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Summary: After beginning his historical work in Switzerland in the 1950s and then continuing it in the United States at the Menninger Foundation, Henri Ellenberger (1905–1993) became the leading historian of “dynamic psychiatry”. This expression commonly denotes mental medicine that draws from psychotherapeutic practices and psychological theories to improve our understanding of mental diseases and to cure them. Although still used today, usually in juxtaposition to 19th century alienism or to biological psychiatry, the origin and meaning of this expression are unclear. An unpublished lecture (1956) by Ellenberger on this subject, accompanied by an explanatory introduction, is reproduced here to shed light on Ellenberger’s interpretation of that term. This article additionally aims to draw certain parallels and distinctions between Ellenberger, Michel Foucault and George Devereux’s teaching in the 1950s. Considering that the history of psychiatry is now a well-established speciality in the academic world, Ellenberger’s lecture is also an original document which enables us to trace the professionalization of psychiatric historiography as an academic discipline back to its beginnings after World War II.
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Introduction: Michel Foucault, Henri Ellenberger and the history of psychiatry in the 1950s

The most popular work about the history of psychiatry is still, in human and social sciences, the *Histoire de la folie à l’âge classique* (in English: *Madness and Civilization*)\(^1\), published more than half a century ago by French philosopher Michel Foucault (1926–1984). Yet other essays exist which have known international success in the past, including Henri Ellenberger’s (1905–1993) book *The Discovery of the Unconscious. The History and Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry* (1970)\(^2\). The author was a physician, trained in France, who felt in love with the methods of clinical psychology and the history of psychiatry in Switzerland\(^3\) in the 1950s—like Foucault—before starting his academic career in North America. Fortunately, these two authors’ works have been translated in several languages across the world including Japanese thanks to Professor Nakai Hisao (Nagoya, then Kobe) and Professor Kimura Bin (Kyoto)\(^4\). However, Ellenberger’s works, sadly, have had little impact in the humanities, while Foucault still enjoys a considerable following. But few today know that he was an attentive reader of the first historical works of Ellenberger in Switzerland.

Since Ellenberger and Foucault’s projects in the field of history of psychiatry were contemporaneous, I have chosen to present some archival material which document Ellenberger’s first teachings at the Menninger School of Psychiatry (Topeka, Kansas) in 1956. His move to America (1953) represented a turning point in Ellenberger’s career. From this moment on he devoted himself entirely to research on the history of dynamic psychiatry. Ellenberger included under this term the mental medicine which draws inspiration from psychotherapeutic practices and conceptions of the psychological unconscious\(^5\) to improve the understanding of mental diseases and cure them. The origin and meaning of this expression are, however, unclear, although it is still used today to distinguish a psychiatric tradition markedly different from 19th century alienism or to biological psychiatry.

---


TEACHING THE HISTORY OF PSYCHIATRY IN THE 1950S

To recreate the context in which Ellenberger started to teach the history of dynamic psychiatry, I will not only draw parallels and make distinctions between the intellectual journeys of Ellenberger and Foucault in the 1950s but also include other professors of the Menninger Foundation. This is not the place to retrace the entire history of this institution, but I would like to remind the reader that it combined the administration of two hospitals—the Winter Veterans Administration Hospital and the Topeka State Hospital—as well as two research and teaching facilities, the Menninger School of Psychiatry and the Topeka Institute for Psychoanalysis, which developed considerably in the 1940s and 1950s—under the authority of the Menninger family. Ellenberger’s lecture, simply entitled “Dynamic Psychiatry: An Introduction”⁶, is taken from the archives of the University of Montreal. Montreal possesses archives, although the main Ellenberger archives are in France, at the Sainte Anne Hospital in Paris⁷. Both archive groups keep the copies of the six volumes of typewritten documents that form the History of Dynamic Psychiatry⁸, which compile lectures, notes and essays that were the foundation of the book Ellenberger published in 1970. The document I will present here is the one Ellenberger chose to place at the beginning of the first volume of a series of 44 lectures (see Table 1). An American research grant application dating back to 1961 also shows us Ellenberger’s ambition to carry out investigations in Europe in 1962 and 1963: France (Paris), Switzerland (Geneva, Bern, Zurich, Basel, and Aarau), Germany (Munich, Weinsberg) and Austria (Vienna).

The first lecture is didactic and clearly aims to spark the medical students’ interest in the history of this discipline, starting from their own practice as young psychiatrists in training. The whole of Ellenberger’s teaching shows that he never intended to write an apology of Sigmund Freud’s genius but instead a general history of the theories of psychiatry and of the psychotherapeutic practices from the second half of the eighteenth century to the Second World War. The introductory lecture takes Jean-Martin Charcot’s “dynamic” conception of nervous diseases in the nineteenth century as a starting point. Finally, in his grant application (1961), just like in his lectures in Topeka, Ellenberger mentions as the main schools of dynamic psychiatry those of Pierre Janet, Sigmund Freud, Alfred Adler, Carl G. Jung, and the school of Existential Analysis. As we well know, these four pioneers can also be found in the book published in 1970. However, the existential movement in post-war Switzerland is the one that Foucault and Ellenberger showed the most interest in. But there is one other significant difference in the archive document presented here: Adolf Meyer, a Swiss-born

---

⁶ Université de Montréal, University Archives, 7151. Text prepared by Emmanuel Delille.
⁷ Centre de Documentation Henri Ellenberger, Centre Hospitalier Sainte-Anne, Paris.
⁸ Ellenberger, H. [undated]. History of Dynamic Psychiatry, six bound volumes. Université de Montréal, University Archives, 7151 and 7152. As the books are not identical, I should specify that I consulted those of Montreal.
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doctor whose influence on American psychiatry has been considerable, is also mentioned as a central actor in Ellenberger’s lecture. But Meyer’s importance receded into the background of historical analysis when Ellenberger left the United States for Canada. In fact, it is important to take into account Ellenberger’s biography as his career is closely linked to his private life and punctuated with “scientific migrations”.

**Biographical elements and definitions of “Dynamic Psychiatry”**

According to biographer Andrée Yanacopoulo, Ellenberger had five different nationalities during his life: British (British Born), French, Swiss, American and Canadian. He was born in 1905 in Nalolo in present-day Zambia within a family of protestant missionaries of Swiss and French origin. After medical studies in France, he became a psychiatrist and worked successively in western France (Poitiers), in Schaffhausen (Switzerland), Topeka (Kansas) and in Montreal (Canada) where he started his academic career in 1959. He worked as an associate professor at McGill University before being appointed at the University of Montreal as a professor, where he taught criminology in the social science department in 1962.

Unlike Foucault, Ellenberger was a trained physician, but both men developed a fascination for psychological tests and existential analysis in the 1940s and 1950s before taking a step back and adopting historical methods to analyse psychological knowledge. The Ellenberger and Foucault families were acquainted—without developing a close relationship—as Ellenberger first worked as a doctor specialized in nervous diseases in Poitiers, where Foucault’s father worked as a surgeon. The fact that Foucault’s critical view, as the son of a doctor, would be influenced by his father’s profession is an element of his biography which is rarely mentioned and yet cannot be overlooked.

During the war, Ellenberger fled France for Switzerland, the country of his ancestors, where he eventually worked as a chief physician in the Breitenau asylum in Schaffhausen. This small county is located near Zurich, not far from Kreuzlingen and Münsterlingen where psychiatrists Ludwig Binswanger and Roland Kuhn respectively worked. The work of these two physicians was very important for Foucault’s first studies on psychology. Here again, one can trace back a convergence: as soon as 1947, well before Foucault (who came to Münsterlingen in 1954), Ellenberger started to visit Roland Kuhn—already well known for his scientific activities, first as a specialist of the Rorschach test and of the phenomenologi-

---

11 He obtained French nationality in 1939 but lived under threat of losing it following laws of the “État français” of Vichy. Another law excluded naturalized doctors from their profession.
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cal approach of psychiatry (Kuhn then became one of the first to specialize in psychopharmacology). In Switzerland, Ellenberger visited Jacqueline and Georges Verdeaux whom he certainly met in France at the Sainte-Anne hospital before the war. Jacqueline Verdeaux was a collaborator of Foucault’s father and the main instigator of Foucault’s interest for psychology and electro-encephalography. Finally, and once again similarly to Foucault, Ellenberger also participated to a translation project of Ludwig Binswanger in the 1950s, but in English.12

These similarities are not only thematic: Foucault read Ellenberger’s first historical studies in Switzerland and probably used them to develop his own lectures in psychology.13 This series of essays, published between 1951 and 1953 in a serial form in the French journal *L’Évolution Psychiatrique*, bound into a hardback edition in 195414—the same year as Foucault’s first work on madness—can be considered as Ellenberger’s first work on the dynamic history of psychiatry, especially as one can find the reflection of his keen interest in the four “pioneer” figures (Janet, Freud Adler and Jung) he would later place at the core of his 1970 work. Finally, Ellenberger was a fierce critic of asylum during the years 1951–1953, well before Foucault, and described a daily life of confinement and rigid rules hindering the patients’—and the doctors’—well-being, while Foucault developed his criticism of these institutions much later, as well as a theory of the great confinement (in French: “le grand renfermement”) which distanced itself from the practice of ordinary psychiatry.

Despite these differences, one can say that neither Ellenberger nor Foucault was an outsider. The archives recently reproduced by Elisabetta Basso and Jean-François Bert16—in particular the psychological tests conducted by the young Foucault as an assistant psychologist—remind us that to interpret his contribution to the philosophy and the history of psychiatry as a brilliant, external criticism—which stays, to this day, the mainstream version of Foucauldism—is a misinterpretation that has been overturned.

Scientific migrations and the development of research at the Menninger Foundation

Ellenberger secured a position at the Menninger Foundation after a journey to the United States devoted to the observation of the psychotherapeutic techniques of schizophrenic

---

13 I warmly thank Elisabetta Basso who advised me on Foucault’s annotations kept at the Bibliothèque Nationale de France. Fonds Foucault, Box Nr 38 and Box Nr 44B, shelf mark NAF 28730.
patients. His first stay in Topeka, in October 1952, lasted a month. On the 21th of October he presented the results of his study in the form of a conference presentation about the use of a projective test called the Mosaic Test, created by Margaret Lowenfeld, in a case of advanced schizophrenia. The conference was a success and Ellenberger was warmly congratulated by Gardney Murphy, the research department’s new director. Murphy and Rudolf Ekstein, another important member of the teaching team at the Menninger Foundation, approached Karl Menninger (1893–1990) on behalf of Ellenberger to secure a contract for him. This offer enabled him to quit his job as a doctor at the Schaffhausen asylum, a work situation he experienced as an imprisonment. In this way he secured a teaching and research position in a neuropsychiatric centre of international reputation for the first time. The Menninger Foundation was not only one of the main training centres for psychiatrists (residents) after the war but also an important centre of American psychology and psychiatry. It was unique in that it welcomed perspectives from the humanities and the social sciences. The Menninger Foundation had already recruited a number of migrant doctors and therapists who had fled Europe during the 1930s and 1940s. Amongst them was George Devereux (1908–1985)—a central actor whose career, at the crossroad of psychiatry and social science, we will now ponder on.

Devereux was an anthropologist of Hungarian origin who was trained at the Ethnology Institute in Paris during the years 1931–1932 before defending his doctoral thesis entitled Sexual Life of the Mohave Indians (1935; unpublished doctoral dissertation) in anthropology at Berkeley University, California. Like Ellenberger, but before him, he was directly recruited by Karl Menninger as a research assistant in 1947. More specifically, Devereux worked at the Menninger Foundation as a “research analyst,” i.e. as an anthropologist trained in psychoanalysis (in the United States, the status of licensed psychoanalyst only applied to physicians). But unlike Ellenberger, he had not yet finished his training as a psychoanalyst which he pursued in Topeka with Robert Hans Jokl, who was also of Jewish and Hungarian origin. Moreover, Devereux worked with psychologist David Rapaport—also of Jewish

---

19 Ibid.
20 The two men also exchanged letters from November 1952 to February 1953.
and Hungarian origin—who ran the department of psychology at the Menninger School of Psychiatry. Rapaport largely contributed to the Menninger Foundation’s scientific outreach in the 1940s. Devereux completed his psychoanalytic training at a key moment when the use and the teaching of psychological tests were at their climax in Topeka, which explains why the results of one of Rapaport’s collaborator, Robert Holt, have such an important place within first Devereux’s study Reality and dream. Psychotherapy of a Plains Indian (1951)—and also why Ellenberger’s first lecture at the Menninger Foundation (1952) focussed on a test.

Reality and Dream. Psychotherapy of a Plains Indian is Devereux’s first book. It is based on the transcription of 30 psychoanalytic therapy sessions that Devereux had with Jimmy Picard (a pseudonym), a Native American from the Blackfoot tribe, who as a World War II veteran was being treated at the Winter General Hospital. Jimmy Picard suffered from psychological distress stemming from a number of factors, including familial conflict, relationship problems, overconsumption of alcohol, and cranial trauma incurred during the war. Devereux presents a few basic aspects of Blackfoot culture, stressing in particular the importance of dreams. The treatment narrative is interwoven with Jimmy Picard’s family history and the anamnesis of his suffering. Devereux’s theoretical positions in the 40’s are based on the psychoanalytical interpretation of neurotic symptoms, considering the Freudian theory as universal. But he tried to avoid psychological reductionism as well.

Thus, when Ellenberger arrived in Topeka, the Research Department were already developed and clinical psychology had acquired a particular significance it did not have before the war. Amongst the dozens of European psychoanalysts who fled Nazi Germany between 1933 and 1945—but especially after the invasion of Austria in 1938—about a dozen specialists, essentially physicians, became long-term members of the team alongside young graduates from the East coast of the United States. By convincing qualified psychologists from New York and Harvard to come to the Menninger Foundation and by obtaining federal funds to develop psychological expertise during the war, David Rapaport managed to build a strong scientific team. Amongst the prominent figures of this team, one can mention the names of Margaret Brenman, Roy Schafer, Sibylle Escalona, and Martin Mayman during the war; after 1945, Robert Holt, George Klein, Lester Luborsky, Philip Holzman, Herbert Schlesinger, Milton Wexler, etc. However, the end of the 1940s and the beginning of the 1950s there was a change in the team. While Devereux worked in close relationship to Rapaport and Holt,


Ellenberger was mostly in contact with Murphy and Ekstein. New director Murphy, with the help of his assistant Robert Wallerstein, ensured the stability and longevity of the Research Department from 1952 to 1964.

Ellenberger and Murphy had a lot in common: they shared a certain theoretical eclecticism, a protestant education (both Ellenberger’s and Murphy’s fathers were ministers), a passion for social psychology and projective tests. Quite a few of Rapaport’s collaborators in the 1940s in Topeka were also Murphy’s former collaborators during his years of teaching (from 1930 to 1940) at Colombia University and at the City College in New York. These are important indications to help us understand how Ellenberger developed his teachings on psychiatric history in the United States in the 1950s in the form of a discussion between the knowledge he had gained in Switzerland on the history of dynamic psychiatry and the academic culture of the East coast of the United States.

Research Assistant and Lecturer at the Menninger School of Psychiatry

Ellenberger’s main activity, once at Menninger, was teaching and research within the Department of Education. He was almost not engaged in medical practice as the patients were mostly cared for by the psychiatrists and psychologists of American nationality. His lectures on dynamic psychiatry provided an historical introduction to the psychoanalytic psychiatry which young physicians were trained for at the Menninger School of Psychiatry. Ellenberger also collaborated with psychiatrist Herbert Klemmer for the supervision and/or evaluation of students’ work—and probably as a member of the editorial board of the *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*, the scientific journal of the Menninger Foundation. He published at least six historical articles in the *Bulletin*, including one co-authored with Karl Menninger, and a number of reviews. It was only during his stay at the Menninger Foundation that Ellenberger could devote himself entirely to teaching and research. Archives give us a good idea of the content of his lectures. Indeed, it is stated that he was “in charge of the course of psychiatric treatment (he selected the lecturers), lecturing on psychiatric syndromes and on the history and development of dynamic psychiatry.” Table 1 shows the programme of this history course.

---
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Table 1: Lectures given at the Menninger School of Psychiatry, Topeka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction. What is dynamic psychiatry?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The ancestry of dynamic psychiatry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mesmer and animal magnetism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. From Mesmer to Janet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hypnotism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Multiple Personality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Great scientific and philosophical trends in the 19th Century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The unconscious before Freud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The dream before Freud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Concepts on neurosis and psychosis at the end of the 19th Century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sexual psychology and sexual pathology before Freud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Janet 1. Life, personality, and work of Janet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Janet 2. Janet’s psychotherapy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Adolf Meyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Freud and his time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Breuer and Freud’s studies on hysteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Freud’s “Interpretation of Dreams”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. “Depth Psychology”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The libido theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Metapsychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The Ego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Freud’s concepts of the Primal Father, the Oedipus Complex, and the Castration Complex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Freud’s philosophical and biological concepts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Freud’s basic psychological concepts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Freud’s cultural theories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Psychoanalysis as a therapeutic technique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The psychoanalytic movement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Psychoanalytic theory of neurosis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Psychoanalytic theory of psychosis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Psychosomatic medicine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Psychoanalysis and criminology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Psychoanalysis and infant psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Psychoanalysis and child psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Psychoanalysis and education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Psychoanalysis and sociology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Psychoanalysis and anthropology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Psychoanalysis and clinical psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. The deviants I.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The deviants II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Alfred Adler I.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Alfred Adler II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. The Neo-Adlerians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Jung I.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Jung II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Ludwig Binswanger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 Here is a succinct list of the courses Henri Ellenberger organized and the names of the Professors from the academic year 1957–58: Art Therapy (Donald Jones), General Principles of Adjunct Therapy (Dr Tarnower), Role of the Ward Physician in the Treatment of Patient who receives psychotherapy (Dr Modlin), Problems of Psychiatric nursing (Dr Hall), Sedatives, Tranquilizers, and Model Psychoses (Dr Feldman), Electric Schok (Dr Dundon), Insulin Therapy (Dr Targownik), Music Therapy (Forrest Slaughter), Psychotherapy (Dr Robbins).

26 One can also find typewritten lectures at the Centre de Documentation Henri Ellenberger (Paris).

27 University Archives, Université de Montréal, 7151.
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Ellenberger was the first to provide such in-depth teaching in history at the Menninger School of Psychiatry in Topeka—and also certainly one of the first in the United States lecture on the history of contemporary psychiatry from the end of the 18th century to World War II. However, it is difficult to measure the impact of this course on the training of Topeka students. Nevertheless, we know—thanks to biographer Andrée Yanacopoulo—that one of these young people, Roger Dufresne, was one of Ellenberger’s students before starting his academic career in Montreal where both men became colleagues.

Ellenberger was not the only professor giving a lecture on humanities and social sciences at the Menninger School of Psychiatry at the beginning of the 1950s, as Devereux himself gave a lecture on anthropology and psychoanalysis. Archives which concern these lectures are available and it would be interesting to compare the presentation leaflets of these courses in order to gain some insight on the nature of the teaching in psychiatry and psychoanalysis in the 1950s.

From 1947 to 1952, Devereux presented a “Psychiatric and psychoanalytic anthropology course” or, more simply, “Psychoanalysis and Anthropology,” which was comprised of 12 sessions of two hours each, every two weeks. These were specifically designed for the “analytic candidates” at the Topeka Institute for Psychoanalysis. Like those at the Menninger School of Psychiatry, these candidates were young (and mostly male) physicians in training. The following is a snippet taken from the archives: “The relationship between psychoanalysis and anthropology. Biological vs. cultural. Cultural factors and the topographic, economic and dynamic approach. Etiology and symptomatology seen culturally. Cultural factors in therapy and objectives. Case-conferences.” The Devereux archives also give us an idea of the range of other courses provided by the Topeka Institute for Psychoanalysis. Indeed, one document dating back to 1958 lists the courses given at the end of the 1940s and at the beginning of the 1950s (see Table 2) when Devereux was completing his analytical training at Topeka. Even though the Topeka Institute for Psychoanalysis and the Menninger School

---


29 Here follows, for information, the composition of the Training Committee of the Topeka Institute for Psychoanalysis in 1952: Karl A. Menninger, Rudolf Ekstein [Ph.D.], Sylvia Allen, Otto Fleischmann, Hugh N. Galbraith, Hellmuth Kaiser [Ph.D.], William C. Menninger, Lewis L. Robbins, Nelly H. C. Tibout. Otto Fleischmann was, during this period, the President of the Topeka Psychoanalytic Society.
of Psychiatry were separate institutes, lecturers often worked in both institutes—and the patients were also the same.

As one may notice from this list of lectures, Topeka was already providing lecture material on the history of psychoanalysis before Ellenberger’s arrival—but only in the form of a self-valorising professional narrative confined to the internal history of the Freudian theories and clinical techniques. Ellenberger brought the Menninger Foundation another type of history based on archives and on a specific methodology of gathering and cross-checking information from different sources. This methodological turning point in history became especially prevalent at the Menninger Foundation from 1954 onwards, when Ellenberger published a long biographical article about psychiatrist and psychoanalyst Hermann Rorschach (1884–1922) in the *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*. The Ellenberger archives reveal that this historical analysis generated an important exchange of correspondence and prompted professional recognition of Ellenberger’s professionalism as well as a certain academic exposure in the United States. One direct consequence of this professional recogni-

---

30 IMEC: DEV 7.10: File which concerns the psychoanalytic training and practice of Devereux at the Topeka Institute for Psychoanalysis 2/2.

tion was the increase of his working hours on the initiative of the Menninger School of Psychiatry board. Ellenberger was furthermore consulted for the revision of the university curriculum at Topeka which included a component on the history of medicine (and then on the history of psychiatry).

The recognition of Ellenberger’s contributions to scholarship was soon reflected in the increasing number of invitations he received to present the results of his historical research in North American universities, especially in Montreal where he would later pursue his career. Additionally, Karl Menninger requested his help and the two men developed an increasingly close collaboration with the aim of writing a book on Menninger’s conceptualization of mental illness. This project never saw the light in its initial form but some letters testify that Ellenberger did write at least one chapter before leaving the Menninger Foundation in 1958 and that at least one article is the result of this collaboration. Finally, Karl Menninger directly refers to this common work as well as to Ellenberger’s historical analysis in a book entitled *The Vital Balance* (1963), probably a reshaping of this project which remained in draft form in the 1950s.

**Conclusion and perspectives: the history of dynamic psychiatry as a literature of exile**

Considering Ellenberger’s career, one can observe that the move from clinical psychiatry to the history of dynamic psychiatry took place progressively in the 1950s. A series of articles entitled *La Psychiatrie Suisse* (1951–53) represents the first stage of this move. His resettlement in the United States in 1953 and his first historical article about Hermann Rorschach published in the *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic* in 1954 can be considered as the turning point. At that time, his students were, admittedly, American physicians in training and he would have to wait until 1962 when he began his position as a professor at the University of Montreal before he could teach non-medical students in a social science department. But this also explains why this appropriation of the historical method is progressive during the 1950–60 decade until the style statement which culminates in *The Discovery of the Unconscious. The History and Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry* (1970). Other hints lead us to think that Ellenberger did not consider himself solely as a physician at the Menninger Foundation and that his self-identity as an historian was becoming more important: for instance, he chose not

---

32 Entitled “Chapitre 3”, it exists in the form of a detailed plan and manuscript in Henri Ellenberger archives. The two men also exchanged letters about this project and the unitary concept of mental illness (Centre de Documentation Henri Ellenberger).

33 Karl Menninger mentions in particular an article by Henri Ellenberger on Sigmund Freud and Gustav Fechner (1956) but also his analysis on the history of psychiatric classifications. See the appendix of the Menninger’s *The Vital Balance*. 
to participate in one of the Menninger Foundation physicians’ prominent scientific project involving the assessment of psychotherapies. This project took the shape of a longitudinal study (Psychotherapy research project of the Menninger Foundation34) which ran for twenty years from the beginning of the 1950s to the middle of the 1970s. The main leaders of this project were David Rapaport35, Stephen A. Appelbaum36, Richard S. Siegal and Irwin C. Rosen.

Ellenberger left Topeka at the end of the year 1958. He then lived in New York (on Broadway) from January to June 1959 to work on his project of a history of dynamic psychiatry. Devereux also lived in New York during this time and, as a new psychoanalyst and psychologist, built up a private customer base alongside his job teaching ethnopsychiatry before moving back to France to pursue an academic career in Paris. Ellenberger also toyed with the idea of moving to France but he would later settle permanently in Montreal. In Canada, he published an article in French called “La psychiatrie et son histoire inconnue”37 which is part of the corpus of historical analysis led at the Menninger Foundation.

Ultimately, one can consider Ellenberger’s life in Topeka as a second exile after his experience in Switzerland. As a profound experience of uprooting and nostalgia, exile is maybe one of the keys to Ellenberger’s history of dynamic psychiatry. I therefore put forward the idea that experiencing exile is one of the explanations for Ellenberger’s historically-based turn in the 1950s. Indeed, one can interpret the history of dynamic psychiatry as the desire to retrieve the origins of the psychology Ellenberger was taught in France and which he had tried to find in Switzerland amongst the Swiss psychoanalysts and psychologists38 to

---

34 The project was supported by a grant of Public Health Service Research Grant from the National Institute of Mental Health, by the Foundation Fund for Research in Psychiatry, and by the Ford Foundation.
36 The Psychotherapy Research Project (Public Health Service Research Grant MH 8308 from the National Institute of Mental Health; others funds: Menninger Foundation's Fund for Research in Psychiatry, Ford Foundation, Spencer Foundation) of the Menninger Foundation began in the early 1950s. The member of team were: David Rapaport, Merton Gill, Robert R. Holt, Phillip S. Holzman, George Klein, Martin Mayman, Roy Schafer, and Herbert J. Schlesinger. Robert S. Wallerstein and Otto Kernberg took over the leadership of the project, which took than 20 years to complete. Richard S. Siegal was principal investigator and Irwin C. Rosen was coinvestigator. Stephen A. Appelbaum published a final report in 1977: *The Anatomy of Change. A Menninger Foundation Report on Testing the Effects of Psychotherapy*.
cope with the stress and the deception caused by a life of confinement at the asylum. First, history is a narrative of the past. Secondly, one can find indirect traces of nostalgia in the last chapter of *The Discovery of the Unconscious*: among the quoted psychiatrists, there is Henri Baruk (1897–1999) and Henri Ey (1900–1977), with whom Ellenberger was very close during his medical internship in Paris in the 1930s, and with whom he exchanged letters for a long time after his expatriation, until the 1970s. But it would not be correct to say that they played a central role in comparison with other physicians in charge of the main reforms of post war asylums. Ellenberger pays them tribute because he remained attached to them. Conversely, in *The Discovery of the Unconscious*, he never quoted the psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan (1901–1981), who became famous in the 1960s. Ellenberger also met him as resident in psychiatry in the 1930s, but he was never influenced by his work, as Lacan developed his major concepts after Ellenberger had definitively left Europe. Ellenberger was, from Paris to Poitiers, then from Schaffhausen to Topeka and finally to Montreal an eternal “emigrant” (*Ausgewanderter*, in Sebald’s sense) who found, in this experience of exile, the means to achieve his intellectual goals and ambitions.
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Dynamic Psychiatry: An Introduction
Lecture at the Menninger School of Psychiatry on
August 22, 1956, Topeka, Kansas

Henri Ellenberger

We are beginning today a series of talks on dynamic psychiatry, its origin, developments and achievements. As you no doubt know, dynamic psychiatry is a relatively new psychiatric movement, originating at about the end of the 19th century. It meant a complete revolution in our ways of understanding mental conditions and of treating patients.

Before we enter into this vast subject, we must briefly consider three problems: 1. What is dynamic psychiatry? 2. What is its place among other psychiatric trends? 3. Why do we think it necessary to discuss its historical development?

1. What is dynamic psychiatry?

The word dynamic comes from the Greek dynamis, which means “power” or “force”. If you take the oldest extant treatise of psychology, Aristotle’s little book, On the Soul, you find that this great philosopher considered the soul a living energy endowed with “powers”—dynamis—a word which has been very inadequately translated with “faculties”. Thus, we must conclude that dynamic psychology, in its broader sense, is 25 centuries old. The contrary of “dynamic” is “static”. However, nobody has ever heard of a “static” psychology or psychiatry and I don’t know what that could be. We must therefore search for a more restricted and specific meaning of the term “dynamic psychiatry”.

Who introduced this term into the scientific language? So far as I know, the first one who used the word “dynamic” in connection with certain clinical phenomena was Charcot. Charcot distinguished a group of “dynamic” paralyses, including those appearing sponta-
neously in hysterical patients, and those produced under hypnosis. He also distinguished “dynamic” amnesias, in which the lost memories could be recovered under hypnosis, from “organic” amnesias resulting from brain lesions, in which lost memories could not be recovered under hypnosis. Charcot’s pupil, Pierre Janet, made the following comparison: suppose that your car is stopped and cannot start, two things are possible: either something is broken, or the motor is out of gasoline. In the first case, we have an “organic” disease, in the latter a “dynamic” one.

Later on, the term “dynamic psychiatry” took on a more specific meaning. We ordinarily call “dynamic” any approach which takes into account the activity and interplay of psychological energies, drives and tendencies underlying the level of consciousness and manifest symptoms. In this way, dynamic psychiatry explains the conscious, the present and the apparent, through the unconscious, the past and the hidden. Let us take a few instances:

1. A schizophrenic woman, a widow, has the delusional idea that her child is dead. This may mean that she unconsciously wishes her child’s death because the child is an obstacle preventing her from remarrying. Here, the conscious is explained by the unconscious.

2. Second example. An apprentice is seized by a terrific and seemingly unmotivated hatred against his boss. These feelings prove to be a transference from the hatred he had felt against his own father, many years ago. Here, the present is explained by the past.

3. Third example. A young man makes himself conspicuous through his arrogant, provocative behavior. This aggressiveness proves to be a reaction-formation, that is, a certain type of defense against repressed anxiety. Here, a facade of behavior is explained by a hidden background.

These are, of course, simple schematic examples. In reality, things are usually much more complex.

2. The place of dynamic psychiatry among other psychiatric trends.

We come to the second problem: What is the place of dynamic psychiatry among the other psychiatric approaches? The basic problem of psychiatry has always been to investigate the motivation of human actions, normal or abnormal. Now, throughout the centuries, the focus of attention was centred on different types of motivation.

(1) Rational-voluntary motivations. According to this view, our acts follow clear-cut decisions, which themselves are the consequences of acts of thought, or of what was called “the understanding” or the “reason”. The ancient Greeks had this naive idea that man was naturally prone to follow the voice of his reason, and that if he acted wrongly, it was because of ignorance or mistake, or at worst because of bad will. We must not laugh at this rationalistic-voluntaristic point of view, which is still tacitly adopted by many Courts
of Justice in their evaluation of criminal behavior. The fallacy of this viewpoint has been so abundantly demonstrated by dynamic psychology that we don’t need to insist upon it. However, let us not forget that reason, common sense and free will still exist, even in severe neurotics and in certain psychotics. Freud said that: “The voice of the intellect is a soft one, but it does not rest until it has gained a hearing”.

(2) The **organicist approach**, is the one which considers man as a perfected machine, thought as a by-product of brain functioning, emotions as endocrinic manifestations, and mental diseases as diseases of the brain. Representatives of this approach, such as Griesinger, Wernicke, Meynert, etc., considerably advanced our knowledge of certain mental conditions. Other no less famous students like Charcot, Forel, and Freud shared for some time this viewpoint, until they came to understand that—aside from the organic substruc
ture of the psyche—there is a certain margin of “dynamic” activity with its own laws and manifestations.

(3) **Instinctive motivations.** Our acts are the outcome of innate instincts, which can be normal or deviated. This is the point of view proclaimed by Gall and by Darwin, and developed by Lombroso, Krafft-Ebing and many others after them. Today, nobody doubts the fact that man is the subject, sometimes the victim, of powerful instincts. Instinct theory is a part of psychoanalytic theory, but only a part.

(4) **Habit and conditioning.** “Habit is a second nature”, according to an old saying. Philosophers contended that most of human acts were the result of the habits we acquired over the course of life, under the influence of circumstances and education. Later, the associationists gave to this theory a more scientific formulation. Modern research on conditioning, particular the outstanding work of Pavlov in Russia, resulted in a theory according to which most of our acts are the result of conditioned reflexes. This theory is not incompatible with dynamic psychology.

(5) **Sociological approach.** Sociologists and anthropologists have shown that the individual incorporates in himself the demands, beliefs and feelings of the social group in which he lives. Marxist philosophy stressed the influence of the social structure, particularly of class conflicts on the formation of an individual’s character, and also on the origin of mental disorders. In a more restricted way, Freud introduced the concept of the super-ego, conceived as the voice of the father, of authority figures and even of society as a whole, speaking within the individual. In recent years, the sociological and anthropological approach has gained more importance from the point of view of psychoanalysis, as we will see in another lecture.
Thus, we find that these various approaches and viewpoints do not contradict dynamic psychology and dynamic psychiatry. Each one has its share of truth. However, they are not sufficient for making intelligible the phenomena of the normal and sick mind, and therefore the advent of dynamic psychiatry was one of the greatest discoveries of the history of science.

3. Is it necessary to study the history of dynamic psychiatry?

Psychiatry is not a collection of recipes, and dynamic psychiatry even less so than any other psychiatric approach. When, as a dynamic psychiatrist, you are dealing with a patient, whatever the disease, you don’t content yourself with making a list of the patient’s complaints and seeking the appropriate medication. You take a complete inventory of the patient’s life situation in his actual setting and study his life-history. This is exactly what we are doing in regard to dynamic psychiatry itself. We take it as if it was one of our patients, and we want to investigate its origin and developments in its various facets.

There is another reason. Really understand a patient means more than a formal, intellectual acquaintance with his symptoms and problems. We try to empathize with him, to see the world through his eyes, in other words, to identify with him, at least temporally to a certain extent. That is exactly what we will try to do with the various trends of dynamic thought. When speaking of Janet, Adolf Meyer, Adler, Jung, etc., we will try to see the world through their own eyes, to think as if—for a limited time—we were pupils of Janet, Meyer, Adler, Jung and the like.