

Sándor Ferenczi and the Budapest School of Psychoanalysis¹

Judit Mészáros, Ph.D.

This is truly an exceptional occasion: the opening of the Sándor Ferenczi Center at the New School for Social Research. It calls to mind two moments in history that have made it possible for us to celebrate here today. The first is the founding of the New School, which has indeed been a flagship of progress in its 90 years of existence. And the Center certainly represents part of this spirit of progress. The other moment is the first latter-day international Ferenczi conference held in New York City in 1991, initiated by two of our colleagues present here, Adrienne Harris and Lewis Aron.²

Here again we see the meeting of New York and Budapest at this great event, as we do at another: as the Sándor Ferenczi Society in Budapest is honored as recipient of the 2008 Mary S. Sigourney Trust Award for our 20 years of contributing to the field of psychoanalysis.

We have reason to celebrate. After half a century of apparent death, the intellectual spirit of Ferenczi has been revived by the unwavering commitment and hard work of two generations of professionals throughout the world.

Ferenczi developed innovative concepts on scholarly thinking, and on the meeting points of culture and psychoanalysis. He and the members of the Budapest School represented not only Hungarian roots, but also the values, the scholarly approach, and the creativity characteristic of Central Eastern Europe in the first half of the 20th century. These have been fundamental in supplying the world with a great many scholars and artists – among them nuclear physicists Edward Teller and Leo Szilard, mathematician John von Neumann, father of the modern computer and writer Alexander Marai – both of them were close to Ferenczi.

Ferenczi energized the psychoanalytic movement. He launched the paradigm shift that still affects psychotherapeutic theory and practice today. At the same time, he also proposed the setting up of key institutions. For example, it was on his recommendation that the International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA) was formed in 1910, an institution which continues to play the same role today. Ferenczi founded the Hungarian Psychoanalytical Society in 1913. He became the world's first appointed professor of psychoanalysis in 1919 and played a significant role in the development of the Budapest School of psychoanalysis.

Did the School really exist? Can one truly speak of a school with no walls, no director, and no students? And if so, what organizing principles provide the common ground that distinguishes the professional philosophy of its members? How did the Budapest School of Psychoanalysis take shape? What was the role Sándor Ferenczi played in it? What significance did this intellectual grouping hold for the evolution of modern psychoanalysis and psychotherapy? How did the defining moments of early 20th-century Hungarian and European politics impact both psychoanalysis and the analysts themselves?

“Budapest is well on its way to becoming the center of our movement.” (*Freud, 1918*)

¹Read on the occasion of the opening ceremony of the Ferenczi Center at the New School for Social Research on January 12, 2009.

² Many papers of the conference were published in 1993: *The Legacy of Sándor Ferenczi*. Edited by Lewis Aron & Adrienne Harris.

In a letter to Karl Abraham in August 1918, Freud said he believed that “Budapest is well on its way to becoming the center of our movement” (Letter from Freud to Karl Abraham, [1918] 2002). How is it that, a mere decade after Freud and Ferenczi first met in 1908, Budapest would be suited to such a role?

The main characteristics of the Budapest School can be tied to the figure of Ferenczi but beyond him it also stems from the *interdisciplinarity* of psychoanalysis: how it became interlinked with the *processes of modernization in early 20th-century Hungary through figures in literature, the arts, and the social sciences*. Ferenczi’s innovative and liberal personality made it possible for a great many creative people from a variety of scholarly fields to become closely associated with psychoanalysis and to enjoy greater freedom in their work in such areas as ethnography, pedagogy, literature and even economics.

The catalyst:

Ferenczi was a catalyst for the development of psychoanalysis. Through his tireless work in teaching and public speaking in Hungary, the “new human view”, as Ignotus, a contemporary literary figure, called psychoanalysis (Ignotus, [1933] 2000, 39), was soon embraced by receptive modernist intellectuals.

The role of media forums for psychoanalysis

Avant-garde intellectuals set up their forums. Hungary saw both the creation of the Free University for the Social Sciences, the medical weekly *Gyógyászat* (Therapy), and the founding of journals for literary criticism, such as *Nyugat* (The West), and for sociology, such as *A huszadik század* (The Twentieth Century), all with the goal of passing on the new intellectual currents. Similarly, a forum was launched by medical students, *A Galilei kör* (The Galileo Circle). And all of these were eager to spread the ideas of psychoanalysis. In other words, both university students and the young avant-garde intelligentsia had the opportunity not only to follow, but also to play a part in the development of psychoanalysis. All of this proved a sound intellectual investment. Ferenczi’s appointment as full professor in Budapest in 1919 and the concurrent establishment of the first department of psychoanalysis within a medical university (Erős, Kapás and Kiss, 1987) represented the fulfillment of these students’ efforts.

Therefore, the contemporary media played an essential role in the fact that, ten years after the first Freud-Ferenczi meeting (1908), psychoanalysis in Budapest had become far more than a new method for treating patients with neuroses. Ignotus described early psychoanalysis as spread by Ferenczi in this way: “the next day we were already thinking differently than we had been the day before” (Ignotus, [1933], 2000, 38). Psychoanalysis could be found in the conversations in the cafés of Budapest and even in folk song parodies.

Eresz alatt fészkel az ösztön
Gátlásomat Ferenczinél
Hóféhérré fűrösztöm.

(Hegedűs [1932] 1988, 28, idézi Valachi, 2008)

With my pretty little instinct
Nesting in the trees,
I scrub my inhibition
Clean at Ferenczi’s.

(translated by Thomas Williams)

The position of Budapest was further strengthened by the fact that the 5th International Psychoanalytical Congress was held there in 1918.³ During the Congress, Antal Freund of Tószeg – the brewery owner who was the first patron of the psychoanalytic movement – pledged what would be the equivalent today of half a million dollars to establish an international psychoanalytic publishing house and library in Budapest. At the same time, he planned to back the setting up of a psychoanalytic outpatient clinic and the teaching of psychoanalysis as part of the university curriculum. Thus, the growth of a strong, diverse system had begun, one which included plans to expand psychoanalytic *publishing, teaching psychoanalysis at the medical curriculum*, and opportunities for low-fee *healing*.

Unlike “the hostile indifference of the learned and educated [...] in Vienna” – as Freud bitterly described his situation (Freud, 1914, 40) – Budapest offered tempting prospects for the entire psychoanalytic movement.

History steps in for the first time – The first wave of emigration – Vienna and Berlin

The end of World War I brought with it the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. Having been on the losing side, Hungary lost two-thirds of its territory in the peace treaty that followed. Other dramatic changes also took place between 1918 and 1920. *In fact, in the space of only a year and a half, the monarchy crumbled and the "Aster Revolution"* – based on the liberal, radical opposition of the First World War⁴ – brought about the creation of a short-lived, first *Hungarian Republic*, which was unable to steady itself amid both the domestic and international political power struggles surrounding it. It thus gave way to a *Soviet Republic* that lasted for several months, which was, in turn, followed by a backlash of rightist *White Terror*. Against changes and disturbances of such proportions, the potential for Budapest playing a central role in the psychoanalytic movement was utterly lost.

The numerous retaliatory measures taken in 1919 and 1920 led to the following losses compared to the advantageous situation of the previous year and a half:

1. Ferenczi was dismissed from his post as department head, and, at the same time,
2. Psychoanalysis lost its position within the university curriculum.
3. As a result of pressure put on Freud by Jones (Letter from Jones to Freud, [12 October 1919] Freud-Jones, 1993, 357), Ferenczi resigned as president of the International Psychoanalytical Association before his term because of the difficult communications from Hungary. In the interim (1919-1920), Jones took over the post.
4. Due to inflation, a portion of Freund's donation had to be taken to Vienna and it was thus Vienna – and not Budapest – where the psychoanalytic publishing house and library were established in 1919.

The White Terror period in the early twenties, the attendant anti-Semitism and the 6% restriction on Jewish students permitted at universities, or *numerus clausus*, all sparked the wave of emigration to which the leftist, Jewish, or anti-despotic portion of Hungary's

³The congress was held between 28-29 September 1918.

⁴Tibor Hajdú and Zsuzsa L. Nagy: "Revolution, Counterrevolution, Consolidation," In: Peter F. Sugar, Péter Hanák, Tibor Frank, Eds., *A History of Hungary*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1994. 295-309.

intelligentsia felt compelled. Outstanding scientists, philosophers and artists left the country then,⁵ and the majority of them immigrated to Berlin. As a consequence of the wave of Central Eastern European emigration that followed World War I, Berlin became fertile ground for modern culture and evolved into a city that fully embraced the talented émigré intelligentsia (Frank, 1999).

It was then that Budapest lost a portion of its analysts for the first time. One quarter of the 18-member Hungarian Psychoanalytical Society left the country. Members who emigrated included Sándor Radó (secretary of the society),⁶ Jenő Hárnik, Jenő Varga,⁷ Sándor Lóránd and Melanie Klein.⁸ Hungarian psychoanalysis was thus forced to resign itself to the loss of its promising young people, some of whom – Michael Balint, Alice Balint and Edit Gyömrői – would actually return to Budapest in the consolidation period between 1925 and 1937. However, soon afterward, they were forced to leave and then to emigrate permanently in the second wave (1938-41).

The first wave of emigration – 1919-1926

Vienna	Berlin	Leipzig	Paris	New York City
<i>Members of the Hungarian Psychoanalytical Society</i>				
Jenő Varga	Jenő Hárnik Melanie Klein Sándor Radó			Sándor Lóránd
<i>Future analysts</i>				
Margaret Mahler Edit Gyömrői (1919) René Spitz	Michael Balint Alice Balint Franz Alexander Georg Gerő Edit Gyömrői (1923)	Therese Benedek	George Devereux, alias György Dobó	

The face of Europe had changed. Budapest fell into decline, Vienna and Berlin grew in significance. Berlin was the stronghold of the émigré Central and Eastern European intelligentsia and became the hub of European culture.

⁵Theodore von Kármán, Michael Polányi, Leó Szilárd, Edward Teller, Arnold Hauser, George Lukács and Karl Mannheim, to mention only a few.

⁶Sándor Radó took an active role in Hungary’s Soviet government. We know from a letter from Ferenczi to Freud that Radó also had a hand in Ferenczi’s professorial appointment. Ferenczi wrote that he had “whipped the matter through the education section” (Ferenczi 812, Freud–Ferenczi, 1996, 353).

⁷Having been a part of Béla Kun’s government as the people’s commissar for finance and then for social production as well as chairman of the People’s Economic Council, Jenő Varga was sentenced to death after the fall of the Soviet Republic. He fled to Austria and took part in sessions of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society for a short period between February and June of 1920. Afterward, he traveled to Moscow to the 2nd Congress of the Communist Internationale and settled in Soviet Russia where he worked with Lenin and was the director between 1927 and 1947 of the Institute of World Economics and Politics of the Soviet Academy of Sciences (Toegel, 2001).

⁸Melanie Klein became a member of the Hungarian Psychoanalytical Society in 1919 with her paper entitled “A child’s development”. She left the country in 1921 due to anti-Semitism.

The first Psychoanalytic Institute was founded in Berlin in 1920; it would establish the basic structure for training in the field. This effort was based in part on the experience of one-time Hungarian analyst Sándor Radó. A decade later, it was through Radó that the Berlin training model moved to the United States, where the groundwork for the American training system was laid in the early 1930s at the New York Psychoanalytic Institute under Radó's leadership.

Owing to its limited opportunities in the late 1920s, Budapest would only see its first training institute established in 1926 and then, in 1931, a polyclinic, which provided low-fee psychoanalytic outpatient therapy, but the city did manage to see the revival of extremely active and creative development in psychoanalytic research and training (Haynal and Mészáros, 2004).

A decade of Berlin flourishing was put to an end with Hitler's rise to power in 1933. This sealed the fate of psychoanalysts in Berlin (Brecht, Friedrich, Hermanns et al., 1985). Then, with the spread of fascism and the annexation of Austria, the best and brightest of the Viennese intelligentsia found itself dispossessed (Stadler and Weibel, 1995) – including Freud and the Viennese psychoanalytic community (Molnar, 1992).

Ferenczi died suddenly of pernicious anemia in May 1933, not long before his 60th birthday – at a time when books were being burned in bonfires on the streets of Berlin in Hitler's Germany.

It is a rare misfortune indeed for someone to soar freely in intellectual terms, but to have her or his emotional development/attachment and her or his loyalty to a sort of father figure stand in the way of the degree of freedom that she or he needs. This is a sure source of conflict. Indeed, Ferenczi saw his own pernicious anemia as psychosomatic in origin:

“In my case the blood crisis arose when I realized that not only can I not rely on the protection of a ‘higher power’ but on the contrary I shall be trampled under foot by this indifferent power as soon as I go my own way and not his” (Ferenczi, [2 October, 1932], 1988, 257).

It was not Ferenczi's death that disrupted the further development of the Budapest School; it was the urgent need to flee from a Europe held in the ever tightening stranglehold of fascism, to flee – if at all possible, if help arrived, and if there was a place to flee to!

Today we could not speak of the impact of the Budapest School without the invaluable assistance of the American Psychoanalytic Association. It set up *The Emergency Committee on Relief and Immigration* on 13 March 1938, a day after the Anschluss (Mészáros, 1998). The Committee set the objective of aiding in the escape and immigration of all its European colleagues by all means possible. They sent affidavits to obtain visas, provided financial support, and sought job opportunities. The Emergency Committee aided 250 European people mostly psychoanalysts in escaping – along with their families if necessary. The majority were assisted within a span of three years until the US entered the war in 1941. *The Emergency Committee supported psychoanalysts by virtue of their profession; it was sufficient merely to be a member of the international community of psychoanalysts. The Committee's decisions were not influenced by professional achievements, and they rose above conflicts based on professional rivalries.*

(It was a similar effort the New School undertook in establishing the University in Exile in 1933. It thus supported more than 180 scientists, artists, and their families, threatened by National Socialism.)

Hungary: The second wave of emigration – 1938-1941 – a continental shift

In the weeks following the Anschluss, the Hungarian Parliament passed its first anti-Jewish Act (1938) and soon after this followed the second one. This facilitated the second wave of emigration, and the consequence was a continental shift.

See the letter from Géza Róheim to John Rickman (slide 15)

Émigrés from Hungary between 1938-1941 by country of settlement			
<i>United States</i>	<i>Australia</i>	<i>United Kingdom</i>	<i>Ceylon (Sri Lanka)</i>
Tibor Ágoston	Klára Lázár-Gerő	Alice Balint	Edit Gyömrői
Róbert Bak		Michael Balint	
Susan Déri			
Sándor Feldman			
Fanny Hann-Kende			
Dezső (David)			
Rapaport			
Géza Róheim			

Hungarians at US psychoanalytic institutions 1925-1942		
<i>The New York Psychoanalytic Society</i>	<i>The Chicago Institute for Psychoanalysis</i>	<i>The Topeka Institute for Psychoanalysis</i>
Sandor Lorand	Franz Alexander	David Rapaport
Sandor Rado	Therese Benedek	Georg Gerő
Geza Roheim		
Sandor Feldman		
Fanny Hann-Kende		
Robert C. Bak		
Tibor Agoston		
Andrew Peto – 1956		

Exemplary among the heroic efforts of the Emergency Committee is the fact that it wrote *over 200 letters* in attempting to place David Rapaport – until he met Karl Menninger, who invited him to work at his clinic in Topeka, Kansas.

School with no walls

What was the significance of the interwar emigration of the Hungarian analysts in the development of modern psychoanalysis?

There are two areas in which the impact of this can be clearly demonstrated: *theoretical and therapeutic methods*, on the one hand, and *training systems and training institutes*, on the other.

Given the length limitations of this paper, I will provide only an indication of their impact below and cover only the most distinguished innovations, those origins can be traced back to Budapest.

I. *Theoretical and therapeutic methods*

“Hungarians were aware that psychoanalysis was a two-way street.”⁹ (Paul Roazen, 2001)

1. *Countertransference – mutual reflective relationship*

From the early twenties in Hungary, *psychoanalysis became a system of multi-directional processes of interpersonal and intersubjective elements*. Ferenczi’s positive thinking as of 1919 on the phenomenon of countertransference represented a fundamental shift in viewpoint (Ferenczi [1919] 1980, [1928] 1997, Haynal, 1988, Cabré, 1998) This paved the way for psychoanalysis to become a system of interactive communication, a “relationship-based” (Haynal, 2002, xi) process or, as Paul Roazen so aptly put it, “a two-way street” in psychoanalysis (Mészáros, 2004a).

Psychoanalysis presupposes the simultaneous existence of interpersonal, intersubjective and intrapsychic processes, based on confidence between analyst and analysand. The analyst and analysand enter into a mutually reflective relationship that is realized in the process of transference–countertransference. Authentic communication on the part of the psychotherapist became a fundamental requirement (Hoffer, 1996), as false statements result in dissociation and repeat the dynamic of previous pathological relations. As we would phrase it today, false reflections result in false self-objects. Both countertransference and authentic communication were incorporated into the psychoanalytic method of the majority of the Budapest analysts. Michael Balint and Alice Balint (Balint and Balint, 1939), Hann Kende Fanny (Hann-Kende, [1933] 1933) and Therese Benedek, who was also close to Ferenczi, were all guided by this conviction from the early 1930s, and it had a strong impact on the development of psychoanalysis after they emigrated. In fact, Benedek was practically among the first to teach countertransference to students under her supervision at the Chicago Institute (Gedo, 1993). Through Clara M. Thompson, who was analyzed by Ferenczi, and Harry Stack Sullivan, another American sympathizer, some of his ideas became part of the thinking of Sullivan’s interpersonal school, founded in the US.

2. *Early object relations theories – Ferenczi, Michael Balint, Alice Balint, Imre Hermann, Melanie Klein, Margaret Mahler, Therese Benedek, René Spitz... Winnicott*

⁹ Film on Sándor Ferenczi, Hungarian Television, 2001.

Ferenczi sensed the significance of the early mother-infant relationship early on. It was this he was referring to in his *Clinical Diary* when he wrote: during analysis we must probe deep, “right down to the mothers” (Ferenczi, [1932], 1988, 74).

Ferenczi had an impact on two key figures of the model of psychoanalytic development. These were Melanie Klein and Margaret Mahler, both of whom had their roots in Budapest. Ferenczi was Klein’s first analyst, and it was Ferenczi who inspired her to deal with children. Ferenczi’s encouragement was well received. Klein became a member of the Hungarian Psychoanalytical Society with her paper “A child’s development” in 1919. The first conceptualized object relations theory is associated with Klein’s name.

Among the Budapest analysts there were several who did not agree with Klein’s ideas on an infant’s inborn primary narcissism, sadism and aggressive urges. Citing Imre Hermann, Alice Balint and indeed his own research and experience, Michael Balint ([1937] 1949) said that they had arrived at the conclusion in Budapest that the earliest phase of the life of a psyche is not narcissistic. It is directed at objects, and these early object relations are passive. The goal is acquired love because that is its due as a person: “to be loved and satisfied, without being under any obligation to give anything in return” (Balint *ibid*, 269). This is passive love/primary love, an archaic relationship between the mother and child; this is the early harmonious experience of the infant with the mother. If it is frustrated, the child has to learn how he/she can satisfy her- or himself. *In this sense, narcissism is a reaction*. Balint’s concept is analogous to Kohut’s archaic mirroring or idealizing self-object relationship (Bacal and Newman, 1990). As a visiting professor at the Department of Psychiatry in Cincinnati, Balint had an influence on “Cincinnatians” (Ornstein, 2002, 27).

Michael Balint regards the loss of basic trust as one of the early traumas, which has to be restored during the healing process (Balint [1933] 1965). In *The Unwelcome Child and His Death Instinct*, based on work with adults, Ferenczi wrote that a rejection of the baby or a lack of love as a consequence of subconscious acts of self-destruction can lead to a life-threatening condition (Ferenczi, [1929] 1955, 103). Similar ideas were being expressed by another Hungarian, René Spitz, in the phenomena known collectively as hospitalization syndrome (Spitz, 1945).

Like Michael Balint, Therese Benedek uses the term “primary object love”, as well as “passive object love”, but her idea is to use the phenomenological term “confidence” as the basis for the development of a positive object relationship between the mother and child (Benedek, [1938] 1973). Based on her first observations of infants in the early 1920s, Benedek described similar symptoms among mothers and their infants as she explored mother-child communication (Mészáros, 2004b). Using the language of current bonding theory, an infant reflects his mother’s manifestations. According to the biosocial theories that govern emotional development, a mother and child create a system of affective communication from the beginning of life, one in which interactions with the mother play a fundamental role in the modulation of the infant’s affective condition (Gergely and Watson, 1996; Fonagy, 2003).

“Not more than necessary”, “Optimal”, “Good enough”

Ferenczi’s earliest writings – in 1908 – dealt with the significance of repression of the “not more than necessary” type in a child’s development (Ferenczi, [1908] 1955). Margaret

Mahler, who was close to Ferenczi, used the word “optimal” in describing a solution to the individualization-separation process, and used the expression “optimal symbiosis” as the cradle of the individualization present. And it was Winnicott who very aptly expressed the notion of optimality as a condition for a positive background for psychic development when he coined the wonderful phrase “a good enough mother”.

3. *Trauma theory*

Ferenczi’s *paradigm shift* in trauma theory is a process which began in the 1920s and has had a long-term effect. Essential elements of it can be discerned in several of his studies; however, his most important findings are to be found in his *Confusion of Tongues between Adults and the Child* (Ferenczi [1933] 1955), as well as in his *Clinical Diary* (Ferenczi [1932] 1988).

With his concept of trauma, Ferenczi untied the Gordian knot. Freud’s dilemma was whether traumatic events were real or a figment of a person’s imagination, which he articulated as the first and second trauma theories. For Ferenczi, it was not a question of whether memories accurately portray real events. He was asking what it was that turned an experience into a traumatic force for the subject. To arrive at an answer, he placed the process of traumatization into a field of relations, in which objective reality is colored by the relationship between the traumatized individual and the aggressor as well as by a number of other phenomena.

He asserted that *trauma is founded on real events* and that its occurrence is *built on the interpersonal and intersubjective dynamic of object relations*. In the traumatic situation the victim and the *persecutor/aggressor operate differing ego defense mechanisms*. Ferenczi was the first to describe the *ego defense mechanism of identification with the aggressor*. He also focused on denial and splitting during traumatic experiences (Vikár, 1999). Anna Freud generalized the use of this term to describe identification with the aggressor within the framework of ego defense mechanisms (Anna Freud [1936] 1994). She understood it as an ego defense mechanism for so-called lesser aggression or fantasized aggression (Dupont 1998), but Ferenczi clearly described it as a mechanism/capacity of the ego. Among the American psychoanalysts, Clara M. Thompson thought along the same lines as Ferenczi.

Ferenczi stressed the *significance* of the presence or lack of a *trusted person* in the *post-traumatic situation* (Mészáros, 2002).

He also introduced the phenomena of resilience as the possible tool of the personality to balance the influence of traumatic events.

All these elements integrated into modern trauma theories and in the approaches of PTSD.

4. *Psychoanalytic psychosomatics*

Ferenczi, Lajos Lévy, who was, among other things, the Freuds’ family physician, and Michael Balint, all incorporated psychoanalytic ideas into the practice of internal medicine from the earliest years onward. For example, Ferenczi held an introductory course on psychoanalytic psychosomatics in 1923 for the Košice Medical Association in today’s Slovakia.

Michael Balint's activity is well-known in the field of psychosomatic treatment, research and training. In the 1950s, he set up case study groups for family doctors, the so-called "Research cum training seminars", or, more popularly, the "Balint groups" (Balint, 1968).

Franz Alexander became an emblematic figure in psychoanalytic psychosomatics. He differed from Ferenczi's point of view in that he no longer saw the body as a carrier of symbols. He saw it as a reactive system, which may react with symbols but may also express itself through a vegetative nervous system, which does not correspond directly to the symbolization process.

5. Developing psychoanalytic research – integration of tests into the clinical work

The development of clinical research and the integration of I.Q. and projective tests into the clinical work of psychologists and psychiatrists are both attributed to David Rapaport. He organized and became the head of the Research Department at the Menninger Clinic in Topeka, Kansas (Gill, 1967). Rapaport exerted a powerful influence on his contemporaries. He lectured at psychoanalytic institutes throughout the U.S., bringing about an appreciation of psychoanalytic theory and ego psychology.

II. Psychoanalytic training and institutional systems

Hungarian analysts had a great deal of experience in developing both a structure for psychoanalytic training and institutional systems, outstanding examples among them being Ferenczi, Michael Balint, Sándor Radó, Franz Alexander and David Rapaport. This is extremely significant because of the importance of a systematic educational program in influencing the next generation. Indeed, those who run institutes bring their intellectual orientation into the culture of the institute.

(1) Ferenczi recommended forming the International Psychoanalytical Association (1910).

(2) Ferenczi was first to consider it necessary for analysts to do their own training because he felt didactic analysis was lacking and thus work often came to a halt (Ferenczi, [1932] 1988).

(3) Vilma Kovács's training analysis construction (Kovács, [1933] 1993) emerged as the "Hungarian model". According to this, a young analyst candidate's first supervision is done with his own analyst so that obstructions that stem from his own personality but are not yet revealed would be able to come to the surface as soon as possible.

(4) Psychoanalytic training first became part of the medical curriculum through Ferenczi (1919).

(5) As of 1922, Sándor Radó contributed a great deal to developing the training system at the Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute.

(6) Radó took the Berlin training model to New York (1930), thus establishing the basic US system of psychoanalytic training.

(7) In 1945, Radó introduced psychoanalysis at the Columbia University in New York City, establishing the Psychoanalytic Clinic for Training and Research, which is still in operation today as Columbia University Center for Psychoanalytic Training and Research.

(8) Alexander established the Chicago Institute for Psychoanalysis (1932).

(9) In Melbourne, Klára Lázár set up the Australian Psychoanalytic Society (1940).

All the analysts who had emigrated from Budapest later became training analysts and thus had an impact on the work of several generations. They managed to win over members of the psychoanalytic community in considerable numbers. Presidents of the New York Psychoanalytic Society included Sándor Lóránd (1947-48), Róbert C. Bak (1957-59), Margaret Mahler (1971-73) and Andrew Pető (1975-77). Michael Balint was the chair of the medical section of the British Psychoanalytical Society and from 1968 to his death in 1970 was its president.

The member of the Budapest school together of the European émigré psychoanalysts using the wonderful phrase of a colleague of that time: “They became our teachers and our friends, and a very positive influence on our lives” (Mészáros, 2008).

Closing notes:

The intellectual survival of the Budapest School stems from the unparalleled solidarity of the American colleagues who set up the Emergency Committee on Relief and Immigration. The Committee not only saved lives, but it also salvaged the perspectives specific to analysts from Budapest and elsewhere in Europe. Following Ferenczi’s lead, like André Haynal said, an unseen call was made to think, feel, and question freely (Haynal, 2002).

Why was Ferenczi important not only for psychoanalysis, but also for scholarly thought in a broader sense and for a way of thinking that embraces interdisciplinary complexity? International research has done much to answer this question over the past 20 years. However, there is a question we rarely ask ourselves. Why is all of this important to us personally? Consider that the spirit of Ferenczi is one that has drawn together professionals from places ranging from Budapest, through Florence, Paris, London, and Buenos Aires, and on to New York. It has drawn them together to preserve the legacy, and – as the opening of the Ferenczi Center in New York and the plans for a Ferenczi Center in Budapest both demonstrate – it has also drawn them together to pass the legacy on to the coming generations.

But what does this spirit of Ferenczi represent?

Maybe many of you share some of my sense of who Ferenczi was. He knew how to watch, how to keep quiet, and how to listen. He could endure the tension created by uncertainties without giving rapid, prejudiced responses. He respected human sovereignty and focused the tools of psychoanalysis on developing an autonomous personality. He avoided professional hypocrisy, and his tolerance and ability to cooperate made it possible to create real interdisciplinary connections.

And today it seems we very much need constructive cooperation to make it possible to continue to build on as many shared values as possible. The Ferenczi Center now opening at the New School will certainly provide new opportunities toward this end.

Acknowledgements

This paper is based on research funded by the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (Washington, D.C.), by the Research Support Scheme of the Soros Foundation, and by the Research Committee of the International Psychoanalytical Association. I wish to express my thanks to Nellie L. Thompson, PhD (Curator of Archives & Special Collections, A. A. Brill Library, The New York Psychoanalytic Institute), to Ms Jill Duncan and especially to Ms Linda Carter-Jackson for her valuable help in my research on the Hungary-related documents (The Archives of The British Psycho-Analytical Society). I am also most grateful to Mr. Paul Bunten (Archives of the Payne Whitney Clinic) and Jerome A. Winer, MD (University of Illinois at Chicago).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARON L., HARRIS, A. (Eds.) (1993): *The Legacy of Sándor Ferenczi*. The Analytic Press, Hillsdale, NJ, London.

BACAL, H. A., NEWMAN, K. M. (1990): *Theories of Object relations: Bridges of Self-Psychology*. Columbia University Press, New York.

BALINT, M. ([1937]1949, 1965): Early Developmental States of the Ego: Primary Object Love. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 30 (4), 265-273; and In: *Primary love and Psycho-Analytic Technique*. Tavistock Publications, London, 74-90.

BALINT, M., BALINT, A. (1939): On transference and counter-transference. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 20 (3-4): 223-230.

BALINT, M. ([1933] 1965): Character analysis and new beginning. In: Balint M. *Primary love and Psycho-Analytic Technique*. Tavistock Publ., London

BALINT, M. (1968): Die Struktur der Training-cum-Research Gruppen und deren Auswirkungen auf die Medizin. *Jb. Psychoanalysis*, 5, 125-146.

BENEDEK, T. ([1938] 1973): Adaptation to reality in early infancy. In: Benedek, T. *Psychoanalytic Investigations: Selected Papers*. Quadrangle/The New York Times Book, New York, 113-128.

BRECHT, K., FRIEDRICH, V., HERMANN, L. M., KAMINER, I. J., JUELICH, D. H. (Eds.) (1985): „Here life goes on in a most peculiar way...” *Psychoanalysis before and after 1933*. Kellner

CABRÉ, M. L. J. (1998): Ferenczi's contribution to the concept of countertransference. *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, 7: 247-255.

- DUPONT, J. (1998): The Concept of Trauma According to Ferenczi and Its Effects on Subsequent Psychoanalytical Research. *Int. Forum Psychoanalysis* 7: 235-240.
- ERŐS F., KAPÁS I., KISS GY., SPANGHERO, G. P. (1987): Ferenczi Sándor és a Budapesti Egyetem, *Pszichológia*, 7(4): 584–592.
- FERENCZI, S. ([1908] 1955): Psychoanalysis and education. In: *Final contributions to the problems and methods of psycho-analysis*. Maresfield Reprints, London, 280-290.
- FERENCZI, S. ([1933] 1955): *Confusion of Tongues between Adults and the Child*. In: *Final contributions to the problems and methods of psycho-analysis*. Maresfield Reprints, London. 156-167.
- FERENCZI, S. ([1919] 1980): On the technique of psycho-analysis. In: *Further Contributions to the theory and technique of psycho-analysis*. Maresfield Reprints, London, 177-189.
- FERENCZI S. ([1928] 1997): A pszichoanalitikus technika rugalmassága. In: *Technikai írások*. Animula, Budapest, 57–70.
- FERENCZI, S. ([1929] 1955): The unwelcome child and his death instinct. In: *Final contributions to the problems and methods of psycho-analysis*. Maresfield Reprints, London, 102-107.
- FERENCZI S. ([1932] 1988): *The Clinical Diary of Sándor Ferenczi*. (Ed. Dupont, J.) Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. and London, England.
- FONAGY, P., TARGET, M. (2003): *Psychoanalytical Theories. Perspectives from Developmental Psychopathology*. Whurr Publishers
- FRANK, T. (1999): Station Berlin. Ungarische Wissenschaftler und Künstler in Deutschland 1919-1933, *Imis Beiträge*. Heft 10. 7–38.
- FREUD, A. ([1936] 1994): *The ego and the mechanisms of defense*. The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis.
- FREUD, S. (1914): On the History of the Psycho-Analytic Movement. The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud. Vol. XIV (1914-1916): On the History of the Psycho-Analytic Movement, Papers on Metapsychology and Other Works, 1-66.
- FREUD, S., ABRAHAM, K. ([1918] 2002): *The Complete Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Karl Abraham 1907–1925*. In: Falzeder, E. (Ed.), Schwarzacher, C., Trollope, C. Majthényi K. (Transl.), Karnac, London, New York.
- The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi. Vol. 2, 1914-1919. (Eds: Falzeder, E., Brabant, E, Giampieri-Deutsch, P.), The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., London, England, 1996.
- FREUD, S., JONES, E.: *The complete correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Ernest Jones 1908-1939*. (Ed. Paskauskas R. A.), Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA. 1993.

- FONAGY, P (2003): A kötődés generációs átvitele: egy új elmélet, *Thalassa* 14(2-3): 83-106.
- GEDO, J. E. (1993): Empathy, new beginnings, and analytic cure, *Psychoanalytic Review*, 80(4): 507-518.
- GEREGELY GY., WATSON, J. S. (1996): The social biofeedback theory of parental affect-mirroring: The development of emotional self-awareness and self-control in infancy, *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 77: 1181-1212.
- GILL, M. M. (1967): In memoriam David Rapaport. In: Gill, M. M. (Ed.) *The Collected Papers of David Rapaport*. Basic Books, Inc., New York, London, 3-7.
- HANN-KENDE, F. ([1933] 1993): Az áttétel és viszontáttétel szerepéhez a pszichoanalízisben. In: *Lélekelemzési tanulmányok*, Somló Béla Könyvkiadó, Budapest, 229-239.
- HAYNAL, A. (1988): *The Technique at Issue. Controversies in Psychoanalysis from Freud and Ferenczi to Michael Balint*. Karnac Books, London
- HAYNAL, A. (2002): *Disappearing and Reviving. Sándor Ferenczi in the history of psychoanalysis*. Karnac Books, London
- HAYNAL, A., MÉSZÁROS, J. (2004): Psychoanalyse in Budapest, 1928-1929. In: Lehrman Weiner, L. (Hg.) *Sigmund Freud durch Lehrmans Linse*. Psychosozial Verlag, 107-116.
- HOFFER, A. (1996): Asymmetry and Mutuality in the Analytic Relationship: Contemporary Lessons from the Freud-Ferenczi Dialogue. In: *Ferenczi's Turn in Psychoanalysis*. New York University Press, New York, London, 107-119.
- IGNOTUS ([1933] 2000): Búcsúztató. In: Mészáros J. (szerk.) *In Memoriam Ferenczi Sándor*. József Műhely Kiadó, Budapest, 37-41.
- KOVÁCS, V. ([1933] 1993): Kiképző analízis és kontroll analízis. In: *Lélekelemzési tanulmányok*. Párbeszéd Kiadó, T-Twins Kiadó, 240-248.
- MÉSZÁROS J. (1998): The Tragic Success of European Psychoanalysis: The 'Budapest School', *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, 7: 207-214.
- MÉSZÁROS J. (2002): Ferenczi's Trauma Theory—Solving a Dilemma /Intra- and Interpersonal Dynamics of the Traumatization Process/. In: Varvin, S., Štajner-Popovič (Eds.) *Upheaval: Psychanalytical Perspectives on Trauma*. International Aid Network, Belgrade, 195-205.
- MÉSZÁROS J. (2004a): Psychoanalysis is a Two-Way Street, *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, 13: 105-113.
- MÉSZÁROS J. (2004b): 'Budapest School' a School? Yes and No. In: Szekacs-Weisz, J. (Ed.) *Lost Childhood and the Language of Exile*. Imago East West, The Freud Museum, 112-133.
- MÉSZÁROS J. (2008): "Az Önök Bizottsága" Ferenczi Sándor, a budapesti iskola és a pszichoanalitikus emigráció. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.

MOLNAR, M. (Ed.) (1992): *The Diary of Sigmund Freud 1929–1939*. The Freud Museum, London.

ORNSTEIN, P. (2002): Michael Balint Then and Now: a Contemporary Appraisal. In: Dupont. J. (ed.): *The Life and Work of Michael Balint. Three Special Issues*. American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 62 (1): 25-35.

SPITZ, R. (1945): Hospitalism. *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, I. International University Press, New York.

STADLER, F., WEIBEL, P. (Eds.) (1995): *The cultural exodus from Austria*. Springer-Verlag, Wien, New York.

TOEGEL, C. (2001): Jenő Varga, the Hungarian Soviet Republic and the Development of Psychoanalysis in the Soviet Union, *Psychoanalysis and History*, 3(2): 193-203.

VALACHI A. (2008): A pszichoanalízis és a magyar irodalom. In: Erős F., Lénárd K., Bókay A., (Eds.) *Typus Budapestiensis. Tanulmányok a pszichoanalízis budapesti iskolájának történetéről és hatásáról*. Thalassa Alapítvány, Budapest, 213-260.

VIKÁR, GY. (1999): Observations on the elaboration of psychic Trauma. In: Nemes L., Berényi G. (Eds.) *Die Budapester Schule der Psychoanalyse*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 397-405.

Judit Mészáros, Ph.D.

e-mail address: juditmeszaros@t-online.hu

Szt. István krt. 13.

1055 Budapest, Hungary