in 1902 the University of Vienna bestowed on him the title of Professor, although he was an associate one. Moreover, every week the notice of what happened in the Wednesday meeting of the Society was published in the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* y la *Neue Freie Presse* through the reports made of the meeting by two of its founder members, Wilhelm Stekel and Alfred Adler respectively. These meetings, what is more, were attended by the cream of the artistic and literary progressive society of Vienna. At that time, Freud still did not count with foreign disciples. As we have seen, the ones who from 1907 onwards come to Vienna to visit him did not do so with the intention of studying or analyzing themselves but to know the author of *The Interpretation of Dreams* and the discoverer of the unconscious. Looked at it from America, the world capital of psychoanalysis was more in Zürich than in Vienna. From September 1907 onwards in Zürich operated a Society of Freudian Physicians as numerous as the Viennese one. It was these who had organized in Salzburg the first International Congress of Freudian Psychology and who, directed by C. G. Jung, edited the first psychoanalytic publication, the *Jahrbuch für Psychoanalytische und Psychologische Forschungen*. It was the Suisse who made psychoanalysis fashionable. After the Salzburg Congress A. A. Brill came from Zürich, Ernest Jones came from Toronto and, with the blessing of Bleuler, it seemed as if Freud had converted himself in the tourist attraction of Europe. In 1909, there was already a Pleiades of Americans studying in Zürich who approached Vienna, between others A. Muthmann, M. Karpas, I. Jekels and L. Karpinska. But, all of them did so following the old pattern of visits to foreign professors which reduced itself to shake Freud's hand, take a cup of coffee with him, discuss his writings, having read them or not, and succeed in that he dedicate to them some of his books. Summing up, if Vienna can be considered the cradle of Psychoanalysis, Zürich —and especially the Burghölzli— is converted into the shop window from which this product starts to be exported to the whole world. To round off the question of reputation of Freud and of Jung, the President of the Clark University in Worcester, Stanley Hall “the king-maker”, in view of that Wundt did not accept to come to the celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the foundation of the University, he invited through separate channels Freud and Jung between many other European professors.

Certainly, this was not the intention with which Adolf Meyer sent his assistants and disciples to Zürich from America. Meyer, born in Niederweningen, Switzerland, had worked at the Burghölzli under Adolf Forel, the predecessor of Eugene Bleuler, and had immigrated to the United States in 1892. For years he had worked at the Bloomingdale Hospital (The Westchester Division of the New York Hospital) and finished up taking charge of the Manhattan State Hospital of New York, an institution destined to be a kind of second Burghölzli of psychoanalysis in America and one of its principal bulwarks in the decade of the twenties. The same than there, relates Oberndorf —apart from the doctors analyzing themselves and following the custom of mutually analyzing their dreams— the use of dynamic psychology coming from Zürich and Vienna was taken very seriously, on the diagnostic level of their patients and in the training of their doctors (Oberndorf 1954). But not only that, Meyer was also the spearhead of what afterwards would come to be called the psychobiological approach, a term coined by him for referring to “a science of man which conceived that his biography, with all his mental functioning, was as authentically biological as was psychology”. Such a point of view, naturally, implied two more assumptions: one, that live man can only be studied as a whole person in action and, two, that this whole person represents an integrated whole of functions hierarchically disposed. Moreover, Meyer defended his teachings and practice as genetic-

dynamic, psycho-biologic, objective and of common sense. This last term often has been badly understood. His critics erroneously have given this term its everyday meaning, leading some to joke that psychiatry starts where common sense fails. Meyer used this term in more than one sense: 1) often he qualified this expression with the adjective of “critical”, pointing out that the common sense was the one which authorized people to be critical —this is to say, the ones who know what they are talking about; 2) it is related to the translation of the term “consensus” and as such represents the constant search of Meyer of the agreement between theory, teaching and practice; and 3) in certain connotations he transmitted the idea little sophisticated that the material of theory and practice of psychiatry, so precious to the psychiatrist, is in no way sacrosanct and, in fact is seen to be subject to modification, acceptance and rejection on part of the general public. It is this way, however, that Meyer sustained that the principal task of psychiatry is to educate the public since its value depended on the acceptance of the public.²¹ The same than Forel had been in Europe with alcoholism, Meyer in America had been an apostle of “mental hygiene”. It was him who first coined the term and who since 1906 went on conceptualizing it.²² It is not strange, then, that it was him that Clifford Beers consulted when writing his famous bestseller, *A mind that found itself*²³, with which in 1908 in America the world movement of mental hygiene is initiated. Meyer supported this movement; another of the ones consulted was the eminent psychologist William James who Freud respected so. The following year, in 1909, the same year that Burrow parted for Switzerland, the First National Committee for Mental Hygiene is initiated. In his absence, Meyer and, between others Jones, in 1910 found in Washington the American Psychopathological Association in which Burrow was destined to play a preponderant role.²⁴ Parallel to this coming together of psychiatry and academic psychology with the popular movement of mental hygiene, occurred in those days another movement which passed totally unnoticed by the psychoanalysts of Europe and which is of transcendental importance for understanding the animadversion of Freud towards the Americans and the attitude of the American Psychoanalytic Association in reference to the problem of training of “foreign candidates”. This association was initiated under the presidency of Trigant Burrow in 1925-1926 in the administrative sessions held during the Congress of Bad Homburg and culminating in the Congress of Paris in 1938 under the presidency of Ernest Jones. We are referring to the investigation sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching which in those days Abraham Flexner had initiated on Medical Education in the United States of America. The publication of this report, on one hand, supposed the end of the confusion created regards the “private schools of medicine” and, on the other

²¹ Wendell Muncie (1959): “*The psychobiological approach*” in *The American Handbook of Psychiatry*, edited by Arietti et al., (Nueva York: Basic Books Inc.) pp. 1317-1333.

²² Adolf Meyer (1906) *The Problem of Aftercare and the Organization of Societies for Prophylaxis of Mental Disorders* and *Aftercare and Prophylaxis* (1908). No one can be involved in the work of psychiatric care without experiencing the awakening of an instinctive wish for prophylaxis. He talked about the need for creating districts of community mental hygiene in which mental health professionals coordinate their services with schools, recreational institutions of nursery schools, churches, social police agencies in an effort of prevent mental disorder and promote solid mental health. A. Meyer (1915) “*Organizing the Community for the Protection of its Mental Life*” en *Survey*, 1915, pp. 34:557-60.

²³ Clifford Beers (1908): *A mind that found itself*, (Nueva York: Longmans Green). Clifford Beers had been locked up in an asylum and upon leaving it he swore to dedicate his life and energy to improving the fate of the mentally ill. This unchained a popular movement of mental hygiene of repercussions in the whole world, joined by the most progressive psychiatric authorities, between them Emili Mira y López in Spain, and Germain.

²⁴ Until 1917 the National Committee for Mental Hygiene dedicated its resources and energies to accumulating reality data in reference to the care and treatment of the mentally ill. From 1920 onwards, this emphasis changes toward the preparation of psychiatrists, psychologists and social workers correctly trained. During the Second World War the emphasis is on the mental health of the Armed Forces and the Mobilization of recruits.

hand, it promoted, through the introduction of the laboratory in the clinic, the American revolution in medical education which takes that country to turn into the spearhead of modern scientific medicine.²⁵ It is important to remember that the teaching of psychoanalysis in Europe as well as in American was and still is a private school and, what is more, psychoanalysis is the only known discipline in which all investigation, its theoretical and practical development and teaching have been defrayed through the free exercise of the profession and thanks to the honoraries of the patients and the candidates in training.

We have mentioned all this in view of situating Trigant Burrow in his time, since not having a perception at the same time European and American, he is often presented to us like a visionary in complete delusion. Contemplated from the American perspective, the following commentary Trigant Burrow makes to Professor Yerkes in the above mentioned letter proves to be most sensible: “Since the beginning of my work in psychoanalysis I was interested in the social implication of the neuroses; I was interested in the social implications of the Self, my own included, naturally. It seemed to me that the analyst and the analysand were prepared to challenge anything as long as it was not this central nucleus; this is to say their own socially conditioned identity. This interested me and has constituted the principal object in my group investigation.”²⁶

Trigant Burrow, when he leaves for Europe not only carries in his suitcase two doctorates, the M.D. of 1889 and the Ph.D. of 1909, but also counts with a good academic and professional curriculum. Already then he was member of The Medical and Surgical Faculty of Maryland, The Maryland Psychiatric Society, The American Medical Association, The Southern Society of Philosophy and Psychology, The American Psychological Association y The American Association for the Advancement of Science. It is not strange then that, in spite of having had him only one month with him, Adolf Meyer when recommending that he go to Zürich probably was thinking of him as future collaborator for the move to Baltimore he was contemplating.

In fact it was Abraham A. Brill who made the aforementioned presentation of Trigant Burrow to Freud in the Hammerstein’s Roof Garden. To Jung, surely, Meyer himself had presented him the day before during the visit the former had paid to Wards Island. This meeting for Burrow means the beginning of an experience which will absorb him completely. Not a month had passed when, selling the properties inherited from his father, he embarks for Zürich —with a son of five and a daughter months— for a year of studies with Jung. This way he was to be the first native American to practice psychoanalysis and the second one to do so in America —the first was Brill who practiced since 1908, although without formal training or any personal analysis. The following decade he dedicates exclusively to the individual method of analysis, a dedication which out of loyalty to Freud and methodological and epistemological purity in the end forces him to adopt the group method of analysis.

Till here we wanted to present our hero. In short, it is every inch of a gentleman from the South, a young man of 34 years of age, with two doctorates, happily married and

²⁵ A. Flexner (1909): “*Medical Education in the United States of America*”, A Report to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Bulletin Number Four, New York, 1910.

²⁶ “A Search...” (p. 527) “...Neurosis and only neurosis became to be my preoccupation when I left Johns Hopkins... At least it was some compensation for me when some years later I could encourage my young associate, William Galt, when he started to interest himself in animal behavior, to graduate in experimental psychology. This I hope will correct some of my negligence in this field on my part, till these last years I have been able to experiment with the neuro-muscular reactions concomitant to the different forms of attention which throughout the years I have come to describe as cotention (global attention) and ditention (partitive attention).”

with two small children, who just moved to New York to extend his studies in psychiatry in the training institution of most prestige in the country and under the direction of the maximum authority, Professor Adolf Meyer, and he finds that the latter, scarcely a month after his arrival, recommends him to move to Zürich to study with Jung, a brilliant psychiatrist of his own age. We know about his cultural and social environment, his family antecedents and what had supposed for him the loss of his sister; we know of his conflict between religion and science and of his interests. Perhaps all this will help us to better understand the first phase of his analytic career that starts with this second study trip to Europe. Burrow parts with the specific objective of investigating that what causes human insanity and the double conviction that the laboratory method is the adequate way to investigate it and that the principal obstacle is to be found in the observer, in that degree of distortion which the investigator introduces in the observation of the facts, a factor denominated by Bessel 'personal equation', a subject in turn on which Burrow had centered the re-elaboration of the "Komplikations Versuch" of Wundt in his doctoral thesis in psychology.

Finally, we would only need to know something about his character. Let us read what William Galt, who knew him well, tells us in this respect: "The ones who did not know him could have an idea of Dr. Burrow completely different of how in fact he was. He was extraordinarily sensitive about the emotional state of the ones who surrounded him and was in constant contact with the preoccupations and experiences of these. He seemed always disposed to leave aside his interests of the moment and to enter fully into the ones of his companions. Really, he turned them into his own, and received with enthusiasm the project or problem presented to him. His way of understanding with sympathy was combined with a generous sense of humor. His relationships show a marked continuity throughout the years. In a world riddled with divorce on all levels — domestic, industrial and international— his professional and family associations maintained themselves unshaken in spite of the differences which at times shook them to their very foundations."²⁷

3.2 With Carl Gustav Jung

The psychoanalytic career of Burrow starts on the side of Jung. The course 1909-1910 was the first Jung dedicates exclusively to the university and the teaching of psychoanalysis, once interrupted his association of a whole decade with the Burghölzli and with Bleuler. Shortly after arrival, on October 2, Burrow writes the first letter to his mother from Zürich and he tells her enthusiastically of the reception Jung had offered them days before. Hoch and he had been invited to his house in Küsnacht and Jung had even presented his wife Emma to them. He says in the letter: "Dr. Jung is my man. I am enchanted with him. It is good to know that I was right in coming here. I think it will be the year of my life." In effect, so it was. But not all was going to be a rose garden. On October 20 he writes again: "The other day we have suffered our first misfortune which cost us \$10 —not a very large sum but an enormous waste in its equivalent of 50 Suisse francs. We became very nervous and for me it supposed days of relentless depression. The circumstance was that we had come to an agreement with other lodgings and the day we were leaving to move we discovered that the cost in this one (Pension Fortuna) were 3 francs less per day of what I had understood and, in consequence, we preferred to continue here, given that it was so healthy and comfortable for all. The other patron, however, insisted in that we should pay 50 francs for damages, something which everybody here considered an abuse and which upset us. As much as we resisted

²⁷ W. Galt (1955) Prologue to "A Search..." p. XVI.

ourselves, in the end we had no choice than pay in view of that our friends advised us that if we did not pay she could take us to court, something which surely would cost us still more, and it so being that we are the foreigners in strange land, it was better for us to pay, something which we finally did and against our heart, because to give \$10 for nothing is as if they tore off your arm from its root. It became very clear to me that my depression and general malaise were totally disproportionate to the precipitating cause and that the cause of my predisposition must be more profound. So that I decided to consult with Jung and he confirmed immediately that the causes had deeper roots and he recommended me treatment. In consequence, I am going to his surgery one hour every day and I hope I can improve a lot thanks to his analysis and psychotherapy. He told me the same than Dr. Barquer (psychiatrist in Baltimore) that my own neurosis will be of great help in the management of the one of others; also he said something else which I liked very much and encouraged me enormously —that from the first moment he had realized that I had a special talent for understanding his psychology, that the type of questions I pose puts into evidence my capacity for this method and learning.”²⁸

This anecdote seems relevant to us since it locates us in the moment and the way that for the first time occurred a didactic analysis —till then, what Freud recommended for training was auto-analysis; if any analyst analyzed himself with another it was because he considered himself ill; Jung himself, during his stay in New York, offered himself to analyze Freud for whom his prostate problems had unleashed a real phobia with the American WCs (Rosenzweig 1992); to combine therapy and training was a real invention. It does not seem, however, that Jung’s opinion was as high as Burrow showed. Here is the commentary of Jung to Freud scarcely a week afterwards: “As a base for the analysis of the “American way of life”, I actually have embrangled myself in the treatment of a young American (a physician). Here again the mother-complex feels at home (this is to say the one of the Mother-Mary cult). In America the dominant member of the family is decidedly the mother. American culture has really fallen into an abyss without bottom. The men have turned into a herd of sheep where the women play the role of rapacious wolves —in the family circle, to be understood, of course. I ask myself if such conditions had ever occurred since the world is world. Truly I think they have not.” Jung’s opinion surely was more due to the prejudice he shared with Freud in reference to the Americans and their ugly habit of qualifying in psychopathological terms their ‘cultural opinions’, as is borne out by the commentary that Jung makes to Freud on November 10, 1908, while preparing the trip to America: “The Americans are peculiar people with habits very much their own. They show curiosity, but rarely genuine interest (a difference as the one existing between the yearning of the neurasthenic and the true wish of the normal lover). The attitude in reference to progress is lamentable. They want to hear about all the ‘latest’ methods of treatment, with the eye firmly fixed on the all powerful dollar, and thinking only in the prestige, ‘kudos’ as they call them, which these will bring in. Recently many articles have been written praising the Freudian psychotherapy, but they are absurdly superficial, and I am afraid that they will judge it with harshness as soon as they hear of their sexual foundations and realize intuitively what that means. The most we can hope for is to secure some few genuine converts and widen the narrowness of their point of view, even though we have to do everything possible to even the way towards the future.”²⁹

Being personal reasons or not, it is clear that the idealization between analyst and analysand was not mutual. Without doubt, in his analysis with Jung there is implicit the experience of the ‘exclusive analysis’ which Burrow will try to formulate in terms of ‘social neurosis’ after his ‘inclusive analysis’ with Clarence Shields who forced him to

²⁸ “A Search...” p. 26

²⁹ Ernest Jones quoted by R. W. Clark in *Sigmund Freud*, p.297.

discover groupanalysis. What Freud was capable of doing with his Oedipus complex, Burrow would do with the “mother complex”, his concept of “primary identification with the mother” —this is to say, a first formulation of the pre-oedipal psyche— which according to Oberndorf constitutes the principal contribution of psychoanalysis from America.

Much has been speculated about why Burrow preferred Zürich to Vienna for continuing his studies in psychoanalysis, as also about the consequences of having analyzed himself with Jung and not with Freud. This “choice” of teacher and of analyst is of only secondary importance, since when it was made there was not even an inkling of a split between Vienna and Zürich, apart from that this was the only place where a formal training was imparted. We have already seen the weight Adolf Meyer had had in this decision, not forgetting either that for an academic career as was waiting for him in Baltimore, Zürich had much more prestige than Vienna. Even so, no matter how much Burrow all his life considered himself basically a Freudian, the imprint of the teachings of Jung are undeniable. Together with Burrow, the seminar of psychoanalysis which Jung dictated in English, was attended by three other Americans—Dr. Young of Omaha, Dr. Amsden and the eminent Dr. Hoch, destined to succeed Adolf Meyer at the New York State Institute when, that same year, Meyer was named Professor of Psychiatry of Johns Hopkins and Director of the Phipps Clinic in Baltimore. After only a few months, Burrow felt completely identified with psychoanalysis as can be seen from the following paragraphs we extract from the correspondence with his mother³⁰: “I am much occupied with an article which I hope to finish in less than a month, in which I give some account of the psychotherapeutic method of Freud and Jung. My idea is to identify myself from the beginning with this new school of psychology and to introduce myself this way before the profession and the public. I look forward to start work next autumn [...] The field is practically empty for psychoanalysis —I am the first American who will dedicate himself to this work and the second one in America. The other is Austrian (Brill). I don’t mention Hoch because he dedicates himself to institutional work. You know that psychoanalysis adapts itself only to the educated classes and I have the sensation that apart from having received the adequate training for it, I have moreover the most important, the instinct. All in all, the perspective could not be better.”

By the way, in the article mentioned³¹ he uses the following quotation of Jung which we have not been able to locate anywhere: “Toda neurosis represents an individual intent of solving a social problem”. Perhaps it was only a personal communication, but it’s a good argument in support of that the influence of Jung on Burrow was greater than the latter recognizes. At the same time it was premonitory of the lifelong position Burrow was going to take in reference to the neuroses. For him the unconscious conflict defines itself already then as a result of the repression of the egotistic instincts on part of the social instincts, and that the task of the analyst, as he had heard from Freud in Nuremberg³²,

³⁰ “A Search...” pp. 24-35.

³¹ Trigant Burrow (1909-1911): “*Freud’s psychology in its relation to the neuroses*”, American Journal of Medical Sciences Vol. 141 pp. 873-82.

³² In relation to the role Burrow was destined to play in the development of psychoanalysis in America, it is not sure that Burrow was a foundational member of the International Psychoanalytic Association in Nuremberg in 1910. This supposition is supported by the description of Jones in his biography of Freud when he complains of not having been able to be present there himself, adding: “*The only American present was Trigant Burrow who had been studying with Jung in Zürich. G. A. Young of Omaha who also had studied there had already returned to America.*” (Jones Vol. 2, p. 68). Against it is the fact that Burrow does not mention it explicitly anywhere, when on the contrary he does say that he had become member of the Society of Medical Psychotherapy of Forel during his stay in Zürich. It is possible that instead of going to Nuremberg he went on vacation to Italy with his family as he mentions in a letter to his mother on March 23. This possibility gives us an idea, on one hand, of the scarce interest Burrow

is not that of “hunting down complexes” but of working through resistances which present themselves in making conscious what is unconscious, be they individual or social. Our impression is that Trigant Burrow is like a dwarf riding on the shoulders of two giants of the soul, Freud and Jung who, although it is true, could see further than either of the them but, however, found himself crushed by the fight between these enormous bulkheads. What often is lost sight of is that if Burrow in such circumstances was capable not only of surviving but to creatively adapt himself to the situation, to advance psychoanalysis was thanks to the protection and encouragement he received during the following decade from that other great little man called Adolf Meyer.

3.3 With Meyer in the Phipps Clinic

The determination of Burrow in pursuing his objectives is in consonance with the promise he had made himself the moment his vocation was revealed to him as investigator of insanity. Upon his return in 1910 he installs himself in Baltimore, the same town where he had found his vocation as a psychologist investigator of insanity and from which he parted in search of a unitary vision of the latter. Happily it so occurred that the very same professor Adolf Meyer—who in New York in 1909 had referred him to Jung for improving the necessary instruments, this is to say himself as an observer—had been contracted as Professor of Psychiatry of Johns Hopkins University and was occupied with getting going the recently inaugurated Henry Phipps Psychiatric Clinic. Freud warned the ones who, like Burrow, dare investigate analytically the subject of the cultural neuroses, not to do so by analogies, “because it is dangerous for men and for ideas to be uprooted from the soil in which they originate and to which they pertain.” In his case, after a short pilgrimage in the Old World and the fatherland of his teachers, our man re-implanted himself in a soil which was his and very much his. We are referring not so much to the place itself but more to the scientific environment, the one of experimental psychology and the clinic as laboratory. Moreover, he does so in good company. In 1909, when they first met, the ideas that Burrow was developing all along already were in a state of metamorphosis in the mind of Meyer. The latter, who by then had already introduced the term of “psychobiological interpretation”, stated that within this wider context the reactions of the psychopathological personality could be explained as a regression to previous phylogenetic reactions formerly protective and now incompatible with adaptation. The association between one and the other was inevitable and, naturally, Meyer was not willing to dispense with the services of such a valuable person and such a promising collaborator. This being so, Burrow started an intense professional activity on three fronts: a) establish a flourishing private practice from which he derives his *modus vivendi* based on his affiliation with the University and the Phipps Clinic; b) develop an activity of investigation centered on the double concept of clinic as laboratory—which is how Burrow conceives from his beginnings the analytic situation—and the laboratory in the clinic—which is how he conceives his task as psychopathologist and mental hygienist; and c) contribute generously to attaining the objectives of the scientific professional and cultural associations to which he belongs.

Supported by his university position and thanks to his particular talent, the private psychoanalytic practice of Burrow could not be more buoyant. The predictions he had made his mother from Zürich more than fulfilled themselves: he had converted himself into a posh psychoanalyst. The mansion in the center of Baltimore which he took for housing and surgery upon return from Europe soon was getting too narrow and he had

showed always in the institutional questions of psychoanalysis and, on the other hand, the equally little interest Jung may have felt in counting with allies in America.

to change office various times and buy a house on the outskirts for a living space. Curiously, to the latter he gave the name of Lifwynn, found in an old Anglo-Saxon dictionary and meaning “joy of life”, a name he will also adopt for the country estate — The Lifwynn Camp— in the Adirondack mountains on the shore of lake Chataugay. Around this lake also put up their lodgings the patients who would be picked up by boat to be able to continue their analysis during the long summer vacations. The practice of psychoanalysis, however, for Trigant Burrow did not reduce itself to private practice. His contribution as associate professor of the university and as faculty of the Henry Phipps Psychiatric Clinic basically was limited to the personal psychoanalysis of the members of the faculty or staff of the university who the institution sent for therapeutic or didactic reasons. Technically, as prove his first papers³³ and the theater play “The Dream Interpreter”, Trigant Burrow’s psychoanalysis was based fundamentally on the analysis of dreams —something for which he had a special talent— reinforced with the ‘word association test’ if it was necessary. Moreover, from 1915 onwards some of these analyses were made under instrumental control, with experimental character and in laboratory conditions; this is to say in the same spirit as Mira y López. From 1916 on Watson, who in the meantime had earned the sympathy and favors of Adolf Meyer, started to rephrase the Freudian categories in biological terms underlining the formation of syndromes of behavior³⁴, an initiative followed by Horace W. Frink —the American analyzed by Freud and which the latter intended to impose as president of the New York Psychoanalytical Society— in his popular essay of psychoanalysis “Morbid Fears and Compulsions” of 1918³⁵.

Burrow’s ideas flow from an almost perfect marriage between clinic and laboratory — which on the level of disciplines he tried to demonstrate between psychoanalysis and experimental psychology— as also from a reflection he almost never made in solitary, or in the solitude of the ivory tower of a discipline, or the solitude of the intellectual who ignores the social reality of which he forms part. As proof, here there are some of the expressions used at different moments for referring to himself. He would say, for example, of his analytic training in the prologue of the first of his books, that he was analyzed in preparation of his work as “social psychopathologist”. In the last book, on the other hand, he presents himself as “clinical anthropologist” and the foundation he establishes as “clinical sociologist” is for the “laboratory investigation in social and analytical psychiatry”. Burrow exposes and discusses these ideas consistently in the professional associations, especially the American Psychopathological Association and the American Psychoanalytic Association, the annual meetings of which habitually are celebrated together. The publication of his articles and conferences is lavish, a minimum of two articles a year.

There is something dramatic in the way how Burrow arrives at his discoveries or at least the way he relates and recalls them, that justify the above mentioned impression that for Burrow his religious faith and his devotion to the maternal religion is converted into devotion to science. This takes him from one peak experience to another. Perhaps this way of his to describe, to write and to live may be no more than a leftover of the vocation of the dramatic author which he had to abandon in favor of science. The following

³³ For example “*Die psychologische Analyse der sogenannten Neurasthenie und Verwandter Zustände*” („The psychological analysis of so-called Neurasthenia and allied conditions“), read in part on December 29, 1911, before the American Psychological Association and *in toto* before the American Psychoanalytic Association in Boston on May 28, 1912, published in *Die Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse* in Vol. 1, 1913, pp. 330-343, under the title of “*Die psychologische Analyse der sogenannten Neurasthenie und verwandter Zustände*” and as a fragment in Vol. 8, pp. 243-58 of *The Journal of Abnormal Psychology* of the same year.

³⁴ John Broadus Watson (1916): “*Behavior and the Concept of Mental Disease*”, *JPPSM* 13 pp.589-96.

³⁵ H. W. Frink (1918): *Morbid Fears and Compulsions*, (Boston: Moffat, Yard & Co.), quoted in Oberndorf.

anecdotes correspond to this period. For example, here is how the main idea of all his conceptualization, the one of the preconscious or “nest instinct” was revealed to him: “In the middle of my psychoanalytic work, suddenly I ran across something which seemed to me like a phase of sensation and of organic becoming aware which preceded the most early objective appreciation on the part of the child of his environment. I remember this moment very well, and the patient—a teacher, by the way, and a woman. I named it like the subjective primary phase of the organism and started to speak of “primary identification of the child with the mother”. This is how in me a pathway of thinking and investigation was initiated of which all my later work is no more than its complete development.”³⁶

His written work reflects the conceptual display of the author framed by his position of departure already described as well as the events taking place in the professional groups to which he belongs and his familiar, social and cultural environment. The principal core of the framework of his arguments is constituted by the series of articles, some of them unpublished, in which he is elaborating the concept of the preconscious which posthumously the editorial committee of the Lifwynn Foundation edited under the title of *Preconscious Foundations of Human Experience* (Galt 1964). There are, however, various articles which cut tangentially through the core and which, to our understanding, have to do with the conflicts becoming manifest in the psychoanalytic community. In the first one of 1912, “Psychoanalysis and Society”, he questions already the responsibility of the psychoanalyst in front of society. In the second one, also of 1912, “Conscious and Unconscious Mentation from the Psychoanalytic Viewpoint”, he tries to conciliate without much success the existing contradictions between the Pleasure Principle and the Reality Principle in “The two principles of mental functioning” of Freud and the ideas of individual and collective unconscious of Jung, both having appeared this same year. His argument centers on demonstrating that psychoanalysis and experimental psychology definitely are not incompatible. Here we understand that for Burrow is reactivated in his professional environment the same denied conflict of the split in the family he had lived through in infancy. It was difficult to deny the implications of the split of Adler and, from 1913 onwards, a time around which the majority of these papers accumulate, it was difficult to dissimulate the disagreements between Jung and Freud, even as far away as the United States. It seems as if destiny took Trigant Burrow once and again to the eye of the hurricane where the currents of opposed ideological positions meet; first between the paternal agnosticism and the maternal Catholicism which will be dramatized between his studies with the Jesuits at college and as Bachelor and his preparation as a biologist and physician during the last decade of the XIX century; afterwards, in his years of training and the choice of career during the first decade of the XX century, between the philosophic and the experimental tendencies in psychology and, from the second decade onwards, between psychoanalysis and behaviorism, and within psychoanalysis itself between the tendencies of egotistic and exclusive analysis personalized in Freud and Jung, and group analysis, in the sense of social and inclusive, which he himself proposes as a solution for the “social neurosis” of which all these splits are no more than its symptom.

We ignore the reasons for which Burrow in 1913 tries to analyze himself with Freud. Be this as it may, the case is that what Burrow looked for, the same than in his first analysis with Jung, was basically a therapeutic analysis. November 5, 1913, Freud answers him in the following terms: “...under no condition would I analyze your wife at the same time than yourself; this would make work very difficult for me. If she does come to Vienna with you and wishes an analysis, she could find one (cheaper) with one of

³⁶ It should be mentioned that this very same tone of revelation will be found in his last conversion which will take him to the instrumental studies of *Cotention*.

my colleagues. Of course, we could arrange it the other way round, I could analyze your wife and you yourself could go to someone different, much as I think that this does not seem to be what you have in mind.” Although the paragraph, with which Freud signs off, seems to give to understand that what the latter proposed to him is rather a didactic analysis: “I would be very pleased if, beyond you benefitting personally, through your analysis you succeeded in clarifying and corroborating many psychoanalytic questions. With great respect from a colleague, Freud.”

We neither know the reasons that took Burrow to renounce this project of analysis. What is clear, however, is that his asking Freud in those moments meant that he chose him and not Jung. The question of wanting to analyze himself together with his wife — something that S. H. Foulkes saw himself forced to accept in his analysis with Helene Deutsch, by decision of the latter— either means that there were difficulties in his marriage which he tried to resolve that way —fact which would make Trigant Burrow the pioneer in couple therapy— or that these difficulties, in case there were, did not imply more than a transference on the level of the family of reproduction of what was going on in Europe in the psychoanalytic family. It would not surprise us that, if this was the case, on the unconscious level for Burrow this implied a rescue phantasy, and this is to say the solution of the disruption in his family of origin. In support of this interpretation, there are two facts. The first is that Trigant Burrow and his wife, instead of analyzing themselves, what they did is finish the theater play “The dream interpreter” they had initiated when fiancés ten years before.³⁷ The other is that he tried to deny the necessity of a schism as he suggests in the article of May 1917 “Notes with reference to Freud, Jung y Adler” where, resorting to a subtle play of words between differences and disagreements, Burrow adduces as proof that his own differences with Jung and with Freud on sexuality did not in turn stop him to agree with both. This article, stating that the actual quarrels more than disagreements of ideas are due to personal piques between the dogmatism of one and the other, finishes with the following act of faith: “I cannot believe that this split is irreparable. It would really be a calamity if that splendid geniality of Jung had led astray his genial perspectives towards a irrevocable disagreement with the clear, firm, disinterested observations of Freud.”

The preoccupation of Burrow about the future of psychoanalysis and the consequences a definitive split between Freud and Jung could bring about can be guessed at through the answer of Freud of January 3, 1915 when Burrow offers him refuge in Baltimore during the war: “Your commentaries in reference to the situation of psychoanalysis in America I consider that you are completely right. I never deceived myself in that psychoanalysis goes against the general inclinations and, for this reason, I think that to dilute it or cover it up with smoke screens, as the ones of Jung, can have for a little while great possibilities of success. My hope lies in that there be everywhere people like you prepared to defend the truth in all its extension and austerity... Our international scientific situation sees itself much affected by the war and probably by its *sequelae*. This should not be a preoccupation for our science although it is for an individual who is not young any longer as is my case.”

The fact is that Burrow did not analyze himself with Freud, and Freud continued in Vienna in spite of the war. There would be necessary another War to get him away from there and take him definitely into exile. The calamity that Burrow feared was inevitable. The disagreement of Jung with Freud turned out to be irrevocable and for the Freudians Jung’s geniality was lost definitely. At the end of 1914, the moment he receives Burrow’s letter, Freud could not be more down-hearted. The congress of Dresden had to be definitely suspended, his medical practice had reduced itself to only two or three hours a

³⁷ See the letter of the former proprietor of his house.

day and he saw himself forced to write without a break his meta-psychological papers so as not to fall into a depression. From the Suisse none of them was left. From the Americans he knew nothing. The only one that had written to him was Burrow and this “to offer him his house as a refuge!!!”³⁸ Even so, the above-mentioned answer with which he expresses his gratitude starts proudly: “Your letter, warm as always, has touched me doubly in these moments of isolation. I thank you for your kind offer, but I cannot avoid the impression that you find yourself under the influence of the gross distortions of the American press. Nobody here thinks of abandoning the town, nor believes that the enemy will pay us a visit. Something of the confidence which Germany inspires dominates also our feelings and we employ all our energies in overcoming this trial. What 1915 has in store for us, nobody can anticipate.”

The depression Freud could not avoid by writing his texts of Metapsychology becomes transparent in the article “Our deception with the war” which he writes in March and the conference he pronounces before the B’nai B’rith society on “Our attitude in reference to death”, both included in his Complete Works as “Actual considerations on war and death”³⁹. Freud’s deception is not so much with humanity but with the international community of artists and scientists who said to have agreed with a scientific Weltanschauung and which has fallen through with the war. “Even science itself has lost its dispassionate impartiality!” he would exclaim, asking himself at the end of the article: “Why the individual collectivities, the nations, despise, hate and abhor each other, including in times of peace, is, after all, incomprehensible, at least for me. In this case it happens just as if all the moral conquests of the individuals were lost when being diluted in a majority of men or, even, only some millions, and only survived the most primitive emotional attitudes, the oldest and roughest. These regrettable circumstances happen, perhaps modified by posterior evolutions. But a little more truthfulness and sincerity in the relations between men and with the ones who govern should even the way towards such a transformation.” His reflections on death take him to formulate it as a drive and to give that paradigmatic jump in the conceptualization of the drives and the mind which takes him from a concept of mind divided in conscious-preconscious-unconscious to a structural concept of the person divided into Yo-Superyo-Ello. The formulation of narcissism as a drive and the concept of death drive will serve him in turn for his future social psychology which he expounds in “Group psychology and analysis of the ego”, “The future of an illusion”, “Civilization and its discontents” and “Moses and monotheism”.

For Trigant Burrow, 1915 also was a crucial year. Three events are worth recording. In first place, he had to definitely give up the plans of his and his wife’s analysis with Freud. Secondly, he started his laboratory work on neuroses in the Phipps Psychiatric Clinic. And third and last, he knew Clarence Shields, the person destined to be his most intimate collaborator and associate for the rest of his life. All and everyone of these events could be considered antecedents of the future theoretical and practical developments which led Burrow to adopt the group method of analysis in the investigation of emotional disturbances in human conduct and the formulation of these in terms of a social neurosis. Instead of analyzing himself with Freud, what the Burrow matrimony did was to finish writing the theater play which at the same time is autobiographical and social. The already mentioned “The Dream Interpreter”, is a plot in which participate eight characters, this is to say the size of a small group, and in which are clearly reflected Burrow’s way of thinking as well as of working at the moment of his “psychoanalytic splendor”. His work in the laboratory of the Phipps Clinic was one way

³⁸ R. Andrew Paskauskas, ed. (1993) *The Complete Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Ernest Jones 1908-1939* Cambridge, Mass. y London, UK: The Belknap Press of Harvard UP, p.309.

³⁹ Ballesteros, Vol. II, pp. 2101-2117.

of again taking up the experiments on attention carried out in his doctoral thesis as also anticipating the instrumental investigations on the neurosis which will lead towards his group method of analysis from 1930 onwards. Clarence Shields was destined to induce Burrow to an inclusive analysis with him which served him as a springboard for the discovery of groupanalysis and the establishment of an original organization totally revolutionary —The Lifwynn Foundation— to be able to develop it and apply it to society.

Of course, Burrow's evolution in psychoanalysis is not independent of the conflict —first latent and then open— between Freud and Jung. It fell to his lot to be an exceptional testimony of it during his year in Zürich and the years following as founder and member of the board of the American Psychoanalytical Association. His theoretical production, of a convinced Freudian but analyzed by Jung, gives us an idea of how he at the same time was digesting this conflict and creatively generating his own ideas. This production develops in three areas: a central core which emerges from his formulation of a preconscious in the sense of primary identification with the mother, a concept which is precursor of what afterwards he formulates as nest instinct and as cotention, the basis of the gregarious sentiment of men as a species. This is accompanied by two more aspects, one which leads to question the concept of normality as an average social behavior from which derives afterwards his formulation of social neurosis; and the other which leads him to question the principle of authority in psychoanalysis and the function of the psychoanalyst in the community. Already in 1912, in "Conscious and Unconscious Mentation from the Psychoanalytic Viewpoint", Burrow picks up the tension between Freud and Jung which is reflected in the concepts of "conscious mentality and unconscious mentality" of Freud in "Two principles of mental functioning" and in the ones of 'symbolic thought and unconscious phantasies' of Jung's "Transformations and symbols of Libido". The perception of these dissonances possibly make him sensitive for detecting his own discovery, since his concept of preconscious is previous to the ones of the Freudian conscious and unconscious, and to Jung's symbolization. However, something goes unnoticed by the majority who, coming from psychoanalysis, try to understand the work of Burrow as the influence which the biopsychology of Adolf Meyer has had in the development of his thinking. We could say that, the same that Freud spent his life trying to write a Psychology for Neurologists, what Burrow tried to write is a Sociobiopsychology for Psychoanalysts. Of course, the preoccupation for the social and cultural was not alien to his teachers whose first squabbles started when Freud, competing with Jung and trying to understand the myths, writes "Totem and taboo".

Burrow's position at the end of his psychoanalytic period proper reflects itself in the following papers: The first, "Conceptions and Misconceptions in Psychoanalysis", read before the Huxley Society of Johns Hopkins University, his *alma mater*. In this one he reiterates his loyalty to Freud at the same time as experimental psychology without, though, disowning the contributions of Jung. There he states that of "the erroneous conceptions in reference to psychoanalysis, the one I believe to be most unfortunate is the one which sustains that there is an inherent opposition between the principles of psychoanalysis and the ones of experimental psychology." The second one is the above mentioned "Notes with reference to Freud..." read before the American Psychopathological Association on May 26, 1917. The third one, never published, is "The Preconscious or the Nest Instinct", read the previous day before the American Psychoanalytic Association, in which he advances the latest formulations of his theory of "the primary identification with the mother".

In 1917, when President Wilson struggled with the doubt whether to avoid entering into war with Germany or declaring the war in favor of the crusade which would finish with all wars —as he sustained in his fourteen points— Burrow decides, as intellectual, to go

into political action. On one hand he writes a series of articles, between them “The psychological factors as underlying Causes of War” and “Psychoanalysis and Convention” and, on the other hand, he makes use of the invitation of the Child Study Association of America to give a series of conferences (Burrow 1917-1918) to divulge his vision of the social neurosis in which the world is involved in.⁴⁰ In these conferences, Burrow makes explicit the theoretical position arrived at up to this moment, a position which, to our understanding, is the one Clarence Shields is going to challenge and who will force the author to pass from the individual method to the group method of analysis, a step which we will report in what follows.

The historical circumstance is that, while Burrow was giving his conferences in New York, in Budapest the psychoanalysts of the Central Powers were celebrating what is known as the Symposium on War Neurosis to which Freud contributed his famous discourse about the “gold of analysis” and in which is proposed the “socialization of psychoanalysis” and a “new type of organization” for the training of psychoanalysts in view of being able to carry forward the future “psychotherapies for the people”.⁴¹ What calls attention is that while Burrow in New York adduces that the principal reason for the personal neurosis is the conventional and for the social neurosis is the institutional, the psychoanalytic community in its Congress of Budapest decides to institutionalize psychoanalysis, something which will be consolidated the five following years. By 1918 had already been founded an official publishing house —Der Internationale Psychoanalytische Verlag— which secured the control of the publications in psychoanalysis, and by 1921 had already been established the Policlinic of Berlin attached to which was the Institute which from 1925 onwards tries to impose the pattern of the training of psychoanalysts on the international level.

The biographers of Burrow (W. Galt, H. Syz, H. and A. Galt) divide his biography in four phases, depending on the emphasis put on one or another aspect of his work. The first one (1895-1909) finishes when he is thirty-four and is characterized by the discovery of the vocation to which he dedicates his life, in other words, it is about —as Freud also had said— the drama of a hero in search of a cause. This phase does not close until, already a physician, he decides himself for psychology and half-way through his doctorate in this new discipline decides to dedicate his life to find a unitary and encompassing solution in relation to the cause of human insanity. The second one (1909-1923), the one we could consider of psychoanalysis proper, starts with his studies with Carl G. Jung in Zürich and finishes with the formal initiation of his groupanalytic investigations in 1923. During these years he develops an important academic and professional life, constructs a blossoming private practice in psychoanalysis which includes notable contributions in this field and, on the institutional level, he plays a very active role in the foundation of the International and the American Psychoanalytic Associations as well as the development of the American Psychopathological Association. The third one (1923-1932) is marked by his investigation in group and philoanalysis. The ideas which lead to this development had been gestating themselves for various years. For some time Burrow had felt unsatisfied with the emphasis put by psychoanalysis on the individualistic evaluation of human conduct. The behavioral disorders were for him, in essence, of a social nature or inter-relational and required that their observation and study were

⁴⁰ The manuscript of these conferences is available in the Yale University Sterling Memorial Library Manuscripts and Archives, Manuscript Group No. 1370, New Haven, Connecticut, 1984. The authors have made a transcription of the original manuscript available for academic purposes. The copy of the original in A4 and the blurred text consists of a prologue by Professor Carleton H. Parker of the University of Washington and four chapters with self-explanatory titles: 1. The psychology of convention. 2. The nature of adaptation to the environment. 3. Hysteria and the institution. 4. The relation of the psychoanalyst with education and life.

⁴¹ S. Freud (1917-1918) “The ways of psychoanalytic therapy” Ballesteros, Vol. II, pp. 2457-2463.

made within a dynamic group context. This point of view acquired pragmatic meaning in the association and mutual analysis in which Dr. Burrow and his student Clarence Shields had embarked themselves from 1917 onwards and from where emerged the method of investigation for the study of group and social behavior. Finally, the fourth phase (1932-1950) is difficult to map out in a definite way. The studies and technical modifications of groupanalysis continued to develop themselves, but they led to a kind of “interpersonal nihilism”. The interest then began to center on the internal physiological changes that accompany the emotional experiences, their conceptual formulation and social behavior. Investigation went onto the instrumental register of breathing patterns, of rapid eye movement (REM) and electrical brain potentials (EEG). We, however, taking literally that commentary of Kurt Goldstein to Burrow when he said to him that he was “one of the few scientists that make one feel that for him life and work are intimately related”, we have become conscious of that each one of these important phases in his life, Burrow starts and terminates them writing a book.

If the personal and family problem which we think that the practice of psychoanalysis entailed for Burrow is reflected in the unpublished theater play, which he not even came around to signing, the most dramatic years of his life happen in the setting of two productions equally unpublished: the already mentioned Conferences at the Child Study Association of America of 1917⁴² and a book —“Our Common Consciousness”— with which he culminates a stage that Ellenberger possibly would be tempted in defining as one of “creative illness” which he so well describes in his *The discovery of the unconscious*. This illness, of which according to Ellenberger suffered Freud and Jung on different occasions, characterizes itself “by periods of work and untiring intellectual preoccupations the principal symptoms of which are depression, exhaustion, sleeplessness and headache with oscillations in the intensity of the symptoms, but with the patient continuing obsessed with the predominant preoccupation in search of a difficult ideal. They live in a most profound spiritual isolation and with the sensation that nobody can help them, from where come their intents of self-healing. The recovery appears spontaneously and in a rapid way; it comes marked by the sentiment of euphoria and is followed by a transformation of the personality. The subject remains convinced of having acceded to a new spiritual world and of having conquered a new spiritual truth which he feels he has to reveal to the world.”⁴³ In the case of Burrow, the acute phase of this supposed illness initiates itself on the occasion of the challenge that Clarence Shields proposes to him in 1918 to embark on a mutual analysis and it extends itself at least until the end of 1922 while he tries to give form to this experience in a book —*Our Common Consciousness*— where he explains his thesis about what it is that the human species has in common. This book, which was never published, would serve as a platform of discussion for a larger group, the original groupanalytic group that rescued Burrow and Shields from the impasse in which they had met themselves with their mutual and inclusive analysis in a “group of two”. Thanks to that groupanalytic group and the group method of analysis initiated with it, the book in the end was re-written in 1923 and published in 1927 with the title of *The Social Basis of Consciousness*; the same year in which the group constitutes itself in a permanent unit of investigation with the name of The Lifwynn Foundation for the Laboratory Investigation in Social and Analytical Psychiatry.

⁴² Los autores tienen en preparación una edición bi-lingüe catalano-inglés de este texto, autorizada por The Lifwynn Foundation.

⁴³ F. Henry Ellenberger (1970): *The Discovery of the Unconscious*, (Nueva York: Basic Books), p. 889.

3.4 Our Common Consciousness

In the winter of 1920-21 Burrow asks for an absence of leave from the University and interrupts, for a time, his psychoanalytic practice. Already on the point of re-incorporating himself to his work, on August 10, 1921 he writes to Adolf Meyer: “It seemed convenient to me to dispose of the space I have taken for myself these days for getting to know myself better. I feel already that it has not been in vain. I hope you can understand how much it meant to me being able to address myself directly to you with a decision which in a first moment did not seem to me desperate, but inevitable.” And, in the following paragraph: “I find that, after all, to that to which I aspired I will only be able to arrive at working at it and, irrespectively, however limited is what has been achieved, now the moment has come that I again offer what I can. It will represent a lot for me to be able to discuss with you my efforts these last months. I have tried to put in writing in the measure I could what have seemed to me the basic causes of the failures of analysis —our exclusive emphasis in the personal at the expense of the inherent social factors. I have come up against a thesis pretty difficult but which I hope to be able to complete in a few weeks since it is going to constitute the basis of all my future work.”⁴⁴

The underlined is of Burrow. We don’t know if he did so intentionally but for us it cannot less than bring reminiscences of those verses of Faust —“Was Du ererbt von deinen Vätern hast, erwirb es, um es zu besitzen” (what you have inherited from your fathers, conquer it for being able to possess it)— with which Freud closes his “Compendium of Psychoanalysis”. To write *Our Social Consciousness* took Burrow not weeks but long and laborious years: a whole decade. The process of writing this book is as exciting as the experience itself with Clarence Shields which originated it.

The whole adventure starts in 1915 when a family, friends of Burrow’s, present Clarence Shields to him, who they had contracted for taking care of their psychotic son. This encounter was destined to mark the professional future of Burrow and gives a definitive turn to his social and family life. When they knew each other, Clarence, a son of German immigrants, still used the family name of Scheetz, which he later changes for the one of Shields, perhaps as a result of the analysis which we will describe in what follows. The latter, a young man, healthy and strong, had grown up in an agricultural community of Pennsylvania and all his education was limited to the one received in the village school. Reserved and shy in social situations, his work as a topographer permitted him to spend time in the open air, the woods and the open fields which is where he felt comfortable. The sudden death of who was going to be his wife made him become conscious of his own emotional insecurity. He left his work and, after some months of going adrift, he employed himself with Burrow’s friends. These, impressed by the personality of Shields, thought that a meeting of the latter with Burrow could well be stimulating and enriching, and beneficial for their son. Here is how Burrow describes the impression Shields caused him in their first encounter: “I have never come across anybody with whom I did not manage to establish immediately the usual give and take of social interchange. I have never known anybody, man or woman, who was not socially accessible, in the ordinary sense of the word, and who, however, was sane. Of course, I had known many who were socially accessible and sane, and others who were socially inaccessible and mad. But, there was a man whom I could not achieve to make him think either in my favor or in opposition to me in the habitual way of interchange. There was no common territory. This was a phenomenon with which during all these years dedicated to the study of human behavior I had never met with. For the first time in my experience I had met a stranger. The circumstance left me perplexed as well as full of

⁴⁴ “The Search...”, pp. 51-52.

intrigue. I was curious to get to know this man. I wanted to come to understand his behavior which challenged all the categories of behavior known to me.”

Galt, to whom we owe this quote, comments that the two men complemented each other in many of their qualities. The simplicity and tranquility of Mr. Shields, his contact with living nature, his resources for many tasks from the details of organizing an office till constructing a closet, complemented, as it were, the more active and more open attitude towards the others of Dr. Burrow. Shields had no interest in the mental concepts as such. Instead, his approach to the problem of behavior was based on such integrity of sentiments which subtly permitted him to become conscious of all the emotional falseness. It was this quality that Burrow appreciated so much, what would lead him years later to refer to his illiterate cooperator as “my distinguished associate, Clarence Shields”. What Galt does not say, and for this no need for psychoanalytic interpretations, is that obviously in Shields Burrow found a kind of “alter ego” not familiar, an-other who forced him to feel “the strangeness of himself” —a pre-symbolic perception which afterwards he would formulate as the “I-Person Complex’.

We ignore which would be the relationship between the two men in the years that go from that encounter in 1915 till when, finally, in 1918, Shields would start his analysis with Trigant Burrow. We ignore also the motive or aim of this analysis. It is possible that it was part of the experimental analysis which Burrow carried out gratuitously at the University or that the patrons of Shields met its cost insisting on that he supervise the work of the psychiatric caretaker of their son. Our conviction, based on the description of Burrow of this person, is that this never was a normal analysis. Shields was well acquainted with the theories Burrow exposed in his conferences and articles as to propose to him the challenge which we will quote in what follows. Given the transcendence of this experience and the fortunate circumstance that we have the accounts of both protagonists, we wanted to include them here with the maximum extension possible, this way giving the reader the opportunity of understanding them in his own way.

Trigant Burrow was the first to describe this experience. He uses it as a prologue to *The Social Basis of Consciousness* (Burrow 1927), the title under which finally would appear “Our Common Consciousness” after a long process which we will comment subsequently. The prologue reads as follows:

“I don’t know to what point I can make clear in which way first emerged the concepts set forth in the following pages. Any concept derived from data of reason and observation necessarily has a mental basis. The scientific and philosophic treatises first of all are the result of scientific and philosophic ideas. With inductive methods as well as deductive ones of reasoning, the conclusions which emerge from these hypotheses constitute the accepted basis of our proceedings. However, with the method of the present study we find ourselves in another field since the beginning of this work did not start this way, although to say that it is not based on conceptual hypotheses, certainly, would neither be true. The difference is in that what follows here was the result of events previous to and independent of any conceptual formulation of the same: the biological necessities preceded and their argumentation followed afterwards. What I want to say perhaps is more easily understood if we take into account that those events constitute personal experiences inseparable of the sequence in which they occurred. For as much as this is not the place to give details of my personal history, the presentation of a thesis as intimate as this one would not be complete without some concrete reference as to its origin.

Having been 'analyzed' some years back in preparation for my work in psychopathology, consequently I spent years 'analyzing' others. However, unexpectedly one day it so happened that when interpreting a dream of my assistant-student, the latter had the boldness to challenge the honesty of my analytic position, insisting that, as far as he was concerned, my sincerity only would be demonstrated if I was prepared to accept from him the same analytic requirements than the ones I imposed on others. As can easily be imagined, such a proposition seemed to me totally absurd. Had I not been 'analyzed'? It goes without saying that this was not the first time that I heard similar propositions from patients but, in spite of that besides in this case I found the suggestion to be amusing, I have to confess that my pride had been somewhat pricked by the insinuation it implied. This way, with the excuse that it was an interesting experiment and thinking that at least it would not hurt during a time to follow him in the current of defiance of the inexperience, and I agreed to the arrangement.

Not many weeks after having occupied the chair of the patient and having given up mine to him, I realized that a situation to which I had consented with more or less superficiality was acquiring an air of a most profound seriousness. My 'resistances' to my self-designated analyst, far from lacking importance, appeared to be simply insuperable, but there was no possibility of going back. The analysis took its course day after day and with it my resistances took hold of me with more and more force. The agreement at which voluntarily I had arrived became indescribably painful. All the interest the situation could hold for me in the beginning was now subordinated to the indignation and pain of the position in which I found myself.

It is only possible to indicate in general lines the progressive events of those difficult months. Unnecessary to evoke the increasing sensation of self-limitation and of failure which went hand in hand with this personal challenge becoming greater every day, neither the corresponding efforts on my part in hiding them by symbolizations and unconscious distortions. What is necessary to underline with all force, however, is the following: Just as, although reluctantly, I became more and more profoundly conscious of my intolerance to self-defeat, little by little I realized that my analyst, as he changed place with me, simply slipped towards the authoritarian point of view which I myself had abandoned, and that in essence the situation still had not changed at all.

This was significant. Immediately it marked the opening of perspectives of experience totally new. In the light of this discovery, for the first time I started to guess what all the time had been underlying in my own analysis and that, as I see it now, in fact underlies any analysis. I started to see that the student before me, notwithstanding his undoubted sincerity of intention, did not stop to show a less personal and appropriative attitude in reference to me than the one I sustained towards him and that all that was necessary was the authoritarian backdrop for this attitude to make itself manifest. In becoming conscious of this condition it became evident to me what had been for me the most crucial revelation in many years of analytic work —this is, that in the individualistic application, the attitude of the psychoanalyst and the attitude of the authoritarian are inseparable.

As day by day this consciousness was making itself more and more evident in me, and with it the growing acceptance of the limitation and the unilateralism of the personalistic critique in psychoanalysis, there started to lessen my personal self-

justifications and my resistances. At the same time, the analyst also, Mr. Clarence Shields, arrived finally at a position from which to guess at the personalism and the resistance which unconsciously had motivated his own reactions all this time. From then onwards the direction of the questioning changed completely. Since then the analysis consisted in a reciprocal effort on the part of everyone of us of recognizing within himself the attitude of authoritarianism and of autocracy towards the other. With this automatic renunciation of the personalistic and private base, replacing it by a more inclusive attitude towards the problems of human consciousness, gradually our whole analytic horizon cleared up not only for me but also for students and patients.

Further ahead one will see more clearly how this new formulation of psychoanalysis, on the more ample base of its impersonal and more inclusive meaning, produced itself completely apart from the logical processes habitually predictable. Only the accidental circumstance of the protest of a student against my own personal prejudices and my subsequent observation of an identical personalism in myself, such as was discovered empirically when interchanging our places, are responsible for an alternative insight in psychoanalysis which have offered me these last years—an insight which has been corroborated by the investigations carried out with a small group of students who work along identical analytic lines as mine. It was, then, totally due to this surprising intent of my student to conquer me with my own weapons, putting me in the place of the patient and the patient taking on the analytic role, how by accident I found myself launched into six years of social experimentation on the discrepancies of an individualistic analysis. If the result of the process was to retract myself from my previous analytic points of view, it was not, however, expression of any personal invention or special talent on my part.

The fortuitous stroke of luck mentioned is the only responsible for abandoning my habitual personalistic basis in psychoanalysis and led me to feel the necessity of adopting a more inclusive interpretation of the unconscious. In the measure that I arrived to guess, through the wider recognition of the unconscious, the corresponding wider sense of the consciousness of man, I arrived to feel the necessity of its more adequate interpretation within an organismic point of view such as I have tried to outline under the theme of “The social basis of consciousness”.

I cannot in a consistent way give references of authority in support of this work. There is none. This work is only sponsored by the spirit of a common enterprise which motivates the group of students who came together in this collective adventure. Although I don't like to deposit in others the responsibility of my own boldness, I don't need to dispense of the pleasure of recognizing—as I do with all my heart—the incentive received at the beginning of my analytic work through the sympathy and encouragement of Dr. Adolf Meyer.

Trigant Burrow, The Tuscany, Baltimore, Maryland”

Twenty years later, on the anniversary of The Lifwynn Foundation for Research in Social and Analytical Psychiatry, Mr. Shields in his presidential report in 1947 gives his own version of that moment:

“Briefly and to be exact, the actual investigations started when Dr. Burrow and I knew each other and, immediately, we were aware of our common interests. The motivations of human behavior had constituted a powerful interest in the life of each of us long before we knew each other. For me, this interest expressed itself

in a vulgar, insignificant and persistent form of search, without knowing what it was that I was pursuing. If I read books, for example, it was only with the aim of finding the answer to questions I not even knew what they were. But, the interest, the impulse was nevertheless no less imperative. On the contrary, with Dr. Burrow this same imperious interest had adopted a more orderly form, which reflects itself in the brilliance of those early works where he expounds his thesis of the principle of primary identification.

In our association, the common interest in behavior and its study which inspired us always was much above any other interest. From the first moment we committed ourselves to a mutual analysis. This investigation was not at any moment comfortable—not even in the beginning. By way of being, we were both prepared for an arduous task, although first of all the latter was limited to the context of the psychoanalytic practice of Dr. Burrow. When in fact we started to work together in the same office, something inevitable in a program of mutual analysis, little by little the unexpected started to happen. In other words, the 'I'-person—using the term which Dr. Burrow would coin afterwards—the 'I'-person of each one invaded the scene. Neither of the two could stand the observations of the other. Our relation became tense. The tension grew to the point of hurting each other. Then, another unsuspected element impacted us brutally. The indomitable rightness of each one came to impose itself and we were definitely not prepared to stand up to it. To say it gently, the two of us were annoyed. We asked ourselves seriously if to continue or not. But we endured it, we held up. We had a task to do. And consequently, we stood to our word.

Even if Dr. Burrow and I were united by a common interest—the same interest that still unites us and the same which basically unites the rest of the group and all humanity—promptly we were to learn that, the same than the rest of humanity, in our approach to human behavior and in the relationship between ourselves we were, after all, only pursuing an ideal, a mental solution. We learned this not speculating intellectually but as a result of the relationship of one with the other which in fact we experienced. In consequence, we paid a hard tribute. Mutually we had to pay this penalty. There appeared inevitable reactions of disagreement, irritation, resentment, blaming and anger. With time we started to guess at a tendency towards splitting—the rip which the behavior of the 'I'-person inevitably brings with it, the same which makes itself evident in the behavior of man on the international level in all parts, at all moments. This turn of events proved to be very disheartening for Dr. Burrow as well as for me. To begin with it was only a surprise which afterwards converted itself in the most absolute shock... This was accompanied by a growing and compulsive wish to retire oneself, to run away. And in spite of everything, we endured. In contrast to what happens in our environment on the international level, where an inevitable split means separation or at least uncomfortable compromises, we did not yield. The impulse to run away, however, became overpowering. This overpowering force to abandon and flee was so painful as the irritation and rage which persistently became evident. All within us and in our environment forced us to abandon. But, we continued. We persevered.

It was this perseverance in front of this disaster in the behavior which constituted the nucleus of our early relationship; nothing other than this going on, this perseverance on the part of two individuals. And it happened just so—in a discrete and unnoticed way—in the middle of sentimental and painful behavior. It was this relation—a relationship which should have split up and did not

split— which incorporated the nucleus of the insurmountable problem as well as the consistent success.

It's unnecessary to say that the conflict continued but also we continued to persevere and the study progressed. However, it was not the study of Dr. Burrow; it was not my study. It was neither the study Dr. Burrow made of me nor the one I made of Dr. Burrow. It was not the study of the behavior of two individuals made by two individuals. It was about a circumstance... it was about a nucleus of circumstances of social behavior. This nucleus came characterized not by the interest of one but of two organisms. It could have been any other two organisms, for example, the study carried out by Miss Hölljes and myself. But, what was important was not the number. The only innovation, the only indispensable condition was that the two, the three or the thirty persevered when the hell of their own emotional behavior —the one of man— showed itself naked and everyone felt himself irresistibly pushed to run away.

This circumstance had neither been planned nor looked for by us, it imposed itself. Hardly had we become aware of what was happening. All we knew was that, hoping to find a nice relationship while carrying out a pleasant task in an agreeable field, all of a sudden and brutally we found ourselves confronted with a dark and formidable dilemma of behavior which eliminated all our intellectual aspirations and left us abandoned in front of the most shameful and virulent aspects of our emotional antagonisms. Here was the essence of our tragedy. The study went on. In this perseverance of two organisms, that according to rules should have run away one from the other, found themselves with the rudiments of an alternative pattern of behavior —of an alternative frame of reference— which not only demanded a new and fresh vision of the subjective inter-relational phenomena but which on top made possible an objective approach to them.

...(This) was the backdrop for all the later discoveries of Dr. Burrow and the line of principal development... (of) philobiology. Even so, the inter-relational dilemma continued to dominate. There was no precedent. There was no perspective as to any reward. No horizon could be seen... Never a human enterprise had come to a pathway so full of failures. Everyone found himself alone. Neither could help the other. There was only one thing to do and we did it: maintain ourselves disposed to face the task. We had work to be done and we kept to it. When all this that had seemed real to us fell in pieces at our feet —the concealed bad as well as the seemingly good, the subversively bad as well as the universally accepted as “normal”, what belongs to one as well as what belongs to the others— we persevered, not just anyhow but neither knowingly, not blindly although neither seeing clearly. During these first days we still did not know that this nuclear circumstance of this impersonal perseverance on the part of two organisms — everyone alone at the same time being at the disposition of the other— constituted the fertile soil from which would sprout the clear and physiological differentiation that Dr. Burrow would make between ditension and cotension, between that which pertains to neurosis, crime and war and that which pertains to this whole which is the central organismic constant of the phylum, of man as a species. Even so, we persevered, we went on.

In this nuclear situation, the behavior of everyone was equal and common. The rightness of each against the one of the other, the wrongness of each against the one of the other was equal and common. This equality and communality is the essence of completeness and health, the foundation of growth and of reassertion of man as live organism. This was only the start. Organismic man saw himself

confronted and still sees himself confronted by the 'I'-person. There is the core of the question. This is the real problem."

Ten years after which took place the events referred to in these reports, Freud concluded in "Civilization and its Discontents" that the two principal difficulties in the analytic approach to the "social neurosis" are in that while in "the individual neurosis we have as point of reference the contrast which distinguishes the patient from his environment, which is supposed to be "normal", this backdrop does not exist in a mass that is uniformly affected, so that we should look for it somewhere else." And, he adds, "as to the therapeutic application of our knowledge, for what would serve the most penetrating analysis of the social neuroses if nobody has the necessary authority for imposing the corresponding therapy to the masses?" In other words, what Freud asks himself in the analysis of the "social neurosis" is about the validity of the very principles of "normality" and of "authority", which Burrow had dared to attack analytically one decade before. Freud, out of principle, naturally does not quote this author.

Burrow started from a principle very different. He did not assume that the backdrop — this is to say the average mental behavior known as "normality"— from which the patient stands out— was "normal", in the sense of healthy or convenient for the individual and the species. For him, in a mass uniformly affected, the backdrop is not in the mass, or in the individual that integrate it with their "average collective behavior", but in the authority which defines these behaviors as healthy or ill, good or bad, true or false, right or wrong. This is how and why Burrow comes to be the first between the followers of Freud who submits to analysis the principle of authority in the very same psychoanalytic community, of the authority of a single analyst specialized exclusively in one only method —the personal method of analysis. The first time we touched upon the subject of the mutual analysis between Burrow and Shields it was as an example of the obstacles which have to be overcome by the individual psychoanalyst in his approximation to group therapies. These obstacles, we said, are of a theoretical and technical order, but also of a personal order (Campos 1979). On that occasion we put the accent on the personal drama it implies. Now, in contrast, the accent is put on the difficulty this supposes for the scientific community to which the investigator belongs, when this community risks a praxis —this is to say, a continuous feedback between theory and technique— that questions the authority of the discipline itself. This is exactly the challenge with which Burrow finds himself on coming out of his mutual analysis, and as a psychoanalyst he feels obliged to raise the matter before his colleagues.

The mutual analysis, although it was Shields who with his challenge had the virtue of initiating it, it would be Burrow —who by profession had been trained as an analyst— to whom, including from the position of analyst, corresponds the responsibility of carrying it out. It would be him and not Shields who would become conscious of the authoritarian backdrop which had them entangled in a deadlock of mutual projections. Once given this step, it would also correspond to Burrow to report on the results of that experiment to his colleagues. Then it was him who threw out a challenge to the psychoanalytic community, and it could not be expected that an institution would have the same kind of humor and of curiosity which took him to take seriously the challenge of Shields. This perhaps explains that he postpone making it public until 1925 and only when he could do it from a position of authority. When presenting the challenge before the International Congress in Bad Homburg, he was then president of the American Psychoanalytic Association and, moreover, in that Congress the central question to elucidate —the standardization of psychoanalytic training in all the member societies and the delicate question of training of foreign candidates— was also related to the question of authority. But this will come later. For the moment what Burrow did was to

get down and write a book. In fact, this is how he announces it to Adolf Meyer in August, 1921, a little after reincorporating himself to the University: "I have tried to put in writing as clear as I could what I believe to be the basic reason of the failures of analysis —this is to say, our exclusive emphasis in the personal at expense of the total negligence of the social factors. This is a difficult thesis for me but I hope to complete it in a few weeks and it will be the foundation of my work from here on." Seven months later, however —in March 1922— he sends him a note withdrawing the manuscript from him and explaining to him the reasons for which he has decided for the moment to refrain from publishing the book: "It has become clear to me in the light of the last months that the book turns out to be over-burdened due to my own limitations[...] I still feel that I cling to the illusion that someone will sponsor me, looking for support in my fears, characteristic of the personality which is the very same antithesis of the one whose interpretation supposedly defends my thesis. This means that it still needs many considerable changes before, finally, finding its way to its publication."

Of the state of mind in which Burrow wrote the book and the vicissitudes he encountered in publishing it gives us an idea the correspondence he maintains between these two dates with Sherwood Anderson, the poet and friend who encourages him to write it. The latter writes him on September 11 of this same year: "I shall be enchanted to write to my own editor Huebsch. When will the book be ready? It is about, as a suspect, an account of your own struggles? It will be a book which we, the ones who have not studied the material as much as you have, can understand? Could you tell me whatever you can about the book so that I can write to Huebsch in a way he can understand? And, tell me also whatever you like about yourself and your plans." An offer which Burrow accepts enthusiastically and thanks him for on October 9: "Your introduction to Huebsch will be of great help, but I want to be frank with you in what concerns the difficulties as much as I still keep hopes of finding some editor for whom his sympathy for the objective of my thesis and its spirit in what concerns human life means more than only its market value. From what you tell me of Huebsch, it seems that I could find in him just the cooperation I need. This does not mean that a book of this nature could not be saleable. It is my impression that the thesis that you set forth in an artistic form in "*Marching Man*" is inherently identical with the one I unfold under the title of *Our Common Consciousness*. For a thesis of what we have in common, of the essential human camaraderie, it seems to me that the book should be published in its most simple way. For this reason I would like to omit the customary entail of the university degrees and dispense of any official connection, leaving that the text sustains itself without the habitual personal exploitations of the scientific treatise. [...] As to my own plans, I must wait. As you can see, I have separated myself from the habitual path of analysis as a "profession" and this has left me in some way free [...] I have left aside the theoretical truth as a profession [...] Do you think that Huebsch will read the manuscript himself or his decision will depend on the opinion of some professional analyst? Of course it will be detrimental in case that the decisions of Huebsch in accepting were to depend on the opinion of a conventional Freudian."

Of course Huebsch gave the manuscript to read to experts in psychoanalysis, and the manuscript had to be submitted to proofreaders, but Burrow was not prepared to modify even a comma of this text. In this sense he writes to Anderson on September 21: "Without any doubt I shall not at all permit that (the woman proofreader) modify my manuscript (this not being in questions of orthography or punctuation); in its essential content I shall not permit anybody to alter it —I would not even permit it to myself. This does not mean that it could not be much improved, but this essay has nothing to do with "excellence". I insist on telling you about it. You will see, I did not write it personally. It was as if it was dictated to me, I saw myself forced in spite of myself to put it in writing.

I cannot tell you up to which point I opposed myself, bitterly defiant. It was life struggling for itself and my part was left reduced to an obligatory submission. What I write you here, perhaps it can be clear for an artist or for that other form of responding to an impulse of life in man, in its more extreme expression that of an artist, this is to say an artist who cannot express himself, the neurotic.” However much good will Huebsch put and the experts to whom he entrusted the reading of the manuscript, they did not find a way of seeing to which public it could be addressed and how to commercialize it. In these circumstances he again writes to Anderson on March 11, 1922, once he knows that the manuscript will be read by an expert in psychoanalysis: “It’s a pity [...] The academic knowledge of psychoanalysis is itself a neurotic symptom —I say this very seriously— and the imposition (*of the editor*) implies the opposition of the academic in all of us. As if psychoanalysis was life and not only a behavior of life! People allow the intuitive element in the artistic forms of reality but they deny it to the scientific forms. If I have to count only with the intellectual understanding of the editor, the book will never be published, intellectually I don’t understand it even myself. The process of making it was not intellectual. It could never have been. All along it was for me the most real of emotional experiences.” And to the proofreader on April 15, 1922: “In what concerns my book, I am thankful for your efforts and intercessions in favor of it but for the moment I have very clear the necessity of withdrawing definitely the manuscript and return to a terrain in which I can feel comfortable. Perhaps my work never comes to be published but at least I can feel comfortable with what concerns it and this means infinitely more to me. When I finish a shorter thesis on which I am working at the moment, I shall return to *Our Common Consciousness*. In the interim I will have acquired more clear ideas in reference to it and I will be able to take it up again with a more secure hand when the moment of revising it comes.”⁴⁵

The manuscript was returned to Burrow just as he has asked for and five years more passed before it finally was published under the title of *The Social Basis of Consciousness*⁴⁶ and this only after having submitted it to a process of group revision which Burrow could not foresee at that moment. His analysis with Clarence Shields continued, by mutual accord it changed to be reciprocal and, finally, would arrive to be inclusive, this is to say that as analysts and as well as analysands the participants include in the process all their organism and come to be at the same time subject and object of the investigation. On his part and in the measure that Burrow was writing about the experience, his ideas became clearer. The continual feedback between theory and practice which comes near to heroism in some moments is obvious throughout the process. The degree of compromise, nearing stubbornness, with which both participants maintained themselves in their undertaking, is explicable through the exceptional moment between two personalities who believe in what they do and do what they say. The immediate consequence for one as much as for the other was a radical change in behavior and life style. His more intimates, who accompanied him in this experience, to be sure had have to have some doubts as to whether Burrow was a genius or if he had had a bout of insanity. In full acne, Trigant Burrow closes down his surgery and initiates the “sabbatical year” mentioned above. Of the difficulties through which he went in those moments and the sacrifices it supposed on the personal and family level, give an idea the commentaries that accompany the letter of resignation from the university which Meyer asked him for in 1927: “Subsequently to that period, I felt myself with the scientific obligation to improve my own therapeutic technique. It seemed to me that the whole

⁴⁵ “The Search...”, p.65.

⁴⁶ Trigant Burrow (1927): *The Social Basis of Consciousness. A study in Organic Psychology Based upon a Synthetic and Societal Concept of the Neuroses*, (New York: International Library of Psychology, Philosophy and Scientific Method Harcourt, Brace & Company, Inc.; London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd.)

psychoanalytic field was in the necessity of a profound investigation and reconstruction. Upon arriving at this decision, I told you about the necessity I felt to abandon my private practice temporarily with the objective of dedicating myself completely to investigation. It seemed to me that to investigate in a field in which there was so much confusion and lack of coordination as in psychoanalysis, it was really worthwhile and, moreover, it was imperative that this was done. It is not necessary to mention to you the sacrifices inherent in abandoning my practice and dedicating myself exclusively to a task of investigation during an indefinite time —the debts in which I incurred and the needs suffered by me and my family forced us to sell our house and to dispense with commodities to which we were accustomed. But these are personal questions which concern my wife and me and do not interest the University. If I mention this it is only to point out the seriousness and responsibility I feel in this enterprise.”⁴⁷

How conscious Burrow was of the risk and the tribute to pay implied in giving account to his psychoanalyst colleagues of the discovery just made with Shields⁴⁸, gives an idea the paragraph in which he speaks of the inevitable splits he guessed at from the beginning: “Certainly, nobody can take lightly the adverse critique and the loss of the friendly cooperation which I have known for years between companions of work [...] The situation was, if possible, more difficult since in the work in which I had involved myself it was indispensable that I omit the old points of view before reaching new points of view. Not knowing towards which specific objectives I was directing myself, I felt obliged by force to embark myself towards unknown shores. It was this factor of lottery inseparable from the first stages of my scientific adventure which was the hardest of trials. But this uncertainty was dissipating itself with time in the measure in which the investigation led our laboratory unit to the solid discovery and a trustable course on which we had launched ourselves.” Even so, as Shields insists in his report, they decided to persevere, to continue forward. In reality, Burrow never was to restart his psychoanalytic practice neither on the theoretical level nor on the practical one as he had known it previously. His way of thinking, his manner of working and investigating with patients, students and colleagues, the aim and way of writing and the very same organization of his practice had radically changed. He associated himself with Clarence Shields, a layman, in a common practice and they established an association of work and life which lasted all their lives.

The theoretical intuitions in reference to a preconscious, a principle of integration based on the primary identification of the child with the mother have been confirmed when discovering that the principal resistance to make it conscious was encountered in the authoritarianism of the one who was in the position of the analyst. This, although on one hand permitted him to explain that the neuroses basically are of a social order and not only personal and that in this sense as neurotic were the official patients as the officially healthy, including the analyst; on the other hand it took him to take up again the old methodological problem of the factor of the “personal equation” of the investigator with

⁴⁷ “A Search...” p. 167.

⁴⁸ The analytic experience with Clarence Shields, which even today could well be motive for a scandal, was not so in the habitual practice in those days where the barriers of the “analytic setting” were by far not so strict as they are today. In the first place, personal analysis, didactic analysis and supervision very often went together in the same session and with the same person. Moreover, as Burrow had experienced with Jung and something customary in Freud, the barriers between the family life of the analyst and the one of the analysands were pretty diffused. As for example the habit, which we don’t know if Burrow imported from Europe, of continuing during his long vacations to analyze his patients who also lived around the lake. On the other hand, moreover, in the Burghölzli as well as the New York State Institute on Wards Island, of which both Adolf Meyer and Burrow had experience, mutual analysis between colleagues and the psychoanalysis of the resident physicians in view of their training was customary.

which he had started his doctoral thesis fifteen years back. The problem of the “complication experiment” of Wundt now converted itself into his problem. The methodological question consisted in how to be able to examine objectively the subjective processes of the investigator himself when the latter found himself affected by the same processes that he observed.⁴⁹ Neither the insight to which he arrived in his own analysis con Shields in reference to the authoritarian attitude of the psychoanalyst nor the thesis he elaborated *in solitario* in reference to a social neurosis of which suffers the whole humanity liberated Burrow from the neurosis he shared with Shields. The personal method of analysis limited to a situation of two persons turned out to be useless in this respect. Following Ellenberger, the situation in which each one of them found himself could be interpreted as “creative illness”. What Ellenberger had not foreseen, however, was that this illness could be a kind of *folie à deux*, a shared illness. Really, as we will see afterwards, once analyzed, it was a question of a *folie à tous*, a social neurosis of which man suffers as a species from the moment he starts to speak and which is transmitted from generation to generation to all the individuals and all human groups without exception. In their mutual analysis, Burrow and Shields had arrived at this kind of impasse which so frequently occurs in the human interrelations, where everyone of the participants is convinced to be in the right and which forces a split, a false consensus, a compromise of circumstance, or something of the kind. We have seen how their firm compromise to study the motivation which underlies human disagreement permitted them to persevere.

Anyhow, more and more intensely they started to feel the need to count with an experimental group which would permit them to examine these inter-relational obstacles on a wider scale. This group, they believed, should include at the same time normal and neurotic individuals and this way constitute, so to say, the test tube, the trial bench for the intensive study of the basic factors responsible of human conflict, in its individual aspects as well as the social ones. This wider group, composed at a time by collaborators, students, and patients of Dr. Burrow and members of his immediate family, employees and domestic service, formed itself for the first time during the summer of 1923. It was constituted by about twenty people reunited in the Lifwynn Camp, the same country estate of the Burrows in the Adirondak mountains converted into a summer camp. The group method of analysis was born from this experience carried out by what we could today call a median group in an intensive residential workshop. Apart from the group meetings formally established, addressed all of them to unmask the latent motivations of the manifest expressions of behavior, this first group during that summer carried out an important project: reading and discussing *Our Common Consciousness*. The investigations initiated on social neurosis in the Lifwynn Camp with the group method of analysis continued in Baltimore in the surgery of Dr. Burrow, fundamentally with patients and as a complement to the personal analyses which he and Clarence Shields carried out. Between 1923 and 1927, when finally the announced book was published, Burrow did not lose occasion to expound his theories in professional meetings and succeed in getting published 25 articles in the journals of more prestige in the field.

⁴⁹ As he would say years later, the nucleus of the question was in that “*the neurosis of man is a subjective experience and he will not succeed in examining this subjective process in himself unless he applies the same objective method to his own subjective processes. It is not a question of examining the behavior of another man or another race of animals, it has to do with seeing my behavior in as much it represents an element within a continuous current of processes and tensions which affect the species as a whole — processes, however, that cannot be appreciated by observing them in others, believing that one can see such subjective modifications there, but through the internal feeling of my own tensions in as much that they form a process subjectively continuous with the individual which I suppose I see.*” Trigant Burrow, letter to William F. Dummer of December 19, 1935. “A Search...” p. 314.

Moreover, during those same years, he and his group, at the initiative of one of its members —Dr. Thompson, director of the Society of Mental Hygiene of Maryland—embarked on a work experiment; about 17 members of the original group of Baltimore. It was a question of creating a journal and that “group of neurotics and ‘normals’ in analysis” for the first time carry out a task together: the journal *Mental Health* of which thirty numbers were published between 1923 and 1926. In *Our Common Neurosis*⁵⁰ there are gathered in form of a book some of the articles published and there also is described and analyzed what had been this group adventure.

With the group method already launched, the new concepts well set, a book under the arm and a group which knows how to read and to write and with which he carries out his investigation, the scientific enterprise initiated with a small group of two had been converted into a group of many and into a crusade against social neurosis: The first was to convert the experts so that they afterwards could do it with the laymen; this is the strategy he decides on. He will start with his psychiatrist psychoanalyst colleagues to continue afterwards with the community itself as a whole.

If *Our Common Consciousness* Burrow had written it as if it was dictated, from the moment that in the spring of 1922 he notices how neurotically he is trying to publish it and he withdraws it, he starts to write from the group in himself. The writing, apart from helping him to clarify his ideas, serves him as therapy. In a letter of April 15 to his proofreader, in which he definitely withdraws the manuscript from her, he tells her that for the moment he thinks of returning to a terrain where he feels more comfortable. He also mentions to her that he has three finished articles and is working on a fourth one, all of which form part of a series he would like to title “A philosophy of neurosis” and which are sufficiently “intellectual” as to even the pathway to who has not have the experience of a thesis like his, which is not at all so. The first of these writings is “*Psychoanalysis in Theory and Life*”, his contribution in 1922 to the International Conference of Women Physicians.⁵¹ It is precisely before such a feminine public that Burrow proclaims the “groupanalytic manifest” on “social neurosis” as an extension of the “mother complex” and where he announces the group work which he is carrying out with a small group of associates and which turns out to be promising towards a more comprehensive psychoanalytic technique and equally applicable to social units as well as to isolated individuals, a manifest in which he finishes proclaiming: “It is through the study and the analysis of our emotions and human complexes observable in the reactions of these groups how a first step was given in the actual laboratory approach in the study of the social consciousness.”

3.5. The social basis of consciousness

With these ideas in mind he renews his activity in the middle of 1924, after the ostracism he had imposed himself while dedicating all his energies to develop the thesis he presents in the spring meeting of the American Psychoanalytic Association in June 1924 in Atlantic City. This is the first time that this Association decides to celebrate its meetings together with the American Psychiatric Association.

⁵⁰ Charles B. Thompson y Alfreda P. Sill (1952) Our Common Neurosis: Notes on a group experiment, Exposition Press, Nueva York.

⁵¹ Trigant Burrow (1922): “*Psychoanalysis in Theory and in Life*”, Proceedings of the International Conference of Women Physicians, Vol. IV, 1922, republished The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, Vol. 64, No. 3, September, 1926 and as Chapter 1 in *The Social Basis of Consciousness*”, pp.9-32, *ibid*.

To this encounter turns up Otto Rank coming from New York where, with his revolutionary theories on birth trauma and didactic analysis of four months, he was creating havoc. This was a difficult year for Psychoanalysis in the Americas. Once again, the phantasm of a split threatened. The position of Brill in New York is sufficiently insecure as to permit Otto Rank to imagine that the leadership of Psychoanalysis is to be filled and travels to America with the idea of organizing the American psychoanalysts with himself as the leader.⁵² After the disaster of Horace W. Frink who Freud had imposed on them as president, the New Yorkers were not for having imposed on them another of his favorites. Burrow on this occasion presents his “*Our Mass Neurosis*”⁵³ where, if he criticizes the psychoanalytic system, it is for scarcity of analysis and not for excess, pointing out the change of perspective which imposes itself in social sciences, and which he sees as an equivalent of the one in physics from Newton to Einstein. The “personal equation” from which he starts in his doctoral thesis, he now makes extensive to the professional group and the scientific community. The following day, before the American Psychopathological Association, the other principal group to which he pertains, he reads “*Social Images versus Reality*”⁵⁴. On this occasion he goes further. Not only does he dare to state that “the community occupies the same central position in the social unconscious than the maternal image occupies in the individual unconscious”, but moreover he adds that “if the social image represented by the community has the same psychological connotation than the maternal image, then this social image cannot have more relationship with reality than the one the image of the mother has with the reality of the maternal organism.” Once said this, he finishes with another declaration equivalent to a challenge:

“The day is not far when the psychopathologist should become conscious of his wider function as clinical sociologist and take on board the obligation of defying the neuroses in their social trenches as well as the individual ones. Once we have eliminated the absolutist basis of evaluation on which our mental processes actually depend, we won’t be able to close our eyes to the social implications of neurosis just as we cannot now close them to the individual implications. The substitutive images, as much as they can benefit from the protection of social convention, they continue to be substitutive images. It does not matter how accepted they be by common and institutionalized mentality, they are no less an obstacle to become aware of consciousness and of development.”

In an interval of the Congress of Atlantic City, Burrow runs into Rank and asks him about the attitude of Freud in reference to the time-limited analysis which he recommends. In front of Rank’s answer, insinuating that Freud not only does not oppose it but is prepared to experiment, Burrow feels obliged to write to Freud. In his letter, Burrow opposes the ideas and practice of Rank from the point of view of theory as well as practice. Moreover, he puts the finger in the wound in associating Rank with the beginnings of the deviationism of Jung. There, after reminding him of his own contributions that appeared in the psychoanalytic journals before 1917, he informed Freud that he finished a book where he exposes some conclusions on the social implications of the neurosis from the point of view that include the collective reactions of the psychoanalysts themselves as a special form of social unconscious or of the mass

⁵² Paul Roazen (1974): *Freud and his Followers*, (Londres: Penguin Books Ltd.), p.381.

⁵³ Trigant Burrow (1926): “*Our Mass Neurosis*”, *The Psychological Bulletin*, June e1926, Vol. 23, pp. 305-312. (Read in Atlantic City, Annual spring meeting of the American Psychoanalytical Association, June 1924).

⁵⁴ Trigant Burrow (1924): “*Social Images versus Reality*”, *The Journal of Abnormal Psychology and Social Psychology*, Vol.19, pp.230-23. (Read before the 14th Annual encounter of the American Psychopathological Association in Philadelphia June 7, 1924).

which surrounds them and of which they are part. “In my book —he tells him— I expressed openly where I think are our limitations. In what refers to my own personal limitations and in the measure that permits my unconscious, I have tried to call attention to which point psychoanalysis has seen itself restricted by too narrow an interpretation of its applications and which are its possibilities of growth. In view of the possibility that my book will be published in short, I would like to know if in effect you are prepared to consider adopting the “new method of psychoanalysis”, as it is known here, or if, on the contrary, you were incorrectly quoted when we were informed that you have expressed the intention of trying the new method today recommended by Dr. Rank and his school.”⁵⁵

The opinion of Burrow in reference to Rank does not differ from the ones sent to Freud at that moment by Abraham or Jones, as neither differ the answers they all receive from Freud. This time, with Rank, Freud did not want at all to hear about “deviationisms”:

“...I think that fortunately your preoccupations are not justified. One cannot speak of a new method of psychoanalysis developed by Dr. Rank and his school. So, there is no similarity at all between this fact and the activities of Jung. It is a mere technical modification which certainly has to be proved. It promises an abbreviation of the analysis. If this is or is not the case, experience will tell. I shall wait to see what it is that experience teaches us. Dr. Rank is too near to me for me to be afraid that he will follow the path others have followed. Anyhow, I would say that I don’t expect too much of the change he suggests. In general, I maintain myself in the previous position, but I don’t feel myself enemy of the new. I would be very happy if you could carry out your plan to visit me.”⁵⁶

Freud’s answer encourages Burrow to confront with him his own position. For however near and loyal he feels himself emotionally to Freud, he knows that conceptually he already finds himself very far from him. In the winter meeting of the Association in New York he presents his definite view of the personal neurosis of the individual as a reflection of the social neurosis of humanity with his paper “*An ethnic aspect of consciousness*”⁵⁷ and all his papers of 1924 will be summed up in the synthesis “*A relative concept of consciousness: an analysis of the ethnic origin of consciousness*” which Burrow makes for the *Psychoanalytical Review* of January 1925. At last, the 28th of the same month he writes to Freud, once again insisting in part on his suspicions of Rank:

“I was very happy to receive this last summer your letter in answer to my demands and to know your reaction to my apprehensions. In spite of being sure of the personal devotion that Dr. Rank professes you, I cannot avoid a certain obstinate suspicion in relation to the recent psychoanalytic innovations. When I hear proclaim the new theories I cannot but note an emotional excess accompanying these presentation. But, the reason for writing you today is to send you a couple of offprints of recent articles, the result of various years of work with groups of students investigating the problem of psychoanalysis in its social implications. The extensions of individual psychoanalysis to groups of analysands seem to me to contribute to confirming numerous of your formulations with the individual... I would be very happy if these writings could be of interest to you”.

Freud’s answer did not make him wait, however it came in a very different tone to the one Burrow expected:

⁵⁵ “A Search...” letter to Freud of July 4, 1924

⁵⁶ Letter of Freud to Burrow of July 31, 1924. Yale Archives.

⁵⁷ Trigant Burrow (1927) “*An Ethnic Aspect of Consciousness*”, *The Sociological Review*, London, 1927, pp. 69-76, (read at the annual meeting of the American Psychoanalytical Association on December 28, 1924, in New York)

"I received both articles. Unfortunately, I am not too satisfied with anyone of them. The first one does not give me a clear picture of what you think. I can see that relativity theory has taken hold of you and that you are making an effort to find an analogy of it in the psychic dominion. But I cannot see up to which point you have been successful in this. It is easier for me to judge the second of the articles, "Social Images versus Reality". There I find the effort I am familiarized with through Jung of converting paternal images (images) in impersonal and a-historic ones, something which I consider an error, and when I read in your paper that the maternal image "does not have any relation with the early associations of our infancy", I cannot but remember that this is something that the daily experience of our analyses contradicts vigorously. Greetings from a colleague. Freud."

In front of this answer, however, Burrow does not shrink away. He responds respectfully but determined and forcefully:

"Your letter, yet, leaves me perplexed and does not let me feel anything different to that you would accept gladly my wish to speak to you with frankness. In reference to the first of the articles... I can say nothing. But, in what concerns the second one, "A Relative Concept of Consciousness", it seems to me that I have been put in an unfavorable place and that nobody better than you would be in conditions of understanding since nobody but yourself has found himself often in similar conditions. It seems to me that the great disadvantage that your own work has suffered has been the false interpretation, statements made by you in clear and unmistakable terms have been definitely distorted and once and again ideas have been attributed to you of which in all justice one cannot make you responsible. I find myself in this same case in reference to your critique of this article. You quote that I said that the maternal image "has no relation whatsoever with the early associations of our infancy". I don't know if you have read the paper yourself or one has presented you with only a summary of it. But I must state emphatically that my article does not include the statement which you quote and to judge my article on this basis seems to me not very just for me. I not only have not made this statement but just the opposite throughout the article, for example: "The image, in summary, which everyone carries in the most intimate of his unconscious, is the one of the mother. And this one is the image he values above all throughout all the life. From Freud we have learnt the great influence of the maternal image on the emotional life. But, it is necessary to recognize, that this maternal image converts itself in the underlying criteria of any judgment that the individual comes to form. Its imprint is encountered in the emotional substratum of all the thoughts and activities of his life. The only place where there is a similar passage to the one you quote is on page 233 where what can be read is 'the maternal image has no relation whatsoever with the maternal organism'. The distinction I make between maternal organism and maternal image becomes well explained. If this distinction, quoted throughout the article — between the impression that the mother suggests and that what the mother is— has been understood, you must realize that I cannot make a statement so absolutely unjustified and so contradictory with the experience of any psychoanalyst, including myself, as the statement that you attribute to me. Such a statement, I can assure you, would have seemed to me so puerile and absurd as it seemed to you..."

I can add, upon attributing to me a position identical to the one of Jung, once again you don't do me justice. My attitude towards social neurosis is definitely analytic, personal, and historic and has been subjected day after day to the

scientific discipline of de facto experiments by the group method. The position of Jung is theoretic and, as you well say, impersonal and a-historic. Far from having identified myself with the concept of Jung, I have repudiated what seems to me a position totally mystic and a-scientific. The social images to which I refer to are nothing more than a social extension of the repressed images described by you in their individual manifestations.”

To this Freud responds but in a very different tone:

“Honorable colleague, I am happy to have been mistaken in my judgment of your second article and I am prepared to correct it. As an excuse I could adduce that I had the sensation that your method of expressing yourself makes it easy to be misunderstood. The deep reason lies perhaps in the fact that your article “*A Relative Concept of Consciousness*” has disillusioned me and irritated me to the point of prejudicing me against the rest of your formulations. With respectful greetings. Freud.”

This interchange of correspondence between Freud and Burrow corresponds to another transcendental point in the history of Psychoanalysis, equivalent to our understanding to the one which took place between Jung and Freud at the end of 1912 and which we have referred to before as the Rubicon of Psychoanalysis. The continuous allusions to Jung are not, then, in vain. The answer of Burrow of January 28, 1925, is equivalent to the famous letter of Jung of December 18, 1912, with which he declares his separation from Freud. The difference is that Jung takes the interpretation of Freud personally, which provokes his rage, while Burrow takes it groupanalytically and although he cannot avoid the irritation Freud’s interpretation produces in him, he understands it and he gives him an opportunity to rectify. In his rectification Freud puts the finger in the wound when pointing out where the “deep reason” which separates them is to be found, which is not the association with Jung but with Einstein and what this implies: a change of paradigm. If it is true that the scientific prejudice of Freud makes him misinterpret Burrow, it also is that the latter in his wish that Freud integrate his view with his own, is also misreading the rectification of the former. We must not forget that group analysis emerges the moment that, as a consequence of the First World War, the “supreme authority” enters into crisis and the socialist ideology triumphs. What this crisis supposes for culture and the arts it also supposes for science and psychoanalysis could not be an exception. The first group psychotherapies of the Adlerians are from this epoch as also is the approximation between Marx and Freud and between theory and practice promoted by the Institut für Sozialforschung of Frankfurt.

We don’t believe that Burrow himself was conscious to which point he was leading with his Group Method of Analysis a change of paradigm or, if he was, he would have been prepared to accept it. Naturally, at that moment Kuhn still had not defined his concept. Today, thanks to Kuhn we know that a change of paradigm takes place when within a scientific community there is a change of the object of investigation, the method of how one investigates and the theoretical explanation of the observed phenomena and, moreover, that these changes don’t happen in a progressive way but a revolutionary one. In his investigations, Burrow changes the object of investigation: from the repressed unconscious he goes onto the preconscious and the organic, common consciousness, from the individual neurosis he goes onto the social neurosis. From the individual method he goes onto the group method of analysis and on the theoretical level he questions the concepts of health and illness and the principal of authority with which operates the analyst. Even so and in spite of having given the revolutionary jump in the development of the analytic investigations, Burrow insists in that his proposal stays within the traditional development of psychoanalysis. Once and again, identifying himself with

Freud, he insists in that the individual method of analysis of Freud is based on the same “laboratory method” that he proposes, when he in fact had left behind the concept of lineal causality in which Freud continued anchored. This confusion and the wish to convince his analyst colleagues and the father of psychoanalysis of the new truth, will lead him to write, publish and present twenty-six articles between 1923 and 1927, and will make him decide to travel to the Congress of Bad Homburg. In fact, the evening of the journey he writes to Freud on August 12, 1925:

“I had intention of answering your friendly note which I received in May. It was very generous of you to write me the way you did and I can assure you that the spirit of your letter means a lot to me. A lot of pain in life is due to unnecessary misunderstandings and I am happy and greatly alleviated that there are no unnecessary misunderstandings between us.

I look forward with excitement to attend the Congress of Bad Homburg and to have the pleasure of meeting again on that occasion. I would like to have time to write more completely the ideas which during these years have been occupying my mind in reference to what seems necessary to me for the development of psychoanalysis in this country. At least my attempt and the one of my associates has been directed to insist on that psychoanalysis should not depend in its data on esoteric doctrines but on data first described by me that can be socially demonstrated through a technique comparable to the one used everywhere in the laboratories of biology. This is the proposal which I have tried to sum up in a paper which I am going to read at the Congress. I would very much appreciate your balanced consideration of this wider approach which we make, my students and I, with the hope that our efforts turn out to be acceptable. I realize that our undertaking is merely in its beginning. Naturally, the “resistances” to this social extension of psychoanalysis has been and, you can imagine, will continue to be overwhelming. But, psychoanalysis did not withdraw in front of the resistances of the individual in its approach to the problems of individual analysis and I think it should neither shrink away before the resistances of our social confederations to our approach to the social mind.

I look forward in the hope of being able to discuss more deeply all this question when we will meet in Bad Homburg.”

Between the two last letters of Burrow to Freud an unusual event had taken place: at the Spring convention of 1925 of the American Psychoanalytical Association, Trigant Burrow was elected President and it would be in this capacity and not only in his own name that he would attend the Congress. How does one explain that American psychoanalysts elect a colleague who, as much as he was founding member, does not stop bothering them in pointing out the neurotic side of their own condition, as he does in the very same meeting during which they elect him, with a provocative article “*Psychoanalytic Improvisations and the Personal Equation*”.⁵⁸ To our understanding it is due to a political opportunity. By then the question of training of foreign candidates was in the limelight and moreover, as Jones writes to Freud, in the same letter in which he notifies Burrow’s election: “The American Psychoanalytical Association which was, of course, founded as a branch of the International seems to have suffered during the War some irregular “Declaration of Independence” and since then there seem to be many doubts as to its status. The practical result has been that, with the exception of those who are at the same time of the New York Society, their members do not feel themselves any longer under the obligation of subscribing to the Journal and to paying the dues of

⁵⁸ “A Search...” p. 82 (Letter to Isador H. Coriat septiembre 4, 1924)

the International. Since then I have exercised all possible pressure to remedy the situation and one tells me that in the annual meeting of this month the Society has resolved to consider itself a branch of the International and accept the corresponding obligations. The council of the Society is constituted by men attached to us, but as a symptom of their ambivalences have elected as President Dr. Burrow, who is a person of a vague and confused type of thinking more Jungian than Freudian. Logically his name will have to appear together with the other presidents of societies on the front-page of the Zeitschrift and the Journal and this is a delicate question which I submit to your consideration.”⁵⁹ Emblematically, according to Jones, the Americans submitted themselves to the rules of the International but led by a rebel.

Burrow⁶⁰ is by then already a groupanalyst who does not resign himself to the fact that his colleagues stay deadlocked in individual analysis and lose the opportunity that the laboratory method of psychoanalysis offers themselves, their patients and the whole of humanity, which permits to incorporate the group method of analysis. Accompanied by Clarence Shields he comes to the Congress of Bad Homburg in September of that year with the hope of being able to discuss personally with Freud the investigations he had carried out in an experiment with the group method of analysis the last fifteen years. There was no luck, this was the first time that Freud did not go to one of the congresses and could not listen to the paper that with such care and tact had the group of Burrow prepared for that occasion. We don't know if Burrow would eventually read or not the translation into German of “*The laboratory method in psychoanalysis: its origin and development*” which at the last moment Hans Syz had prepared. To present his method before the international psychoanalytic community and discuss it personally with Freud was of capital importance. We don't believe that Burrow had too many hopes of being able to convince them, but even so, the same as he did not abandon in starting this adventure con Clarence Shields, on this occasion he neither gave way. Of how transcendental this moment and this step was for the development of groupanalysis give us an idea some paragraphs of the letter with which he responds to the petition of his son Jack to accompany him on this trip:

“My going to Europe implies very serious considerations. It is not possible any more that I go to Europe with the carefree spirit of a tourist who only has the perspective of momentary pleasure. If human happiness in general can be better served through my going to Europe and the participation in the Congress of Bad Homburg, I will be, I assure you, not less happy than you in your perspectives of work. However, where the question is happiness in general, the decision is not in my hands, apart from the responsibilities which have become my obligation and pleasure of carrying them out. As I tell you, the question of my going has a far-reaching meaning...”

⁵⁹ R. Andrew Paskanskas (1993): *The Complete Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Ernest Jones 1908-1939*, The Bellknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge (Mass) y London, p. 376.

⁶⁰ Burrow, commenting with the then president Coriat a note of Jones which by error had been sent to him by his secretary, was sorry not to have been able to comment it personally: “For me what more stands out in the discussion of Jones is the question of business and I am not too capable in these things, as much as I give credit to the objective needs of the case as does Jones. But, what I would have liked to discuss with you is an aspect which is important to me from the point of view of our group work. As much as it is not a condition for which one could blame us, it seems to me most indignant that the psychoanalysts be themselves so neurotic and as confused as the patients and that they unconsciously should be using the conflict of their patients for distracting the attention from their own. I think that to pretend that neurosis is not a social condition and which we share equally with our patients is something which perverts completely the central objective of our work.”

However, the following paragraph reveals that the very same group of Burrow is on the point of consolidating itself, independently of which was the reception of the paper in Bad Homburg:

“The coming two weeks and a half will be the most decisive weeks as to the future of the work to which I have dedicated all my thought so many years. The time has arrived in which the effort Mr. Shields and I have come to make together with our collaborators and students must take a definitive shape in this moment. If the work has to continue, by autumn we have to have established a laboratory for its continuation. The steps to be taken have to be taken immediately. We have only some weeks left for outlining the precise plans.”⁶¹

The correspondence which Burrow and Clarence Shields maintain with the rest of the group staying in the Lifwynn Camp, waiting anxiously for news, indicates us till what point this was important for the group. September 3, upon finishing the Congress, Burrow writes to Hans Syz:

“It is already late and I am too tired to write a real letter. The Congress finished today at midday. All in all it was worthwhile. To present our position was almost necessary. I want to say that it was a necessary formality. I don’t think that many of the Germans had been able to follow my paper. Although, they are interested in reading it and I have to send it for them to the Zeitschrift... The most disagreeable part of the encounter was the attitude of resistance almost vulgar of Jones toward me. He was most disdainful and I think he did all he could to discredit my position with our German colleagues. It does not matter!... There were two administrative sessions. They were most painful for me. It became evident that they were mere political meetings —that psychoanalysis is on the point of disintegrating itself with the end of Freud and that desperate efforts are made of artificial respiration to maintain alive an organization which lacks vitality result of internal coordination and harmony...”⁶²

I will have to make very clear our position on the next two occasions —the winter and spring meetings in New York. Psychoanalysis has lost the phylogenetic meaning of life upon trying to maintain itself without this essential biological basis.”⁶³

This same night Clarence Shields write to Mrs. Burrow who was also in Europe:

“It’s 11 o’clock on the dot. I am waiting for Dr. Burrow to come back from the meeting of Presidents and this is only a note with the idea that it arrive before the letter that Dr. Burrow thinks of writing you. He is much occupied and it is possible that he may not find time until the end of the week. It’s not that he has told me so. He was going to write today. Also he had all the intention of sending you a telegram yesterday instead of today, but there are too many things to do. He has not even had time to sleep and rest. To be one of the Presidents makes all the difference.

The presentation of the paper has gone well. The program did not include any time for discussion, so that we don’t know which would be the reaction of the audience. There were courteous congratulations of Dr. Clark and Dr. Glueck but the lack of discussion seemed to me an inconvenience for something which could have been a lively program. The organization in general has been taken care of

⁶¹ “A search...”, lLetter to Jack Burrow, July 24, 1925, p.108.

⁶² Letter to Freud en la que no quiere que figure en el Zeitschrift.

⁶³ “A search...”, Letter to Hans Syz of September 2, 1925, pp. 110-112.

competently but the meetings themselves were conducted without any care. Feeling the irritation due to the enormous extension of some of the papers, Dr. Burrow rapidly cut his to twenty-three minutes. He read well —there was the customary applause— and one went on to another paper. There is something very little esthetic about this Congress. I cannot say it in another way at this moment, but we have the feeling Dr. Burrow as well as myself that it has been important that this proclamation of this work had taken place in front of an international audience. The work of Dr. Clark this afternoon was interesting but as much as he frequently used the phrase “primary identification”, not once he used the name of Burrow. No matter. All on this trip leads us only to increase our interest in the work of Baltimore and become still more conscious of the great need of its posterior development.

Dr. Burrow just arrived. The meeting was most boring —nothing has happened. I would like to tell you about our trip until now but I am also very tired... Dr. Burrow will write to you when he finds a moment... Sincerely, (signed Clarence Shields)”

There follows the letter of Burrow himself of September 5, 1925:

“Dear Brownie, I know that you will excuse my not writing extensively this night. The sessions at last have finished and I am dead tired. The presentation of my thesis was well worthwhile. It was essential. The actual psychoanalytic base is unhealthy and cannot be maintained. Of course, the psychoanalysts are not conscious of this and it will be only in the measure that our work develops that it will take its place as a scientific principles of consciousness... I am so happy to have Jack with me and that he can at last arrive to feel that this real work is my work, as more remotely as he will possibly already feel it... With love, Trigant.”

Just as well that in the journey back he had time to write the paper he had promised for the winter meeting of the American Psychoanalytic Association. The following weeks were exhausting:

“Since my return from Europe —he comments to Brill excusing himself for not having answered his letter before— I have been very preoccupied with the illness and recent death of my mother. Finding myself face to face with a loss like this one, I find that at this moment all my philosophies desert me and I lose a lot of enthusiasm for the things which ordinarily are of importance to me.”

The loss he had to face is not only the one of the mother who brought him into the world, but for him his “analytical mother” was also agonizing: “the actual psychoanalytical base is unhealthy and cannot be maintained. Of course, the psychoanalysts are not conscious of this and it will be only in the measure that our work develops itself and arrives at taking the place as a scientific principle of consciousness.” Was there any way of saving her? What he could not continue to hope for was that his psychoanalytic *alma mater* was a “mother” as understanding as his had been. The whole history of the discovery of Group Analysis, the same as the one of Psychoanalysis comes written in a dramatic tone, but at this moment for Burrow it reaches tones of Greek tragedy. There is no other solution as to submit to destiny. All in all it had been worthwhile. To present the position of Group Analysis was necessary, it was a necessary formality. At last the Rubicon was crossed and the die is cast, *alea jacta est*. But, what to do now? First, publish the paper of Bad Homburg in the Zeitschrift as they have asked him to. Second, write the clarifying papers for the Americans he had thought of. Third, consolidate definitely the laboratory where to continue the investigations with his group. Forth, establish a social organization which functions in accordance to groupanalytic principles

discovered with his group. And, finally, publish the definite version of *Our Common Consciousness* which he had ready for over two years. It is to be seen if this strategy serves or not for his psychoanalyst colleagues to accept what he offers them as a remedy in the fight against the social neurosis, which they the same than everybody else suffer from. Anyhow, it will not be because of him that things remain as they are.

To publish the article of Bad Homburg in the *Zeitschrift* was not going to be easy. Three years will go by before it does not appear in its pages.⁶⁴ Before appears in *Imago* the German version of *The Group Method of Analysis*, the clarifying article they had asked him for and which Burrow presents in the winter meeting to his American colleagues.⁶⁵ One month after having read the paper of Bad Homburg he receives a letter from Dr. Federn as spokesman of Freud, telling him that the latter is very interested in publishing his paper in the *Zeitschrift*. By the by he offers him “a psychoanalytic interpretation of the why it is not understood” —having taken a distant and superior attitude when writing it and leaving all the weight of understanding it to the reader— and he suggests to him as remedy to try and rather give account of the results of his method instead of the theories. Burrow, without rejecting the interpretation but neither accepting it, promises to be more open in giving account of the results. The opinion which Federn transmits to him is no more than an educated way of saying what Freud really thinks of Burrow, as he explains to Rado, the editor of the *Zeitschrift*: “I have read the manuscript of Burrow and I subscribe your critique and the one of Eitingon. Burrow gives me the feeling of being a “*verworrener Fasler*” (a confused babbler). Recently I have maintained a certain correspondence with him in reference to a paper in which he insists in introducing the Relativity Theory in Psychoanalysis. I have the impression that making objections to him by letter will not change anything with him. But, a note as the one you suggest could be appropriate. It could still be more definite, for example: due to the abstract manner of expressing yourself and the scarce information offered by the author... Naturally, one should let him know that the editorial committee thinks in adding an observation of this kind to his article. I don't think this will offend him too much since in his over-estimation of himself he is invulnerable. Anyhow, we can run the risk. The stupidity is so patent and the considerations of the American gentleman don't have to go too far. The Americans transfer the democratic principles from politics. Everyone has to arrive to be president at least once, but nobody is permitted to continue being it and nobody should stand out over the rest and this way all this gang never learn to produce anything...” The lack of respect for Burrow in Freud is part of the disdain he has for the Americans but what also becomes clear is his incapacity of accepting the challenge of change of paradigm which Burrow proposes. That Burrow was conscious of the situation is proven by the fact that he did not even exhaust the time they had given him in Bad Homburg for reading his paper and the commentaries he makes to his most intimates. However, his own prejudice and the false hope that Freud's attitudes and the ones of the psychoanalytic community could change if they entered into group analysis, will take him to continue a dialogue of deaf persons in the correspondence with Freud. His presentations to the American Psychoanalytic Association and the publication of articles in the psychoanalytic journals will go on until in 1927 the old *Our Common Consciousness* is published.

In his attempt to widen psychoanalysis to the social ambit and deepen his study of group analysis, Burrow is conscious of being placed into that symbolic-affective impasse determined philo- and ontogenetically which cannot be overcome more than by group analysis. He knows that trying to overcome this impasse he will stumble on resistances

⁶⁴ Trigant Burrow, *Die Laboratoriumsmethode in der Psychoanalyse: Ihr Anfang und ihre Entwicklung*, *Intenationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, 1928, Vol. 14, pp. 375-86.

⁶⁵ Trigant Burrow, *Die Gruppenmethode in der Psychoanalyse*, *Imago*, 1926, Vol. 12, pp. 211-222.

as great in the individual and the community as Freud had encountered in the individual analysis and, as in the case of Freud, it will be useless to overcome them by mere explanations. In his contributions to the psychoanalytic meetings as well as in the journal Mental Health edited by his group, he invites the reader to listen to the words from his sentiments and to convert the reading in some way into a groupanalytic exercise. The more explicit examples of this attitude are in the exercise he proposes to the people present in the spring meeting of the American Psychoanalytic Association in Cincinnati on May 31, 1927⁶⁶ and in the book *The Biology of Human Conflict. An Anatomy of Behavior Individual and Social* where ten years later will be assembled the spirit and the dialectic of all these writings.⁶⁷ In all these years the work of Burrow, however, encounters a better acceptance and understanding between artists, sociologists, anthropologists and philosophers than between psychiatrist and psychoanalyst colleagues. These cannot accept that the principles and the method exposed by Burrow are not, as he insists, no more than an extension of the Freudian method. They are convinced that group analysis is presented as an alternative and substitute of individual psychoanalysis when really Burrow does not think in his method as more than a complement, necessary and indispensable to individual psychoanalysis and that, in fact at least during the first times, having followed a private psychoanalysis was required previously to entering a group analysis, and all participants were free to return to a private analysis while continuing in their group analysis.⁶⁸ What Freud and his colleagues ask of him is that he stop explaining in what he bases his method and that he go and explain what he does and what results he obtains or, including as Oberndorf proposes to him, to send him a delegate to visit his laboratory. Burrow, as much as he would like to please him, answers:

“...This is not possible given the nature of the group technique. Group analysis is a participative analysis of a group. It is not about an analysis carried out by a group in front of an individual who observes it —no more than in an individual analysis such an objective action could happen on the part of an external spectator. But all this, I think, will become clearer as other groups of individuals feel the need to submit their own social reactions to their own objective observation. This is, I believe, the only way how group analysis could occupy the place of a necessary complement of the actual private analysis.”

The work realized by the study group which for the first time met in 1923 for that unique experiment in the Lifwynn Camp continued to expand. The group meetings went on developing during the course in the Phipps Clinic where some of the members worked and analyzed themselves or in the private practice which Trigant Burrow and Clarence Shields maintained still in Baltimore, and during the summers as unity of investigation in the same Lifwynn Camp. Little by little the need had made itself felt to count with premises more appropriate for such work and upon return from Bad Homburg in the winter of 1925 a house was rented in St. Paul's Street in Baltimore for the laboratory. There lived six of the students, while the others came to the meals three times a day and the regular planned meetings. Many of these meetings took place around the table while they were eating. It was not accidental that they did so. Burrow felt that assigning a place on the table is how one is admitted to the wider familiar circle, naturally once one attained the control of his sphincters and was capable of using certain symbols, certain social and behavioral meanings and follow the corresponding prohibitions. To

⁶⁶ Trigant Burrow, “The Autonomy of the I from the Standpoint of Group Analysis”, Psyche, London, 1928/01, Vol. 8, pp. 35-50.

⁶⁷ Trigant Burrow (1937): *The Biology of Human Conflict. An Anatomy of Behavior Individual and Social*, Macmillan, New York.

⁶⁸ “A search...” Letter to Paul Federn of February 7, 1926, p.127.

incorporate oneself in the family unity constitutes for the individual his first social group, a symbolically systematized community. This way one tried to reproduce on the level of the laboratory on this dining table or the family with all its conventions, the same conditions in which one was born and has been raised. "Our aim, says Burrow, was to apply an objective method of investigation to reactions and processes which till then we had accepted subjectively without critique."⁶⁹ The participants of this study group maintained the laboratory by paying for "room and board" and sharing the responsibility of taking care of the house. With the exception of one of the students, who voluntarily assumed the function of full-time housekeeper for twenty-seven years, the majority of members of the group were actively employed in the community, some as physicians and nurses, others as businessmen and merchants. Shields continued to help Burrow in his office for which he showed unusual capacities of organization and the students carried out together some enterprises as the preparation and edition of the articles for Mental Health already mentioned.

The following winter Burrow began to interest himself more and more in the greater understanding and contacts of sympathizers with his work that offered New York. At the same time the need became manifest of giving a more formal structure to the organizational device than the one disposed of until then for the laboratory investigation. In this sense Burrow wrote in 1926 to his associates:

"Instead of myself being a healthy psychopathologist to whom the sick and delinquent neurotic comes in search for help and pays professional honoraries for the therapeutic remedies I have on sale, we are a group of co-workers who put voluntarily time and resources at the service of a common proposal without any pay. What we need now, when we become conscious that the foundation in fact already exists, is to think in the way of carrying it in practice. Of course, we have to have well present that what our project implies is an emotional foundation and not merely an economic foundation".⁷⁰

The Lifwynn Foundation for Laboratory Research in Analytical and Social Psychiatry was socially and legally incorporated in Maryland in August of 1927, adopting as a name the one of the Camp in the Adirondack Mountains where for the first time the group method of analysis had been conducted within the framework of a community. As directors they chose a professional members of the group and Burrow was elected as scientific director, a position he occupied to the end of his days. In September an office was rented in New York for Burrows and Shields and they took a house in Greenwich where the group moved to live. The move to New York coincided with the publication, after so many years of waiting, of the amplified version of the old *Our Common Consciousness* by the International Library of Psychology, Philosophy and Scientific Method at the same time in England and the United States under the definitive title of *The Social Basis of Consciousness: A Study in Organic Psychology Based upon a Synthetic and Societal Concept of the Neurosis*. Of this book Burrow sent one copy to Freud who upon receipt sends the following note to Burrow as only response:

"Thankfully I acknowledge receipt of your book The Social Basis of Consciousness. I am sorry that its first chapter already presented great difficulties for my comprehension. Sincerely yours, (signed) Freud."

With this sharp note Freud takes as finished his "correspondence" with Burrow. But not vice versa. Burrow would continue to correspond as shows the letter of 1935 with which he accompanies a shipment of his most recent writings: "It will be for the future to decide

⁶⁹ Trigant Burrow, The Biology of Human Conflict, p.253.

⁷⁰ "A Search...", p. 171.

if, carrying the central principles of your teachings to the field of behavior as a whole with all its socio-physiological implications at the same time phylogenetic and ontogenetic, my application of your original concepts constitutes intrinsically an application less loyal to these concepts than the position of many adherents to psychoanalysis whose loyalty is considered habitually as the more strictly orthodox interpretation. Of course, I would not like to force between us any affiliation which would not be convenient to you... Speaking to you this way, when I am sending you articles representative of our most recent work in the field of human behavior, I only want to leave testimony of my own sentiment that there is an inherent continuity between that what you have given us in the field of psychopathology and what I have tried to demonstrate, which are the concomitant causal elements in a world neurosis...”⁷¹

The administrative sessions of Bad Homburg that have seemed to Burrow so boring, to others they seemed very stimulating. Oberndorf, former president of the American Psychoanalytic Association and member of the Psychoanalytic Society of New York, who in representation of the latter was elected member of the International Training Committee, when accounting to Brill about the agreements on the training of psychoanalysts there adopted, this one did not lose time in naming a committee to get the European recommendations going on the basis of organizing courses sponsored by the Society. From then onwards, in New York the supervised instruction in psychoanalysis replaced the previous undetermined didactic analysis where every analyst could choose from the voluminous literature those points which more attracted him from his experience and inclination. This is to say, that at the same moment in which the International Psychoanalytic Association, when adopting the model of training of the Polyclinic of Berlin, reinforces its institutionalization, Trigant Burrow is thinking in incorporating his laboratory group as a foundation in view of fomenting that cooperative creativity which avoids the institutionalization of psychoanalysis. This, however, does not settle the dispute between Americans and Europeans which was centered not so much on standards and methods of training than on if the latter could be imparted or not by anybody who was not a physician. Psychoanalysis in America had followed a different pattern to Vienna. Due to the virtual ostracism to which the medical profession had submitted Freud for more than twenty-five years, the latter had looked for the acceptance of other professions —psychologists, sociologists, artists, philosophers— allied to his principal interest that is psychology and the psychic apparatus. Of the about twenty people, all of them dedicated to the liberal practice of psychoanalysis or didactic analysis, who in the middle of the twenties came to the meetings of the Vienna Society, less than half were physicians. On the other hand, the list of members of the American Psychoanalytic Association in 1925 had thirty-eight names, all of them physicians, fourteen of them from the group of New York; all dedicated to the private praxis of psychoanalysis. Of the twenty-four others who lived in other localities, for only half a dozen of them psychoanalysis was their principal interest; the rest used prudently the principles of psychoanalysis in the care of mental patients and in their approach to other sociological problems with psychiatric implications. The differences in relation to medical analysis were growing to the point that on the occasion of the process against Theodor Reik in Vienna, Freud would write his famous pamphlet on “Lay analysis (psychoanalysis and medicine)” (1926). The International Journal of Psychoanalysis in 1927 published a discussion of more than a hundred pages on this question to which twenty-five analysts of different societies were invited to participate. The sentence of Schilder —“To me it seems unquestionable that the treatment of the patient should be a question reserved to physicians”— is emblematic of the position taken by the Americans, especially in New York. The question of lay analysis in reality is

⁷¹ “A Search...” Letter to Freud of May 9, 1935, p.296.

a false problem, since it is not a question of the basic discipline required for a psychoanalyst to treat patients but if the practice of psychoanalysis should be a professional practice or an amateur practice. The only exception we know of, as we have seen earlier is, the one of Trigant Burrow who, even if he did not train professional psychoanalysts, between the students of his laboratory he counted with more non-physicians than physicians. Of Burrow it was said that he reunited all the characteristics for becoming a leader, a great teacher and having great success as a psychoanalyst. The market of training in New York at the end of the twenties, at the height of a crisis, could not be more propitious for somebody like him, a prestigious psychoanalyst, who just had written a book where he demonstrated not to have any prejudice against non-physicians. But instead of setting up an Institute or a School as did the group of Brill, he incorporates his group as a foundation in society. To find the formula to be able to do so in accordance with the principles of group analysis supposed for him and his group once again a theoretical as well as a practical effort. As Burrow commented to Leo Stein:

“It will amuse you to know that group analysis is becoming fashionable in New York. The popular adaptation of it has to do, I believe, with the analysis of collectives of people by a self-proclaimed arbiter called psychoanalyst. It is a form of group analysis where the arbitrary position of the analyst achieves a wider arbitrariness thanks to its social amplification. The plans we have been contemplating during such a long time, last September have taken us definitely to creating a Foundation incorporated under the laws of Maryland. You were right; the question after all is an economic question. We have to dispense with a leader as a central image of private authority and our common problem will be faced by us together if we are to break with the ties of the social neurosis which comprises us all. This implies at least, as you say, an economic situation. I hope to be able to avoid confusing it with the economy manifest in politics and industrialism. As I see it, our economic problem is primary and essentially a physiological problem — in the sense of racially physiological. There definitely are in our common species physiological relations between individuals of which we scientists have not taken duly into account. It is a long and complicated history. These last weeks I have been looking for a simple and good way of saying it.”⁷²

In fact, the bye-laws of the Foundation are a master piece in how to achieve to establish a social unity relatively healthy in this socially neurotic world and to practice analysis without betraying the principles of group analysis. It is one of the few analytic organizations which radically and systematically apply the principles and the group method of analysis to all aspects of its functioning.

Upon becoming an employee of the Foundation, Burrow was definitely liberated from charging honoraries to earn his living and with it had given the last step of this radical transformation in the professional life which in him had come about as a consequence of his mutual analysis with Shields.

We don't know if Freud in his reading went beyond this first chapter, but to be sure he must have read the preface and the introduction which precede it. The sentence with which it starts will not have predisposed the spirit of Freud for reading: “After sixteen years of psychoanalytic work based on the principles of Freud, I have arrived at the position which differs essentially from the one of his followers as well as his competitors and which obliges me to give account of the development which my conceptions have followed, and to formulate as clearly as I can the position to which it has taken me.” The

⁷² “A Search...”, Letter to Leo Stein of December 29, 1927, p. 197.

position which Burrow makes explicit in the first chapter cannot be more devastating for the individual analysis. He starts by questioning the concept of sexuality with which Freud operates, interpreting it as a symptom of social neurosis from which suffer the individual as well as the community, including in the latter naturally the psychoanalysts. Prepared to question, he questions the theory, the technique and the profession of the psychoanalyst.

The problem that Freud had in understanding Burrow, from the point of view of the personal psychoanalysis he had discovered, is in that group analysis does not constitute an elaboration or application of Freudian theory but offers a wider framework which includes psychoanalysis and from which the analytic relationship can be understood.