In a letter of December 31, 1911, Freud wrote to Carl Jung about a matter of concern:

Frau C____ has told me all sorts of things about you and Pfister, if you can call the hints she drops “telling”; I gather that neither of you has yet acquired the necessary objectivity in your practice, that you still get involved, giving a good deal of yourselves and expecting the patient to give something in return. Permit me, speaking as the venerable old master, to say that this technique is invariably ill-advised and that it is best to remain reserved and purely receptive. We must never let our poor neurotics drive us crazy. I believe an article on “counter-transference” is sorely needed; of course we could not publish it, we should have to circulate copies among ourselves. (McGuire, 1974, pp. 475–476)
More than 80 years later, similar concerns about countertransference enactments and sexual boundary violations haunt the psychoanalytic profession. Unlike Freud, however, most contemporary analysts agree that discussions of countertransference no longer require a shroud of secrecy. Our journals regularly offer scientific contributions that feature frank disclosures of countertransference issues in the author's work. The analyst's countertransference enactments are widely regarded as both inevitable and useful to the process (Chused, 1991; Gabbard, 1994f; Jacobs, 1993a; Renik, 1993).

Much of the enthusiasm for the concept of enactment, however, stems from the assumption that enactments are partial and that the analyst catches himself before the enactment leads to a gross and unethical boundary violation. Indeed, enactments occur on a continuum from subtle changes in body posture to frank sexual involvement with the patient. More profound enactments that involve significant violations of the analytic frame are less likely to appear in the pages of our journals and in the public forums of our scientific meetings.

The notion of professional boundaries is a relatively recent addition to psychoanalytic practice. Freud and his early disciples indulged in a good deal of trial and error as they developed psychoanalytic technique. Most of Freud's circle persevered in their efforts to define technique and were sucked into the vortex of a host of major boundary transgressions. As Freud noted to Oscar Pfister in a 1910 letter, "the transference is indeed a cross" (Meng & Freud, 1963, p. 39). As Freud's 1911 letter to Jung quoted at the beginning of this chapter suggests, the concept of countertransference had not been systematically elaborated, so that many of the early analysts lacked a solid conceptual framework for understanding what was happening to them.

The study of boundary violations in the history of psychoanalysis is also the study of the evolution of the concepts of transference and countertransference. As Andre Haynal (1994) pointed out, issues of transference, countertransference, and the optimal level of emotional involvement by the analyst were all evolved in the context of triangles involving boundary violations. First, Freud was the third party in the Carl Jung-Sabina Spielrein relationship, and shortly thereafter he was enlisted to solve the problematic involvement between Sándor Ferenczi and Elma Palos. Finally, a similar triangle was created when Freud analyzed Loë Kann, Ernest Jones's common-law wife.
The recent publication of the correspondence between Freud and Jung, between Freud and Ferenczi, and between Freud and Jones has provided extraordinary insights into the underlying dynamics of boundary transgressions in psychoanalysis. Analysts read these transcripts not only because of their historical value or because they provide titillating gossip; we study them to attempt to understand the fundamental vulnerabilities of the psychoanalytic situation. To paraphrase Santayana, those who do not study the history of boundary violations may be condemned to reenact it with their own patients.

Early on in his work with hysterical patients, Freud learned that patients often fall in love with the analyst and expect reciprocal feelings:

> In not a few cases, especially with women and where it is a question of elucidating erotic trains of thought, the patient's cooperation becomes a personal sacrifice, which must be compensated by some substitute for love. The trouble taken by the physician and his friendliness have to suffice for such a substitute. (Breuer & Freud, 1893–1895, p. 301)

As Lawrence Friedman (1994) stressed, the psychoanalytic situation involves an element of seduction. The patient is misled by the analyst to expect love, whereas the analyst tends to provide an ill-defined substitute for love. Friedman acknowledged the fact that the exact nature of that substitute remains difficult to define.

The vicissitudes of love or substitutes thereof continued to haunt Freud throughout the development of psychoanalytic technique. Recognizing the power of transference love to keep the patient involved, he noted in a letter to Jung that “the cure is effected by love” (McGuire, 1974, pp. 12–13). A little more than a month later, a comment in the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society minutes seemed to confirm this view: “Our cures are cures of love” (quoted in Haynal, 1994, p. xxvi).

It should be noted that Freud’s understanding of transference was rather rudimentary in the years before and after the turn of the century. In his description of a patient who developed a wish that Freud would kiss her, he noted that such wishes arise through the phenomenon of transference, which he attributed to a “false connection” (Breuer & Freud, 1895, p. 302). This was the first appearance of the term transference in Freud’s writing. In an extensive footnote to his discussion of Frau Emmy Von N., Freud (Breuer & Freud, 1895) elaborated on this
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notion. His meaning clearly reflected a rather restricted view of transference, namely, that when an unconscious connection is not apparent to the patient, the patient manufactures a conscious or false connection to explain his or her behavior. This idea that transference love was inherently “false” or “unreal” was revisited at some length 20 years later in “Observations on Transference Love” (Freud, 1915b). A careful reading of that paper suggests that Freud had shifted his view a bit to acknowledge that there were “real” aspects of transference love in addition to those that stemmed from unconscious connections with significant figures in the patient’s past.

In his struggle to clarify whether transference love was similar to or different from love outside the analytic setting, Freud appeared somewhat equivocal (Gabbard, 1994b; Schafer, 1993), lending an air of ambiguity to the issue that persists to this day. In a postscript to the Dora case, Freud (1905a) recognized that transference involved an erotic reenactment of a drama from the past. If the past experiences were of a positive nature, the patient would be suggestible and compliant in the transference. If they were negative, the patient would be resistant (Kerr, 1993).

Because Freud was influenced by figures such as Bernheim, many observers have assumed that he regarded persuasion and suggestion as the active ingredients in psychoanalytic treatment. His position was actually a bit more complex. Freud regarded erotic attraction as the true vehicle of cure, whether the cure was by hypnotic suggestion or psychoanalysis. In his correspondence with Jung, he explained that the patient’s erotic attraction to the analyst accounts for the patient’s efforts to understand and listen to the analyst’s interpretations.

FREUD, JUNG, AND SPIELREIN

Much of Freud’s conceptual struggles with transference, countertransference, and the concept of love can be glimpsed in his correspondence with Jung. In 1904 Jung analyzed Sabina Spielrein, his first analytic case, in a period of approximately 2 months (Kerr, 1993). Following termination, Jung and Spielrein developed a working relationship in Jung’s psychology lab. When Spielrein became a beginning medical student, the friendship between the two intensified. In the midst of this friendship, there were intermittent interviews that revived aspects of
the analyst–patient relationship. Four years after the original 2-month treatment, Jung and Spielrein engaged in a tempestuous love affair that culminated in Spielrein’s attacking Jung and drawing blood when he attempted to end the relationship. Her reaction to Jung’s efforts to end the relationship is a common development in such affairs and has been described as “cessation trauma” (Gutheil & Gabbard, 1992).

The relationship between Jung and Spielrein is a cogent illustration of why so many “posttermination” romantic relationships present the same difficulties as those that are concurrent with analysis. Although the treatment had officially ended, the transference and countertransference dimensions of the relationship continued with a life of their own outside the formal confines of treatment. These phenomena are discussed extensively in Chapter 8.

Whether or not Jung and Spielrein actually engaged in sexual intercourse cannot be established with certainty from the written correspondence and other documents remaining. However, the details of “did they or didn’t they” are relatively unimportant in light of the pervasively boundaryless relationship that characterized the years following the analysis. The scholarship of John Kerr (1993) and Aldo Carotenuto (1982) has reconstructed the Jung–Spielrein relationship in sufficient detail that much can be gleaned from the data about the development of such relationships.

As Jung’s first patient, Spielrein was extraordinarily special. Infatuated with Jung, Spielrein went on to attend medical school and move into the role of student and friend. The two of them soon began to view each other as soul mates who were connected through mystical, telepathic bonds. Jung, who was prone to an interest in the occult and parapsychology, became convinced that Spielrein and he could know what the other was thinking without verbalizing their thoughts.

It is noteworthy that Jung pointedly avoided using the term transference, even after the appearance of Freud’s Dora case in 1905 (Freud, 1905a; Kerr, 1993). He eventually used the term transposition instead. There is something inherently humbling in the psychoanalytic notion of transference. The analyst must reluctantly acknowledge that forces are at work that transcend his or her irresistible magnetism. If any other analyst were sitting in the chair, similar feelings would appear. Analysts who fall in love with their patients and become sexually involved with them often long to believe in the exclusivity of the
patient's feelings toward them and cannot bear the pain of thinking that feelings of such intensity could be transferred to someone else (Gabbard, 1994f).

Another dimension to the Jung-Spielrein relationship was brought to light by Kerr's (1993) analysis of the psychological themes in their scientific writings of the time. Jung was preoccupied with the image of mothers as terrible and destructive. Apparently because of his intense resentment of his own mother, Jung dwelled on an image of a malevolent, incestuous mother who was responsible for man's mythological descent into hellish nether regions. At the same time, Spielrein's writings were concerned with the inevitability of destruction as a necessary accompaniment of love. As Kerr notes, "the two texts, his and hers, adjoin each other like severed halves of a forgotten conversation" (1993, p. 333).

Spielrein's long-neglected thesis deserves further study. Sexuality, in her view, always harbors an implicit threat of dissolution of the self. From a Darwinian perspective, the survival of the species is superordinate to the narcissistic investment of the individual. Part of her notion that sexuality involved dissolution was based on her view that fusion rather than pleasure might be the aim of the sexual act (a hypothesis that psychoanalytic clinicians often confirm in the exploration of patients' sexual fantasies). The ego must always resist sexuality at some level, therefore, and Spielrein suggested that the defenses against disintegration of the self most often took the form of inner images of death and destruction.

Connections between sexuality and death had been observed for centuries in legend (Tristan and Isolde), in colloquial phrases (the French term for orgasm, *la petite mort*), and in verse (the poetry of John Donne). However, the particular connection forged by Spielrein seems to have had specific significance for the relationship she was involved in with her former analyst. Indeed, the relationship nearly destroyed Jung's career and brought Spielrein to the edge of despair. Jung tried to rationalize his way out of his unethical behavior by explaining to Spielrein's mother in a lengthy letter that he had never charged her a fee for his services:

I could drop my role as doctor the more easily because I did not feel professionally obligated, for I never charged a fee. . . . But the doctor knows
his limits and will never cross them, for he is paid for his troubles. That imposes the necessary restraints on him. (Carotenuto, 1982, p. 94)

In another letter, he stated to Spielrein's mother that "I have always told your daughter that a sexual relationship was out of the question and that my actions were intended to express my feelings of friendship" (Kerr, 1993, p. 207). He later described his correspondence with Frau Spielrein to Freud as a bit of "knavery."

Many modern cases of sexual boundary transgressions by analysts in some ways confirm Spielrein's thesis. One of the most striking aspects is the self-destructiveness in the analyst's behavior that is obvious to everyone but the analyst. It appears that the analyst unconsciously enacts a masochistic scenario that relates to childhood wishes of self-sacrifice. Often the details of this fantasy involve a wish to "go out in a blaze of glory" by acting on incestuous wishes for a parent and experiencing the retaliation and punishment for a forbidden act of pleasure. Sexual consummation with the patient offers a special means of actualizing such motives. Jung ultimately enlisted Freud's help in extricating himself from the situation, but Spielrein continued to feel that she had been used and was deeply hurt by the relationship.

FREUD, FERENCZI, AND PALOS

Freud later observed a similar turn of events in Ferenczi's treatment of Elma Palos. Ferenczi had previously analyzed Elma's mother, Gizella, a married woman, whom he had had as his mistress. Ferenczi fell in love with Elma in the course of his analyzing her and finally persuaded Freud to take over the case (Dupont, 1988; Haynal, 1994). What ensued was a rather remarkable series of boundary violations. Freud made regular reports to Ferenczi regarding the content of the psychoanalytic treatment of Elma and specifically kept Ferenczi informed of whether or not Elma continued to love him. He also sent confidential letters to Gizella about Ferenczi. Ultimately, Ferenczi took Elma back into analysis, but she ended up marrying an American suitor, and Ferenczi married Gizella in 1919.

It is clear from the Freud–Ferenczi correspondence that Freud found the situation messy and highly disconcerting (Brabant, Falzeder, &
Giampieri-Deutsch, 1994). In a letter to Gizella Palos in 1911, he made the following observation:

The main difficulty is this: Does one want to build this alliance for life on concealing the fact that the man has been her mother’s lover in the fullest sense of the word? And can one rely on the fact that she will take it well and overcome it in a superior manner when she knows it? (pp. 320–321)

Freud did not try to disguise his feeling that Gizella should be the preferred choice for Ferenczi. In his correspondence with Ferenczi, Freud made a number of disparaging comments about Elma, including that she had been spoiled by her father’s lavish attention and was incapable and unworthy of love. Judith Dupont (1994) explained this departure from neutrality as a reflection of Freud’s concern that a young wife and children might have distracted Ferenczi from his devotion to the psychoanalytic “cause.”

Ferenczi appeared to gain some perspective on the situation when he interrupted the treatment of Elma and sent her to Freud. On New Year’s Day of 1912, he noted to Freud that “I had to recognize that the issue here should be one not of marriage but of the treatment of an illness” (Brabant et al., 1994, p. 324). Later, on January 20 of the same year, he wrote the following to Freud:

I know, of course, that by far the greatest part of her love for me was father transference, which easily takes another as an object. You will hardly be surprised that under these circumstances I, too, can hardly consider myself a bridegroom any longer. (Brabant et al., 1994, p. 331)

The relationship between inner boundaries (i.e., self and object representations) and the erotized countertransference of Ferenczi appears to have been pertinent. Ferenczi viewed Elma as psychotic or near-psychotic and was fascinated by the apparent fusion of self and object and by her openness to him. A similar phenomenon occurred later in Jung’s career with Toni Wolff, but the chapter in Jung’s memoirs describing this episode was expurgated (Kerr, 1994).

Despite this messy situation, Freud subsequently took Ferenczi into analysis, a process that occurred in a series of three meetings (some of
which occurred during 2- to 3-week holidays) between 1914 and 1916. A more informal analysis took place in the summers of 1908 and 1911. Freud appeared to have some misgivings about jeopardizing the friendship by introducing an analytic relationship but nevertheless proceeded (Haynal, 1994). The ensuing analysis (we use the term advisedly) took place after Freud and Ferenczi had voyaged to America together for the Clark University lectures. On the ship they did a bit of mutual analysis. Harold Blum (1994) suggested that their subsequent periods of analytic work should be thought of as “analytic encounters.” Freud would write Ferenczi letters addressed “Dear Son,” in which he would suggest that they would have two analytic sessions a day while also having a meal together. Hence the analytic relationship occurred in parallel with other relationships, including mentor–student, close friend, and traveling companion (Blum, 1994). Moreover, Freud apparently wished that Ferenczi would marry his daughter (Haynal, 1994).

To be fair to Freud, this blurring of the roles of friend and analysand caused him to undertake Ferenczi’s analysis with some trepidation. Indeed, the correspondence between the two of them suggests that Ferenczi placed a great deal of pressure on Freud to analyze him and that Freud finally capitulated after expressing considerable reluctance. On the other hand, Freud had analyzed Max Eitingon during strolls through the streets of Vienna and Kata Levy during summer holidays at her brother’s house (Dupont, 1994). Ferenczi apparently entered the analytic process with bitterness that was masked by obsequious loyalty. In a letter of May 23, 1919, he made the following comment to Freud:

From the moment you advised me against Elma, I developed a resistance against your person, that even psychoanalysis could not overcome, and which was responsible for all my sensitivities. With this unconscious grudge in my heart, I followed, as a faithful “son,” all your advice, left Elma, came back to my present wife, and stayed with her in spite of innumerable attempts in other directions. (quoted in Dupont, 1994, p. 314)

After the analysis, Ferenczi continued to have resentment toward Freud because Freud had not analyzed his negative transference. Freud defended himself in a letter of January 20, 1930:
But you forget that this analysis took place 15 years ago, and at that time we were not at all sure that this kind of reaction must happen in all cases. At least, I was not. Just think, taking our excellent relationship in account, how long this analysis would have had to go on to allow the manifestation of hostile feelings to appear. (quoted in Dupont, 1994, p. 314)

In that same letter, Freud seems to have come to the recognition that analyzing someone with whom one has a preexisting friendship is ill-advised: “I notice that, in connecting things with our analysis you have pushed me back into the role of the analyst, a role I never would have taken up again toward a proven friend (quoted in Dupont, 1994, p. 314).

Although Ferenczi renounced his wish to marry Elma, he went on to engage in other forms of boundary violations that were also problematic. After his break with Freud, deeply bitter about his “training” analysis, he began to experiment with mutual analysis. With four female American patients, he tried analyzing them for an hour followed by an hour in which he would let the patient analyze him. Entries in his diary at this time demonstrated his confusion of his own need to be healed with that of his patients: “Our psyche, too, is more or less fragmented and in pieces, and, especially after expending so much libido without any libido-income, it needs such repayment now and again from well-disposed patients who are cured or on the point of being cured” (quoted in Dupont, 1988, p. 13). A few months after this entry of January 17, 1932, he abandoned mutual analysis, apparently because of the obvious problems with confidentiality. If he stuck to the basic rule of saying whatever came to his mind, he would be telling one of his patients about the personal disclosures of other patients.

Another form that Ferenczi’s wish to be loved and healed took was an effort to provide his patients with the love their parents had failed to provide them (Gabbard, 1992). He saw his patients as victims of actual sexual trauma and abuse, and he sought to repair that damage. His technique included kissing and hugging the patient like “an affectionate mother” who “gives up all consideration of one’s own convenience, and indulges the patient’s wishes and impulses as far as in any way possible” (Grubrich-Simitis, 1986, p. 272). He had grown up in a family with many siblings and never felt he received the love that he wished to have from his mother (Blum, 1994; Grubrich-Simitis, 1986).
She was harsh and cold, in Ferenczi's view, and he thus tried to give to his patients what he did not receive as a child (Gabbard, 1992).

On December 13, 1931, Freud expressed his growing concern about Ferenczi's technique in a famous letter:

We have hitherto in our technique held to the conclusion that patients are to be refused erotic gratifications ... where more extensive gratifications are not to be had, milder caresses very easily take over their role. A number of independent thinkers in matters of technique, will say to themselves: "why stop at a kiss?" Certainly one gets further when one adopts "pawing" as well, which after all doesn't make a baby. And then bolder ones will come along, will go further to peeping and showing and soon we have accepted in the technique of psychoanalysis the whole repertoire of demiviergerie and petting parties, resulting in an enormous increase of interest in psychoanalysis among both analysts and patients. ... Father Ferenczi gazing at the lively scene he has created will perhaps say to himself: maybe after all I should have halted my technique of motherly affection before the kiss. (Jones, 1957, p. 164)

Clearly, Freud was already aware of the well-known "slippery slope" phenomenon in which boundary violations that begin as minor and apparently harmless gradually escalate to major violations that are damaging to the patient.

FREUD, JONES, AND KANN

Freud was involved in another boundaryless ménage à trois when he undertook the analysis of Loë Kann. Ernest Jones and Kann had been living as husband and wife (although not technically married) since shortly after they met in London in approximately 1905. Kann apparently came to him as a patient, suggested by Jones's comment in a letter to Freud: "Now I have always been conscious of sexual attractions to patients; my wife was a patient of mine," (Freud–Jones correspondence, June 28, 1910, Paskauskas, 1993). In 1908, when Jones moved to Canada, Kann joined him there.

Jones's reputation in Canada was marred by rumors that he was recommending masturbation to patients, sending young men to prosti-
tutes, and even showing obscene postcards to patients to stimulate their sexual feelings. A former patient threatened to charge him with having had sexual relations with her, so Jones paid her $500 worth of blackmail money to prevent a scandal. He explained this situation in some detail to James Jackson Putnam in a letter of January 13, 1911 (Hale, 1971). He clarified that he had seen this patient four times for medical purposes and that there was no truth to her claim that she had had intercourse with him. Because she also attempted to shoot him, he retained the protection of an armed detective. Jones described the patient as a hysterical homosexual woman who, after leaving his care, went to a woman doctor of strict moralistic views with whom she fell in love. Jones implied that his female colleague encouraged the former patient to bring charges against him. He felt he was foolish to pay the blackmail money and that the situation would be harmful to him whether he did or not. In a footnote to the Freud–Jones correspondence, Andrew Paskauskas (1993) suggested that the female doctor was Emma Leila Gordon, an extremely religious member of the Women’s Christian Temperance Union, who frowned on alcohol consumption and loose living.

Concerned that he would lose Kann, Jones asked Freud if he would analyze her. She was afflicted with a number of somatic symptoms as well as morphine addiction. In 1912, Kann and Jones moved to Vienna so Freud could begin his treatment of her. Freud was evidently quite taken by her; he told Ferenczi in a letter of June 23, 1912, that “I will be pleased to be able to expend much Libido on her” (Haynal, 1994). The bond between Freud and Kann grew stronger as the treatment continued, even to the point that he invited her to spend Christmas Eve with his family (Appignanesi & Forrester, 1992). Freud made regular reports to Jones, apparently without regard for confidentiality, just as he had done with Ferenczi when he analyzed Elma. In fact, a major topic of the Freud–Ferenczi correspondence was their parallel observations about Jones, whom Ferenczi was analyzing, and Kann.

When Jones felt increasingly excluded from the process (more by Kann than by Freud), he became sexually involved with his maid, Lina. Meanwhile, Freud steered Kann in the direction of Herbert Jones, a young American to whom she was drawn (Appignanesi & Forrester, 1992).
Freud clearly saw Ernest Jones as sexually impulsive, and the correspondence during this time reflects his disapproval of Jones’s behavior. In a letter of January 14, 1912, he said to Jones, “I pity it very much that you should not master such dangerous cravings, well aware at the same time of the source from which all these evils spring, taking away from you nearly all the blame but nothing of the dangers” (Paskauskas, 1993, p. 124). Paskauskas suggested that the reference to Jones’s cravings as “dangerous” might have reflected Freud’s concern about Jones’s sexual boundary violations with patients. Paskauskas also quoted Jones’s letter of April 1, 1922, regarding his analysis of Joan Riviere: “It is over twelve years since I experienced any [sexual] temptation in such ways, and then in special circumstances” (Paskauskas, 1993, p. 466). It is also significant that Freud’s technique papers were written during the same time frame, which suggests that their emphasis on abstinence and objectivity may have grown out of concern for the boundaryless behavior of his disciples (Barron & Hoffer, 1994).

FREUD’S VIEWS ON ETHICS

Freud’s need to place himself in the role of consultant to his male protégés regarding their women was clearly an overdetermined role that he found himself repeating again and again. Adam Phillips (1994) noted that Freud appeared to experience considerable glee in his ability to handle women whom Jones found unmanageable, like Loë Kann and Joan Riviere. He also was patronizing to the point of condescension in his attitude toward Jones on these matters.

Freud’s attitude about sexual relations between analyst and patient, however, was not nearly as cut and dried as implied by his correspondence with Jones and by his 1931 letter to Ferenczi. Although Jung expected a severe rebuke for his dalliance with Spielrein, Freud was surprisingly understanding and empathic. He wrote to Jung:

Such experiences, though painful, are necessary and hard to avoid. Without them we cannot really know life and what we are dealing with. I myself have never been taken in quite so badly, but I have come very close to it a number of times and had a narrow escape. I believe that only grim necessities weighing on my work, and the fact that I was ten years older than yourself when I came to [psychoanalysis], have saved me from
similar experiences. But no lasting harm is done. They help us to develop the thick skin we need to dominate "counter-transference," which is after all a permanent problem for us; they teach us to displace our own affects to best advantage. They are a "blessing in disguise." (McGuire, 1974, pp. 230-231)

Freud took a similar attitude of tolerance when a sexual transgression by Victor Tausk came to light (Eissler, 1983). Kurt Eissler noted that in contrast to the high ethical standards we have today in psychoanalysis, Freud quite possibly felt less puritanical about sexual boundary transgressions. Freud, like Jung, appeared to blame female patients for the transgressions of analysts: "The way these women manage to charm us with every conceivable psychic perfection until they have attained their purpose is one of nature's greatest spectacles" (McGuire, 1974, p. 231). Freud's view of the female superego as more lax than the male counterpart is a clear subtext in this remark. Despite this censure of women, however, Freud expected the male analyst to be skilled enough to avoid the seduction (Eissler, 1983).

It is possible that Freud did not view ethics as a paramount concern to his new science. In a letter to the Protestant minister Pfister, who was a practicing analyst, Freud made the following comment:

Ethics are remote from me. ... I do not break my head very much about good and evil, but I have found little that is "good" about human beings on the whole. In my experience most of them are trash, no matter whether they publicly subscribe to this or that ethical doctrine or to none at all. ... If we are to talk of ethics, I subscribe to a high ideal from which most of the human beings I have come across depart most lamentably. (Quoted in Roazen, 1975, p. 146)

There is no doubt that Freud was skeptical about the capacity to harness and sublimate the power of the drives. His letter to Pfister addressed boundary transgressions as inevitable miscues in the development of a new science. In another effort to reassure Jung about his fiasco with Spielrein, Freud drew an analogy in a letter of June 18, 1909:

In view of the kind of matter we work with, it will never be possible to avoid little laboratory explosions. Maybe we didn't slant the test tube
enough, or we heated it too quickly. In this way we learn what part of the
danger lies in the matter and what part in our way of handling it.
(McGuire, 1974, p. 235)

Kerr (1993) frankly doubts that the revelation of Jung's relationship
with Spielrein would have caused Freud much concern. Kerr pointed
out that sexual transgressions between analyst and patient were veri-
tably ubiquitous among Freud's early disciples. Wilhelm Stekel was
well known as a "seducer." Otto Gross, who believed that the healthy
solution to neurosis was sexual promiscuity, was engaged in group
orgies to help others relieve themselves of their inhibitions (Eissler,
1983). Jones married a former patient. Even the clergyman Pfister was
infatuated with one of his patients. Kerr (1993) emphasized that dis-
agreements with Freud's theories were much more troubling to Freud
than sexual transgressions.

A more cynical view of Freud's attitude was that the advancement of
psychoanalysis as a clinical and scientific endeavor was of such para-
mount importance in his hierarchy of values that it superseded consid-
erations of ethics. Recent discussions of the Frink case have made it
clear that Freud was willing to lift his proscription against analyst-
patient sexual relations if the cause of analysis might be advanced as a
result (Edmunds, 1988; Gabbard, 1994b; Mahony, 1993; Warner, 1994).
When Horace Frink, a young American analyst, came to Freud for
analysis in 1921, he told Freud that he was madly in love with one of
his former patients, Angelica Bijur. Freud encouraged Frink to divorce
his wife and marry Bijur. He also told Bijur that she should divorce her
husband and marry Frink to avoid a nervous breakdown. Bijur was the
heiress of a wealthy banking family, and clearly Freud saw the mar-
riage between Frink and Bijur as potentially leading to a large donation
to further the cause of psychoanalysis. In November 1921, he made the
following comment in a letter to Frink:

May I still suggest to you that your idea Mrs. B[ijur] had lost part of her
beauty may be turned into her having lost part of her money. . . . Your
complaint that you cannot grasp your homosexuality implies that you are
not yet aware of your fantasy of making me a rich man. If matters turn
out all right, let us change this imaginary gift into a real contribution to
the Psychoanalytic Funds. (Quoted in Mahony, 1993, p. 1031)
The results of this marriage were, of course, disastrous, and Freud's behavior can only be viewed as reprehensible. Mahony (1993) commented on the historical double standard applied to Freud and argued that Freud's way of comporting himself must be judged by the same set of standards used for other analysts. When a patient achieved insight, Freud seemed willing to modify his principle of abstinence (Hoffer, in press). For example, in a letter to Ferenczi dated February 17, 1918, Freud noted: "The day before yesterday a patient left behind a bonus of 10,000 crowns for the cure of his masochism, with which I am now playing the rich man with regard to children and relatives" (quoted by Brabant & Falzeder, in press). He also allowed Anton von Freund, a former analysand, to endow the International Psychoanalytic Press.

A RETROSPECTIVE ASSESSMENT

Looking back at these historical events, one way to understand them is as inevitable labor pains accompanying the birth of a new field. Personal and professional lives were intertwined in almost every conceivable way. Freud melded friendship and analysis in the treatment of Marie Bonaparte, during which he disclosed a good deal of personal information about himself. Bonaparte later was in treatment with Rudolf Loewenstein, only to ultimately become his lover (Appignanesi & Forrester, 1992). Jones sent the Stracheys to Freud for analysis as well as to be future translators of his work. Jung analyzed Trigant Burrow aboard a sailboat on several occasions. Leo Rangell's (in press) view is that many of these early boundary violations must be viewed in a historical context of a new science struggling to define its parameters and should not be regarded as indications of lax technique or immoral character. Although this perspective undoubtedly has some validity, the psychoanalytic pioneers had some knowledge of the inadvisability of the transgressions. Both Freud and Klein knew they should not be analyzing their children and went to considerable lengths to conceal those treatments. The early analysts may have felt that they had suffered greatly in the development of the new science and considered themselves "exceptions" to the rules that applied to others.

Whatever the reasons for this pervasive pattern of boundary violations, damage was done; complications surrounding a mother’s labor
may indelibly scar the child. The early boundary transgressions of the psychoanalytic pioneers shaped the dimensions of the new profession and must be viewed as a legacy inherited by future generations.

One of the main aspects of the legacy is a lack of clarity about the boundaries of the analytic situation. Certainly nonsexual boundary violations are far more pervasive than frank sexual relations between analyst and patient. Anna Freud acknowledged in later life that she felt exploited by many aspects of her father’s analysis of her, including her father’s publishing accounts of her daydreams (Young-Bruehl, 1988). Klein encouraged analysands to follow her to the Black Forest for her holiday, where she would analyze her patients while they reclined on her bed in her hotel room (Grosskurth, 1986). Winnicott held Margaret Little’s hands through many hours as she lay on the couch and, on at least one occasion, broke confidentiality by telling her about another patient he was treating and about his countertransference reactions toward that patient (Little, 1990). Judy Cooper (1993) reported that when she was in analysis with Masud Kahn, he continued to give her papers he had written and asked her to read them. Indeed, the training analysts’ expectation of loyalty from the candidate being analyzed has been a major boundary problem throughout the history of psychoanalysis, even to the point that in some cases former analysands have taken care of their former training analysts in old age.

Both sexual and nonsexual boundary violations were common among analysts who were highly influential in the development of psychoanalysis in the United States. Margaret Mahler had a sexual relationship with August Aichhorn, who was analyzing her (Stepansky, 1988). Frieda Fromm-Reichmann (1989) fell in love with her patient and married him. Karen Horney allegedly had an affair with a younger male candidate she was analyzing (Quinn, 1987). Stephen Farber and Marc Green (1993) chronicled the history of a number of starstruck analysts in southern California, who conducted boundaryless analyses with their celebrity patients. Analysts served as technical advisors for films produced by their patients. Others collaborated on screenplays with their patients. Still others encouraged donations from their patients to various foundations with which the analyst was connected. Most of all, there was general blurring of the boundary between an analytic and a social relationship.
The historical response of psychoanalytic organizations within the United States to boundary violations has been variable. In many cases the solution to any transgression of professional boundaries was to prescribe more analysis. When disciplinary actions were taken, there was often such a backlash that whistle blowers and ethics committee members felt they were under attack for enforcing ethical standards.

One such case occurred in 1941, when Gregory Zilboorg, a prominent member of the New York Psychoanalytic Association, was accused of unethical conduct by a writer who was in treatment with him. According to the charges, Zilboorg had entered into a dual relationship with his patient in which he advised him on job-related issues in addition to conducting his analysis. For his business consultation, Zilboorg expected to be paid an honorarium of $1,000 a month on top of what he was receiving for his analytic fees (Farber & Green, 1993).

After an investigation of the charges, 9 members of a 12-member panel voted to censure Zilboorg. Presenting himself as a victim of vicious and predatory behavior by his colleagues, Zilboorg stirred considerable sympathy. When the issue came up before the full membership of the New York Psychoanalytic Association, Zilboorg threatened to sue every member of the organization who voted for his censure. In an impassioned letter of support to Zilboorg, Karl Menninger, then president of the American Psychoanalytic Association, proclaimed:

Of course you have made mistakes; so has every other analyst. . . . But when, on the other hand, a patient feels you have made a mistake and persuades one or two or half a dozen colleagues that you have made a mistake and then one or two of these colleagues pursue the matter by complaining to an organized scientific society about your mistakes and charge you with fraudulent intentions, which is to say criminal intentions, and when this scientific body takes such complaints seriously and listens to them and debates them over a period of months, I think an extremely serious miscarriage of good taste, public policy, scientific principle and common decency has occurred. A number of very bad precedents were set by what occurred in New York, and whatever mistakes you may have made (I do not believe anymore that you even made any mistakes, but I am putting this subjective clause in here because I don’t think it matters whether you did or not) it is a resounding shame and disgrace
that these alleged mistakes should have been exploited and capitalized upon by colleagues with personal grudges against you. The bringing of a patient to a scientific organization to give evidence against a physician is one of the most dangerous and vicious precedents that I can think of and violates all medical precedents. (Faulkner & Pruitt, 1988, p. 357)

In the face of threats of lawsuits and protests from colleagues, the charges were soon dropped. The meaning of “ethics” in those days often involved protection of one’s colleagues. Moreover, other analysts were concerned that they might have to face charges by their patients, and no one wanted to deal with that prospect.

Another reason to stress the importance of historical developments in the area of analytic boundaries is that the intergenerational transmission of attitudes about the concept of boundaries can be extraordinarily powerful. In the mid-1960s, a training analyst in an institute was charged with sexual misconduct. Two decades later, two analysts he had analyzed were also charged with sexual misconduct in the same city. Blind spots in one analytic generation may well become blind spots in the next. Our emphasis on the historical legacy can be problematic, however, if we misuse it to blame our analytic parents rather than address basic challenges of the analytic situation that transcend time and place.

If analysts are to prevent destructive enactments of boundary violations, we must begin with a psychoanalytic understanding of how such enactments evolve. In addition, we must enrich our understanding of the impact these violations have on our patients. For too long, institutes and societies showed greater concern for the protection of the progressing analyst than for the patient who was deprived of an analytic treatment. This legacy of the “old-boy system” is now being corrected by greater attention to the patient’s suffering and appropriate reparation.

The history chronicled in this chapter is certainly not exhaustive. An attempt to be encyclopedic would fill an entire volume. Rather, our intent has been to describe a powerful historical context that has influenced generations of analysts. In the chapters that follow, the relevance of these historical incidents will be clear as we note the tendency of history to repeat itself.