

FROM SIGMUND FREUD TO VIKTOR E. FRANKL:  
INTEGRAL PSYCHOANALYSIS NORBERTO R. KEPPE

# FROM SIGMUND FREUD TO VIKTOR E. FRANKL: INTEGRAL PSYCHOANALYSIS

## Index

From Sigmund Freud to Viktor E. Frankl: Integral Psychoanalysis – Norberto Keppe .....	3
The use of the Dialectic Technique in Integral Psychoanalysis - Cláudia Bernhardt Pacheco .....	47

### ***NOTE ON THE MEANING OF KEY TRILOGICAL TERMS***

Throughout this book the reader will note that the following three key Trilogical terms are frequently used by the author: *conscientisation*, *inconscientisation* and *interiorisation*. These words are English neologisms created by the author Norberto R. Keppe and are defined as follows:

- **CONSCIENTISATION** - The psychological process of becoming aware of reality, both external and internal.
- **INCONSCIENTISATION** - The wilful attitude of concealing, repressing or denying one's consciousness or, in other words, hiding from oneself something one does not wish to see.
- **INTERIORISATION** – This term is not to be confused with internalization. Interiorisation consists of using external reality as a mirror to understand more clearly what exists in one's inner self (feeling, thought, conscience, intuition, emotion, etc.). It is the principal technique used in individual Trilogical Analysis.

### **PRESENTATION**

The Society of Integral Psychoanalysis was officially created in 1970 in the city of São Paulo, Brazil, exactly ten years after its founder, Dr. Norberto R. Keppe, had returned from a three-year period of study and work in Vienna with Prof. Viktor E. Frankl.

As we already know, Logotherapy constitutes the Third Viennese School of Psychotherapy, after those of Sigmund Freud and Alfred Adler. However, Frankl introduced a true innovation when he pointed out fundamental errors of traditional psychoanalysis that have caused great troubles not only in the scientific but also in the social field.

Frankl, however, always said that his work would be a complement to Psychoanalysis, never imagining that it could be a true correction, not only in the theoretical aspect, but in the practical as well. And it is exactly the latter that Keppe has accomplished.

He noticed from the time he began his psychotherapeutic activities, not only in the Hospital das Clinicas of the Faculty of Medicine at the University of São Paulo, but also in his private clinic, that there was an insufficiency in the fundamental hypotheses of psychoanalysis. Little by little, under the influence of Frankl's ideas, he succeeded in establishing a group of hypotheses, which proved to be much more effective in the therapeutic process. All of these hypotheses are drawn from the fields of philosophy and religion, from which some of the greatest questions concerning humanity have arisen. They have practically nothing to do with biology. Indeed, one might ask what psychological difficulties (which are related to thought and feelings) have to do with something physical or physiological. Thus, by incorporating these hypotheses into psychotherapy, Frankl and Keppe have truly restructured Freudianism, whose original tenets had hitherto impregnated all areas of human activity.

As we know, Freud correctly analysed man, but only in his secondary aspect. Frankl and Keppe have succeeded in practically reaching man's essence, and Keppe perceived that nervousness, neurosis, psychosis and physical diseases are due to a battle that we carry on against truth, beauty and goodness.

This book was written by eight members of the Society of Integral Psychoanalysis. They not only explain the hypotheses and technique of Integral Psychoanalysis, but also make a critique of several kinds of psychological orientation that cause even more damage to the persons who 'submit' themselves to these techniques. The book ends with a comparison of Frankl and Keppe conducted by Dr. Shlomo Zekhry, vice-president of our Society.

I want to take advantage of this opportunity to thank Dr. Frankl for what he has accomplished in benefit of mankind, which we have now been able complete through integral psychoanalysis.

## FROM SIGMUND FREUD TO VIKTOR E. FRANKL: INTEGRAL PSYCHOANALYSIS

I studied and worked with Dr. Viktor E. Frankl in Vienna from April 1958 until June 1960. During that time, I had the opportunity to study several Viennese Schools of Psychotherapy, such as the Adlerian orientation, Dr. Knut Baumgarten's Child Guidance Clinic, the Viennese Circle of Deep Psychology and the traditional Society of Orthodox Psychoanalysis.

During those years, I worked with Prof. Frankl's ideas in the therapeutic field, and finally I succeeded in verifying them in practice. I can tell you that ninety percent of them were confirmed, as you will observe during my presentation.

I would like to point out some of his main hypotheses: a) the denial of Pan-Determinism, with which much of our present culture is impregnated; b) all the freedom the human being makes use of (even in choosing his illness); c) the serious mistake of Freudian pan-sexualism, which has distressingly invaded the whole world; d) the opening to transcendence; e) the confusion made by Freud between religion and neurosis; f) the fact that being conscious (*bewusstsein*) is being responsible.

In the last part of this work, I present practical cases (recordings of individual analysis sessions) that will help you become acquainted with the methodology of Integral Psychoanalysis.

### **Psychopathological Psychotherapies**

Up to now, all processes of psychotherapy have actually been far from psychological. Psychoanalysis itself, whether orthodox or not, is more than anything else a biological, organic treatment. Many other techniques, such as Rogerian, Transactional analysis, psychodrama and behaviorism, are socio-therapeutic—if ever a psychotherapeutic approach could be such.

What I am saying is that all of these approaches attribute the cause of human anguish to physical or social factors and consider the psyche to be the result of brain secretions (according to the old medical teachings), or social factors (lack of affection, economic difficulties, problems with status, etc.). In other words, they see psychic life as always victimized by something external to it.

All these ideas that dominated the field of psychotherapy are the same sick ideas that the people who look for treatment have, and they are wrong because of their foundational ideas. In other words, the psychotherapeutic processes are as pathological as the people who look for them, and this type of psychotherapy ends up merely changing the neurosis. After a psychotherapy process, the individual winds up with another illness, this time with all the blessings of "science". I would call these psychopathological "psychotherapies". We could say that, in this case, science, which should elevate the person out of his psychopathological situation, conducts the same process that has been making us ill. This, then, does not benefit us as it should.

All that has been accomplished so far in psychotherapy has been either biotherapy or sociotherapy. The former has been generally organized by physicians who have the idea of curing emotions and feelings primarily by addressing sex (libido) and administering medicines, electric shock and insulin.

Sociotherapy has been preferred by psychologists who thought they would find in the social field the motive for every human estrangement. In this area, we find the Cultural School (Karen Homey and Erich Fromm), the Frankfurt School (Herbert Marcuse), Wilhelm Reich, the English anti-psychiatry, Foucault's School, Vera Schmidt in the Soviet Union, and also the transactional line. Generally, therapies use all these processes together.

What I am trying to say is that to attribute the etiology of psychological disturbances to factors that are foreign or secondary to psychic life is itself psychopathological because it feeds the individual's persecutory elements, thereby making his condition worse. If problems were external, or even hereditary, then we would always be right in feeling resentment or even revolt towards our parents.

### **There is no Unconscious involved in the origin of illness, but rather an attitude of Inconscientisation**

I believe that the biggest mistake that has flooded all fields of psychotherapy has been Freud's idea about the existence of an unconscious as the basic agent of neurosis. Coincidentally, this idea has also invaded every area of human thought, thereby granting the human being an enormous justification for his mistakes.

Any psychotherapy that is based upon the existence of an unconscious as the origin of pathology is precarious, firstly because of the large period of time needed to deal with something "unknown," and secondly because this cannot be achieved anyway because most times it doesn't exist. This perspective has given rise to the formation of a great number of ideas and theories, each one more fanciful than the next, in an endless and useless sequence.

There is a famous phrase in philosophy, *non multiplicatur entia sine necessitas*, which means that one must not create unnecessary things. Any process of analysis that requires a long time to achieve a result proceeds from the idea that investigation ad infinitum is necessary, and the client is little interested in doing that.

This hypothesis of the existence of an unconscious that prevents us from being sane is exactly the same as that which attributes our disorders to evil spirits that seize us and must be exorcised. This is the reason that Erich Fromm, who was analyzed by Sachs, one of the seven of Freud's closest disciples, said in his last interview to the French newspaper *Le Monde*, that he had never once been benefited by psychoanalysis. As for psychoanalyst Dr. Wilhelm Wittenberg of Munich, Fromm said that, while he was an enchanting man, the only thing that he remembered about him was that you needed to put his cream in before his coffee. Karl Jaspers said that psychoanalysis was a dogmatic process, which, to be accomplished, required the client's belief. Was Carl Gustav Jung not right in rejecting the proposition of the Oedipus complex—at least as a fundamental factor of the origin of neurosis?

From the very first writings Freud published on the theory of the human being's afflictions, many people in Vienna were of the opinion that he demonstrated a lot of imagination and that his work was more literary than anything else. And it is also well known to anyone who has done psychoanalysis that any objection to Freud's ideas is interpreted as a kind of resistance.

In the second part of this paper, I wish show you that we are not victims of an unconscious, but of our wish to inconscientise what we do not want to see. How could we be victims of instincts and impulses (*trieb* in German)?

Medard Boss was a psychoanalyst for many years, and one day he realized the inadequacy of all theories about the unconscious in treating neurosis. His point of view was that Freudian analysis required a whole range of intellectual acrobatics. In an

interview he gave in Brazil last May, he said that "to be realized is to integrate oneself into the world; every human life that cannot be realized in everyday life is bound to fall into depression."

We cannot be victims of what we do not know, but we damage ourselves with the attitude of wanting to conceal what we are aware of. In my opinion the theory of the unconscious was the biggest psychological deception of the twentieth century.

### **Social Psychotherapy**

First of all, by social psychotherapy, or rather sociotherapy, I am speaking mainly about Transactional Analysis, Rogerian Therapy, Psychodrama and Behaviourism.

These psychotherapeutic approaches were born psychopathological. This happened from the very first experiences of attending clients because these methodologies attributed the cause of problems to the client's relationship with others.

I am talking now about the psychoanalytical approach that relates all human welfare directly to the kind of social and biological (sexual) behaviour the person has. All families who have directed their children to this type of treatment have gone through bad moments as their children increase their revolt against their own home.

The psychoanalysts of our Society have written a book entitled *Alienating Psychotherapies*, in which they describe the negative effects of any treatment modality that leads to further concealment of consciousness from the individual. It is due to these negative side effects that there is strong opposition from people in general to these various methods and schools of psychotherapy.

If you consider the matter closely, you will realize that there has been a serious misunderstanding in the field of psychotherapy, which tries to lead the individual to happiness through means that are inferior to him; that is, sex, money and economic and social power. A human being can only be happy if he is in contact with the life that comes from his inner self—and this life is the same that governs the entire universe.

Every psychoanalytical approach that emphasizes the social or biological aspects (mainly sexual) of the psyche is a waste of time. The mere idea of being happy through somebody else causes us incredible affliction owing to the impossibility of finding somebody perfect. And here begins our inner hell.

There is a fundamental mistake in thinking that one can be happy through somebody else, who, after all, is just a fellow creature with the same level of misery as ours. In fact, this attitude is merely the search for a new form of alienation compared to true happiness, which consists in being in harmony with our own goodness. And where can our goodness be?

If the human being was created in God's image and most perfect resemblance, our goodness is mainly inside us, and the human interior is the most wonderful creation on Earth. One has only to accept what exists there, for true reality exists within us. It is there, waiting for us to humble ourselves enough so that we consider it. And we do that by giving up the attitude of escape in order to remain in what is eternal within ourselves.

What probably most characterizes so called mental illness is the attitude of blaming the social environment for all our personal problems. After all, we know that a lost person does not survive in the forest but can survive for a long time in any society.

### **Libido is not the Foundation of the Psychic Life**

For many years, Freud's explanation of the sexual etiology of problems did not satisfy me. In fact, I believed that psychoanalysis was stagnating because it placed its primary focus upon the libido of the human being. While attending his clients in sessions and researching the human mind, Freud was a great scientist. But when he used his ideas of the libido to explain illness, it was a complete disaster. However, because his methodology was unsurpassed, his theories, even though they were mostly absurd, became accepted in the scientific world and remained the standard for almost a full century. Only now are they being almost entirely demolished.

The worst error of all, though, was to consider the libido as being responsible for our equilibrium or imbalance. Even if we consider that Freud was giving the word a different meaning (i.e. not only a sexual one), the majority of psychotherapists have insisted on trying to solve the human being's problems through relationships. To demonstrate this, the second chapter in Freud's book, *The Theory of Neurosis*, is entitled Sexuality in the Etiology of Neuroses. Moreover, the second chapter of his *Neurasthenia and Anguish Neurosis* sees all causes of affliction, a) through the first contact with sexual problems; b) in newlyweds; c) in premature ejaculation; d) in interrupted or reserved coitus; e) in sexual abstinence; f) in the climacteric (menopause) period.

Directly dealing with sex constitutes an improper intrusion into the client's life and is, to tell the truth, totally useless. It even seems to me an unethical attitude.

Whenever people have come to us with problems of homosexuality, frigidity or impotence, etc., their conduct has immediately been analyzed from a psychological standpoint and, within a short time, their difficulties have been healed. This demonstrates that the basic problem is not in sex itself, but in something preceding it or, in other words, in the way of thinking and feeling.

F. G. was a forty-two-year-old man who had always lived among young men. He owned a shop but had financial problems, and exhibited a number of physical problems as well, including circulatory problems, varicose veins and accentuated dyspepsia. After seven months of analysis, he began a sexual relationship with a woman, his cardio-vascular problems disappeared and he bought two more shops and became more prosperous.

To clarify this aspect let me stress that when a client talks about his sexual difficulties, we endeavour to show what this reveals in his or her psychological life; in other words, in the difficulties that he or she has in his relationship with him or herself. As the person begins to get in touch with the inner self, the sexual difficulties are automatically healed. What happens in the physical, physiological life is always a result of what first goes on in one's inner self, in the psychological life.

Whenever you treat a symptom directly, the result will oppose what is expected from the psychotherapy. This becomes clearly evident in the area of sexuality where numerous cases can be found of patients with one difficulty or another who, after a certain period of attention on it during analysis (which feels like an affliction to them), become totally impotent. In this orientation, most homosexuals end up by "assuming" (or accepting as they say) their condition—and this is the opposite of what we would expect from treatment.

### **We do not have dangerous instincts or impulses**

Every conventional psychotherapeutic method aims at taking care of something that exists in each person's inner self and which is considered dangerous. But this very idea constitutes an attitude of affliction, perhaps even the basic one, in the formation of the process of sickness.

I have the impression that so far all methods of psychotherapy have led the individual to greater alienation in two different ways: a) by taking for granted the existence of evil characteristics in the psychic life (death instincts, aggressive instincts, etc.), b) or else by conceding that what exists is an innate, natural goodness, as if we were very normal creatures injured by a horrible environment (Carl Rogers and all the influences of Jean Jacques Rousseau), which is even worse because it leads to a total escape from the consciousness of all problems.

A return to seeing the psychic life as the real world to be investigated has not been accomplished yet. We in Analytical Trilogy are pioneers in this sense.

The human being has made a great error in giving enormous importance to evil (pathology) as if it were very powerful—or, at least, existed in the same proportion as good (sanity). Every time we do not consider what exists we are wasting time because we are replacing truth with fantasy. This is what I call Platonism.

I am of the opinion that religious institutions, mainly Christianity, have been making a serious error from their beginnings by considering the human being as constituted by an immortal soul linked with God and a condemned body linked with sin. Such a proposition sees in man two principles, one good and one evil, and suggests that the body should be punished and castigated because it is something inconvenient. In fact, all the attention of priests and religious ministers has been devoted to this area in neglect of all the others. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, this proposition gained further credence due to the fact that a great genius by the name of Sigmund Freud attributed the etiology of every illness to the body (sex).

The result of all this was a general blinding, for we could say that our entire existence in this world consists of the correct use of the physical aspect. As a matter of fact, the great religious thinker, Thomas Aquinas, said that we are substantially formed of a soul **and** a body. As human creatures, we cannot be otherwise.

The reason such an erroneous principle was created can only be explained as being caused by the extensive sabotage against the truth through the attempt to deny that everything that exists belongs only to the Creator. As a matter of fact, the thinkers of ancient Greece were of the opinion that the universe would be eternal (Aristotle). On the

other hand, by denying the value of the physical, we have ensured that we will subsequently have an exaggerated fixation with it. In other words, we have become slaves of the physical, for what is rejected increases in strength.

The idea of a body in opposition to the soul, or the physical bothering the spiritual, constitutes a heavy cultural heritage, and a way of underestimating creation itself, which can be eternal only when both are unified. We have a very intense link with this world in which we were born because we were created for it. So much so that Leon Bloy said on his deathbed, "Oh, kingdom of this world, how much have I loved thee!"

## **Psychic Inversion**

The fundamental discovery that I have made in the psychopathological field is the process of Inversion, through which we see everything that we perceive opposite to what it is. From the moment I had this realization, I began to consider every methodology and scientific hypothesis with suspicion. After all, a scientist is as ill as his client and may even treat people not only wrongly, but completely contrary to how he should. In fact, it seems to me that this is exactly what has been happening.

We have an example of a physiological inversion in the situation where our eyes perceive an exterior image entering through the retina in an inverted way, but we correct this because we know how reality is. However, we generally don't do the same thing in psychic life. To the contrary actually: we invert things and continue on that way.

But why do we invert everything and see reality as bad and imagination and fantasy as agreeable? The basic cause for this is envy, which is a synonym for alienation. In fact, the word "envy" in Latin is formed by a suffix *in* (the negative) and the word *videre* (to see), so that *invidere* means "not to see". A little later I will help you to better understand this element.

We think that truth is stupider than we are so we do whatever we want with it. And our incredible pretension is to make every reality subject to our confirmation before it is permitted to exist. For example, proving God's existence is the same as confirming that light, life, beauty, the sun and the stars exist. It is ridiculous to prove any of these things because they are evident. All that is left for us to do is accept this or not.

But there is one fundamental detail: this God whom we refuse, omit or modify is our own inner selves that we refuse to accept, and this refusal gives rise to three types of psychopathology. One is the individual who denies everything—even love and life. This person simply kills everything, at least in his mind. He is against science, philosophy, the past, everything. Second we have the individual who omits everything. He knows what exists but rejects it. He does not deny like the former because he is not so foolish and knows what damage this may cause him. He simply omits. And thirdly, we have the individual who modifies and alters everything—not only what he sees but also what he studies and lives. It seems to me that this type of personality would include most people.

On a scale, the first group are the sickest (schizophrenic, paranoid, seriously depressive), the second are the borderline cases and the third are the immense majority of sick people; that is, us—the ones who still allow something to exist in the world. We are, perhaps in another way of saying it, the least crazy.

I consider one of my main discoveries to be that everything that exists by itself is by its nature good (except when we omit, deny or alter it). This, of course, is equivalent to saying that everything real is good. As Igor A. Caruso from Vienna once said, "Could an instinct of death ever exist?" We are, therefore, something good but are made ill by our own will when we oppose ourselves (see Schopenhauer, *The World as Representation*).

The human being wants health to be a result of his own will; he does not want to admit that it exists by itself. In fact, this is why we destroy it, because we want to be the creators of ourselves. But is it even possible to create ourselves? Not even with all the good will of existential philosophy.

We are living in an age called homo-centrism. But this begs the question: is man really the centre? From the moment we placed the human being at the centre of the universe we also placed on his shoulders such a heavy load that he has bent under its weight.

As far as humanism is concerned, we are still at a pre-Copernican or pre-Galileo stage when the Earth was thought of as motionless and the entire Universe moved round it. Likewise, every person wants to believe that everything else moves around him or her.

### **Personal and Social Alienation**

Many people think that the world is run by the men who govern nations, mainly the more developed ones. This is not true at all. The people of a nation do not need someone to govern them because they are more judicious than their governors since they already have all the balance necessary for human welfare. We know that politicians would never do psychotherapy (as Wilfred R. Bion concluded) because they live within a sociopathology (psychosocial pathology).

The whole structure of society is impregnated with psychopathology. This is not only true in the area of thought but also in the area of religious institutions and principally in the area of science. We can see clearly the illness that invades all these areas.

In 1976, I wrote a book called *Psychoanalysis of Society*, in which I tried to apply to social life the same process of analysis that could be applied to psychological life. My whole study was based on the traditional psychoanalysis of Freud, Klein and Bion. However, I did not find this sufficient to explain the social process. From the moment I realized this, I decided to discover another way to contact the inner self.

The human being is still innocent when a child (*inoscere*: Latin, *non noscere*), but when he enters the world of knowledge he pretty much adopts an attitude of hypocrisy. Evil entered the world through knowledge, meaning that man stifles, twists and distorts the whole truth, which is not in knowledge, for by reasoning we can commit any madness, while with love we can only love. We replace all the intuition and consciousness that we have when we are children with reasoning and hypocrisy when we grow up.

We do not have to do much to live; we just have to accept this life, which is a wonderful thing, and work with what it is for it is something so incredible that every minute we waste by doing nothing is infinity thrown away.

We are eternal in the same way as life is; we will never stop being (existing), because we can only have consciousness of what is real, and if consciousness tells us that eternity exists, it is because we are in it forever.

It is in dictatorial regimes, which Latin America has in abundance, that we see the struggle against consciousness. Such regimes censor any unfavourable news, thereby thinking that this will stop what is bad from existing. They first gag the press and the so-called intellectuals. They act exactly like the most seriously sick people in society, meaning with complete intolerance. The principal consciousness they are censoring is that of errors because truth exists by itself and even supports us, while errors are committed only by human beings and nobody else.

The illness of the human being lies in his arrogance and conceit; we are not dishonest because we are ill but we are ill because we are dishonest. Thus we can say, "He is so dishonest that he has come to the point of being seriously mentally ill."

Here's an example of how we work in practice. In her analysis, Mrs. P. K. reported that for years she had not had any satisfaction in her sexual relationship. She and her husband had owned a school, which they sold because of its state of disorganization. She then bought a snack bar and it also failed. Her husband decided to leave the home because of the precarious situation.

Here's our interpretation of this situation: Mrs. P. K. rejected the relationship with herself, and this was the source of her displeasure with life. As people say, "She was out of her mind." As a matter of fact, she had made a complete mess of her inner self and everything she did externally reflected this disorder in her inner self. Her husband leaving represented her escape from herself. Her psychological situation was, indeed, precarious.

The most hectic work that a human being can do is to indulge in all the activity necessary to alienate himself. Thus we can say that the truly "active" person can seem inactive, subdued and even catatonic.

We do not accept the obvious simply because we consider ourselves to be the creators of truth, and this is why reasoning has always been considered by philosophers to be the pinnacle of human achievement. Not only in ancient times but also in the Middle Ages and even on into our modern times, the idea that man could reach happiness by reasoning has been steadily nourished, as if happiness could be something we provided for ourselves. However, did not Thomas Aquinas spend his whole life trying to prove God's existence?

Henry Bergson in France was the first thinker to give value to intuition; Husserl in Austria laid the foundations of modern psychology with his studies of consciousness; Herman Keyserling's School of Wisdom in Darmstadt observed with notable intuition that the meaning of things could only be discovered through a peculiar intuition and the hermeneutics of symbols and myth.

We have come to an age when, as Wittgenstein astutely observed, philosophy is no longer philosophy, thus making necessary the process of integration between thought, feeling and action (philosophy, religion and science).

What I mean is that when each of these areas is isolated from each other alienation occurs. And is this not what has been accomplished? But if we unite them again, we shall have the new Man—not the product of pseudo-evolution but the real being that we are but do not express as we should. The Man that we imagine as living in the twenty-first or twenty-second century etc. is the same that exists here and now, except for a very different attitude, which is an attitude of relaxing and accepting the enormous inner richness that he possesses but does not use.

## **SECOND PART**

### **Psychological Psychotherapy**

What is left for me to say is that psychotherapy in its real sense has not been accomplished yet. The word means “therapy of the psyche” (psychoanalysis would be “analysis of the psyche”). When I talk about the psyche, I refer to what exists in our inner self, including even the will, feelings, intuition and perception. It is actually due to our will that our psychological life becomes crazy since we focus it outwards, our preferences being to the social and the biological fields. Isn't it said that a (mentally) ill person is out of his or her mind?

The psychic life is formed by emotions and thoughts and depends on the intuition and consciousness to detect them before human beings finally use their reason and will to accept them or not. Therefore, the inner self has two distinct aspects: the first is fundamental, real and, we might say, sane; the second is variable and dependent on our decisions, that is, our will. When the latter bends before truth, accepting what intuition and consciousness show, there are individuals in harmony with themselves, but when the will prefers to elaborate fantasy and imagination and puts them in the place of reality, there we find the sick individual. It is the real world that supports and feeds us; the world of imagination, which we try to create, provides precarious results.

Everything I have accomplished in the field of psychotherapy comes from practical experience, from continual twelve-hour days, not only at the Hospital das Clinicas of the University of São Paulo's Faculty of Medicine but also at my private clinic. In fact, my strong suit has never been theory but practice. The methodology I have used was already in place, and that is Sigmund Freud's, although a new body of hypotheses has had to be elaborated and some changes in the technique devised.

It seems to me that the entire world is weary of theories about the human being that don't work in practice. What happens is that one professional tries to fit a sick person into one hypothesis while another conforms to a different hypothesis, as if we psychological professionals were the bestowers of psychological health. Is it even necessary to provide examples? Freud tried to fit mentally ill people into his Libido theories, and we know well the disaster that caused. Philosophy and religion present us with so many famous individuals who tried to impose their ideas dishonestly.

When someone asks urgently, "What should I do to get better?" I answer, "You should stop trying to do something," or, "You should do nothing." As a matter of fact, it would be better if most people did nothing at all. What I mean by this is that our despair appears exactly when we think that everything, including our sanity, depends upon our power. In fifty or eighty years none of us will be here anymore, and yet the universe will not move any slower nor will seeds stop germinating or rivers stop flowing towards the sea, etc. However, much damage will depend on the degree of sanity we display now.

### **Fantasy and Reality**

Illness is the attitude of attacking life, the struggle against reality; it is the wish to exterminate all truth. Psychological or physical illnesses are always consequences of an attitude of opposition to what is real.

In 1956, the Catholic University of São Paulo (PUC) contracted Professor Enzo Azzi, Professor Gemelli's assistant from the Psychology Institute of Milan. He was accustomed to saying during his classes that a neurotic is an individual who lives inside

reality but does not accept it—which is the equivalent of saying that a neurotic wants to live in a special world created by his fantasy. People who have a close relationship with seriously sick people realize this very well, and acknowledge that it is also common to all. In fact, it is practically the basis of the whole process of disease.

Thomas Aquinas considered imagination to be a faculty of the soul, and therefore something necessary to existence. In our psychoanalytical work, we have verified that fantasy is the most constant condition in psychotic people whose intention it is to live only according to their imagination. For this reason, we frequently find numerous Napoleons interned in psychiatric hospitals. In Brazil there is a young man who wears a harness and calls himself a horse. Once when talking to me he said that he was going to have lunch, and he took some grass out of the bag he had with him and insisted that I join him. When I called him by his name, he was offended and said emphatically, "My name is Horse."

The perception of the fantasy built by people considered the sickest ones has provided me with the key to detecting the main attitude that leads the human being to his greatest difficulties. The pathology of the human being is caused by his attitude towards reality; it is something proceeding from his denial, omission or misrepresentation of life, of truth. Therefore, it is in the field of culture (thought and feeling, philosophy and religion) that the cause of his difficulties can be located. And, unfortunately, the greatest of all geniuses in the area of psychotherapy was a physician (Freud) who denied religion and omitted philosophy. He was fond of Schopenhauer and that was all.

In my book, *Liberation*, I expose the entire theory and methodology of Integral Psychoanalysis, and I establish a clear difference between what we call "truth" (meaning what we accomplish) and Truth itself, that is, the unchangeable finality. Obviously, we add fanciful elements that have little to do with true reality to a great deal of what we do. You can see this in what passes on cinema screens, in television shows and on the stage. These productions are designed to take us away from reality, even though they are built upon truth. So it is not the things themselves that separate us from reality, but what we do with them through our imagination.

The result of all this fantasy that we elaborate is despair for we want to believe that a happy life depends on our social position (Marx) or on the preposterous ideas we elaborate and the fanciful desires we build.

If somebody asks, "What is truth?" anyone of us can answer, "It is what *is*." You, I, all of us are a reality (truth); or rather, truth is evident. And what is a lie? It is the denial of what *is*, it is its omission or corruption—for example, an incorrect law, the existence of which is something impossible to exist except in our imagination. Now, you may say, "But there are so many wrong things." In order for a mistake to occur, an underlying truth must have been distorted. Only truth, goodness and beauty exist by themselves. Our attitude of going against what is true, good and beautiful distorts them and gives rise to evil.

Man has built his civilization and placed in it all the arrogance of which he was capable, and it has not worked out, because everything that he can do will be inferior to himself (since he will not be able to fit into what he has done). This is even a matter of logic. At the same time, Man does not want to accept a real civilization that places economic and social power on an inferior level, in a place where they serve humanity. Man decided to be the owner of truth and started to build the world the way he wanted. Obviously, however, as we are not creators but merely discoverers of truth, we have not succeeded in this intention. Instead, what we have accomplished is this grotesque civilization, which has always been in crisis. In fact, we are observing the falling apart

of the greatest fantasy the human being has ever elaborated in human history, which is the belief in the everlastingness of the material element and of the entire group of individuals who have always made use of physical riches as a way of alienating themselves from true reality. Fortunately, a great part of mankind has a different view of this, and it is this quiet group that is responsible for maintaining some balance.

Man has replaced truth with fantasy, God with his imagination, wanting to believe that infinity lies in what he thinks. Thus, just as he thinks that the oil and forests are inexhaustible—as they would be if fantasy were infinite and reality mediocre—so he believes the Creator is small, and Man infinite. The sickest people want to believe that they are opposed to the world and to truth (God) as if there were other worlds, other truths, and other gods. It is not so and the struggle against all this is the battle against what we have that is real, beautiful, and good. We are, therefore, fighting only one person: the person that each of us is.

Whether he accepts it, or not, Man lives in reality, is nourished by it and can only be happy when he accepts it. At the same time however, when a person says that he does not accept truth, he is saying that he does not accept himself because he himself is a truth, an enormous and incredible created truth, and the greatest that exists. After all, if truth is everywhere, it is in us more than in anything else for we are the greatest wonder of all creation.

### **Platonic and Real Dialectics**

According to the discoveries of Integral Psychoanalysis, we have to admit to two "realities": one that refers to true reality (which is generally the opposite of what we think is real); and the other that refers to our attitude of wanting to build "truth", and this has caused every neurosis, psychosis, nervousness, sin, whatever you care to call it. Indeed, owing to our vision deficiencies, how could we perceive things correctly since our perception is obscured from birth? Still, we can correct this situation with intuition, which asks us only to accept reality. From the very beginning of my work, I noticed the attitude the very sick individuals adopted in relation to the imagination they have about everything, and how impossible it was to work only with this type of behaviour. I began to realize that without a point of reference, it is useless to analyze an individual. This would be just like two blind people relating through their fantasies. After all, did Einstein not say that one could know the speed of a train only by relating it to a still object?

The method I have chosen to work with is dialectical for it seems to me to be the best method available. When I talk about real dialectics, I mean the meeting of two realities in order to form a third one, even if this appears incongruous. For example: only a humble individual is wise and great while the arrogant individual is mediocre. This seems as if it refers to the union of two opposite although convergent ideas. When someone says that he would like not to be lazy, he actually means that he would like not to see himself as lazy. The press itself is accused of spreading confusion when it is only demonstrating the confusion that already exists. This is not true only of laziness but also reflects the confusion we have in the act of seeing. In other words, sight and consciousness only show what exists, which is the representation of life itself since all knowledge and perception are achieved by a process of comparison. I should also mention that we are always the result of two factors—our physical life (father and mother) and, even more, our psychological life, which is the basis of our behaviour.

Most people believe in the existence of powerful forces of evil that exert a strong influence upon them, causing them to make mistakes. Accordingly, they start to

attribute their own aggressiveness to such evil influence. They become attached to the idea that their aggressiveness is “powerful” and are therefore reluctant to give it up. The biggest mistake we can make in therapy is to lend credence to the client’s idea that his aggressiveness is so “powerful” that he can thus hurt himself (self-aggression) and hurt others. This may provide the client with the perfect excuse for abandoning treatment. A large number of people who abandon treatment do so precisely because they think this will be prejudicial to analysis or hurt the analyst.

I have observed that when a client talks about himself he is directing the conversation so as not to reach one of his real problems. However, when a person talks about another he reveals himself. It is impossible for an individual to see himself; he always has to use a mirror. What I mean by this is that nobody is able to recognize himself as he is.

In the analytical process, we must talk about other people in order to reach ourselves. There is no other way. Only the most balanced people are able to achieve the true dialectic. The false (dialectic) is a sickly monologue while the true one brings a relationship with truth (God).

I have noticed that every truth branches into two, enabling us to realize the dialectics that exist in everything that is real. The only way to return to the truth is to use the dialectical process, which links us with the lost truth.

### **Will as the Origin of Illness**

One of the most curious facts in the entire field of psychopathology has been the omission of the will from study, and this has increased its distance even more from philosophy and theology. Just like a cathedral, to be completed Man and even civilization itself require time and the contribution of their predecessors. Why, then, are we so intent on separating science from philosophy and theology? The answer that occurs to me is the desire of the human being to form a science from nothing, as if he were a new creator who could accomplish everything miraculously. Jean Piaget said, "Any man who has not been in contact with philosophy is incurably incomplete."

Science is not an orphan of nature; it has a father and a mother, which are theology and philosophy. I have often wondered about whether we should we create a new way of living, a new philosophy, religion or science, or is the whole truth already there, waiting for our acceptance? If the latter is so, we are forced to admit that we have not given due attention to the great wonders that have been achieved in all areas, and we have damaged ourselves in the process.

What are we — our neuroses, psychoses, illnesses, misunderstandings and errors? No, what we are is truth, reality, the greatest wonder ever created; what we call evil is just an attitude of omission, denial, or distortion of this wonderful reality. We are linked with everything that is bigger, more beautiful and better than we are, and our illness is only the attitude of wanting to destroy this incredible union. We were not born to misfortune and dishonour but to glory and happiness; our true existence is not martyrdom and suffering but joy and satisfaction; we were not born to ignominy but to accomplishment, for creation is everything that is most rich, good, beautiful and pleasant. The universe exists because of light and beauty, not because of darkness and oppression. The darkness and oppression caused by finite human beings highlight the glory of infinity by way of contrast.

Now, if sanity and happiness are within our reach, why do we not accept them? We don’t accept them because we think that we will suffer if we do because then we would have to accept goodness, which we have not created, and this would mean

overcoming envy, anger and rage in order to have a feeling of gratitude—and feelings of gratitude are our happiness, they reflect our acceptance of life, which is love. To live well we have to accept life, but to achieve this we are obliged to give up our megalomania in order to see that existence is a gift we received. In accepting life we will live in truth and beauty and this will be good for us. When we accept what we receive, we immediately establish contact with truth and beauty and allow ourselves to be good to ourselves, meaning accepting health and well-being. Development and perfecting suggest the idea of losing something because they imply the acceptance of reality, which we think to be mediocre, while daydreaming and fantasy appear to be of great advantage because they seem limitless.

Can fantasy be good? If truth is what exists of what is most beautiful, good and real, then imagination (its opposite) can only be tragic and dark. We want to believe the contrary, however, just because fantasy is a genuinely human creation. I believe it to be of fundamental importance to reveal the value that people have attributed to pathology and evil. It's as if we consider these latter to be the basic elements of existence that could throw the universe, perhaps even God himself, out of balance—and all this only because we are the ones who created them. Pathology is identical to evil; it does not exist by itself but exists as an erroneous attitude that a person adopts in relation to goodness, which is the only thing that truly exists.

To become ill we must oppose our reality and health, but to return to goodness we are obliged to dialogue with our own inconsistencies. To such an extent is our situation comical that a client described it as, "I have suffered very much in life from nothing." Illness only exists because of one thing: the rejection of life, and the rejection of life means refusing God.

### **Universal Envy and Theomania**

The twentieth century presented itself with a sombre aspect: we've already had two world wars and are in danger of having a third, which would be our last. We have experienced a noticeable increase in crime, kidnapping, hijacking, robbery and delinquency of all kinds. The large forests are being destroyed, rivers and seas are being polluted, and we are in danger of perishing from the very vegetables we plant and the meat and fish we eat because we have poisoned them. There is, therefore, something terribly wrong with our present civilization, and what is wrong comes from the human mind, which wants to believe that every danger can be overcome in time. This is what I call Theomania. It's the idea that we could have the power of gods and, at a moment's notice, as if by the touch of a magic wand, we could put everything right again. But it is not so.

The human being has placed himself as the centre of the universe. Is not our Modern Age characterized by homocentrism? However, we are not this centre because we are not the basis of everything that exists. This belief is the cause, not only of the civilization we have built collapsing (like a beautiful castle of cards), but also of the fact that man himself seems to be in pieces. The centre of the universe lies within a giant force that makes everything move and gives it all life. Some call it the cosmic force while others name it Jehovah, Allah or God, but whatever we call it, it is one thing only, and we are conscious of it.

What I mean is that we want to be Gods; this is the basis of all our difficulties. It's as if we want to fly without wings or even worse, build the inner and the outer world as we imagine them. I have given this phenomenon the name of Theomania. In this condition, we have formed the idea that the world is wrong and that only we can be

right. We are trying to be the owners of truth, and this truth should be what we think, feel and do, with everything else being either wrong or at least not exactly as we think it should be.

Our idea is that everything has to be created by human beings: cities, industries, commerce, economy and mainly psychological and physical health and, why not say it, the very world itself. This is the basic cause of all human afflictions, and it's also the reason everyone continually asks, "What should I do in order to be well?"

Most people seek three types of things: a) enormous economic profit (wealth through money); b) social status (social and political position); c) complete satisfaction of the libido. However, those who have achieved these things do not feel well. Why? Because these are elements that are inferior to the dignity of the human being. They are helpful elements and not fundamental to our happiness. They are subject to us and not predominant (at least, they should not be).

Apparently, Man has built a civilization that is the opposite of what it should be; that is, it is subject to material interests. We are inside an inverted psychosocial scheme, and psychotherapists and psychoanalysts have done nothing so far to correct this situation, which is exactly the cause of all our estrangements.

We think that the obvious is mediocre. But look at your hands, your own body, the fields with their animals and flowers, space with its billions of stars, and ask, "Can there be greater grandiosity?" And yet we insist on being dazzled by the heap of ideas put forward by the more imaginative among us — to such an extent that Immanuel Kant, possibly Mankind's greatest thinker, demonstrated that it is possible to arrive at opposite conclusions by using the same argument. Madness, therefore, lies in the way we use reasoning, which is the madman in the house, and not feeling, which is balance because it is love. With reasoning we can fancy anything; with affection (love), we can only love. We think that life is mediocre but it is the only thing essentially ours. We want to believe that our imagination is great, brilliant and beautiful, yet it is merely a dim light. We have a universal feeling of envy towards the Creator, which leads us to reject the whole magnificence of His work, closing our eyes before everything that is *really* beautiful and magnificent. And by closing our eyes to the world, we are closing them to ourselves.

For what other reason are we loquacious when we complain about life or attack the honour of other people, and parsimonious when we must praise and show gratitude? Client C. J., my Japanese client, said that we insist on being crazy because doing so is our attempt to diminish the greatness of the Creator's action—although perhaps she did not realize that our greatness, which is linked to the Creator's, would have been diminished, too.

In the Time magazine published in the first week of April, there was an article that pointed out that scientists are finally realizing the existence of God—which is equivalent to saying that they are finally giving God permission to exist.

After having tried to separate from truth, the human being imagined reality according to his ideas, thereby placing himself in the position of bestower (Sartre). He has imagined that his flaws have such a great dimension that the Creator himself suffers from them. We rarely think that any error signifies an attitude of loss practiced against ourselves, and this can only do us harm. All the greatness and beauty that exist do not at all tremble before man's fury towards them, and every illness implies an attitude against only one person: each of us. No one can be against God or truth because he is neither a God nor the truth; one can only be against oneself.

## **Conscientising and Interiorising**

The process we use is pretty much the opposite of that used by traditional psychoanalysis. Ours attempts to embrace the entire immense reality that exists around us and also mainly in our inner selves, that we do not want to see while Freud's method attempted to make conscious half a dozen repressed elements in the psychological structure that came from the external world. We are of the opinion that the most pathological aspect in human beings is the one that prevents both our own inner self and the external world from existing.

Consciousness is not formed by us. Instead, it seems to be a factor that transcends Man's will (Husserl). It is not like knowledge, which generally depends upon our effort. Whether we want it or not, there is something in our own inner self that points out to us our denial, omission and alteration of the truth, as well as providing a feeling of great joy for the good that we do. The Hellenic philosophers called this "the voice of God." Both consciousness and intuition show us the truth, like camera flashes, and these are the moments of contact with everything that is eternal and which, by the way, we are experiencing here.

The really necessary consciousness is that that is related to the alteration, omission, or denial of our truth, beauty and goodness, for what is correct exists by itself and does not have to be worried about. After all, was truth our own creation? So we have only to worry about the problems we create when we create impediments to all the marvels that exist. The more consciousness we accept the more beauty, truth and goodness we shall find everywhere — especially in our inner selves.

We think that to accomplish good is to benefit someone else or even truth itself and not ourselves. We can only effectively help one person: who we are, and nobody else. Therefore, the central point in the sickly attitude is the perception that the idea of harming or helping whoever is actually harming or helping ourselves.

After many years as a psychoanalyst I found myself at a dead-end, and then I realized my great misunderstanding in wanting to calm down someone through his or her relationship with someone else. The search for someone else is always the search for alienation, an escape from oneself. The idea (incidentally the very modern one) of finding happiness through somebody else is exactly the intention that has prevailed among humanity since its beginning, which is that of placing the reason for one's life in external elements, and we know that such an attitude is the foundation of all alienation. Every time we look for happiness in something external we will be wasting our time because this will always be an attitude of escape.

The famous Oedipus complex is a social fact that, when interpreted psychologically, shows us our relationship with our inner self, both in the emotional field and in the field of thinking. Only through handling it psychologically (in an interiorized way) will we be able to find peace. The human being is like a cosmos; he has everything that he needs inside himself. Furthermore, he has the Creator's hand moving in his inner self. It is clear no one can escape from what does not exist and since everything that does exist is good, we can only escape from what is good for us.

The human being could not be more perfect than he is. Very often we have the idea that we could, through a mysterious process of evolution, arrive at an incredible stage of progress. Seldom do we think that we already have it and that it is only waiting to be used. Every time we imagine a different existence we use a process of escape. The process of conscientising is always an interiorizing process because it is the act of accepting in the inner self what it already is. The person who feels lonely is one who tries to separate himself from his inner self, for contact with our inner life never makes us lonely.

Throughout our lives, we search for peace in social institutions, in external forms of existing, in certain exercises, even in hedonic pleasures, and we “forget” that peace dwells fundamentally in our inner self, or rather in the relationship with the truth that is there. What we look for in distant places, sometimes in other countries or regions, is already within us. It seems that our inner self is shallow but it is, in fact, deeper than the whole universe because it is what is most closely and eternally linked with the Creator, and therefore, to infinity, where we will stay forever. What I mean is that the human being is the most perfect element on Earth, and thus everything that exists regarding politics, science, philosophy, economy, religion, art, has arisen from this centre, which is us. It is interesting that this realization is possible only now because of the closing of the complete circle of civilization: theology, philosophy and science have been integrated into something that is no longer religion, philosophy or science in their traditional sense (unilateral), but the so-called cosmic man capable of embracing the perception of the whole universe.

On the one hand, there has been a generalized resistance to each of these particular areas, while on the other there has been an attempt to arrive at a true perception of them all because the truth of religion is the same as that of science and of philosophy. All of them constitute the same reality, which was harmed when it was separated from Man's inner self. Now this reality is returning through the acceptance of the integral human being.

### **Integral Psychoanalysis**

The complete methodology and hypotheses of Integral Psychoanalysis were completed this year, and this is my first presentation about this science. The United States of America is the ideal country for this owing to the practical character of its civilization. What we have accomplished is not a science in its traditional, positivist sense. Nor is it a philosophy or a religion; it is the three at the same time, thus forming something different, which we call truth, reality.

To conduct psychotherapy is a simple thing because it consists only of accepting the obvious—and even here we have made a mountain out of a molehill. Little by little, culture itself has been emerging from the intricate jungle of intellectualism and entering the open field of intuition and consciousness. Not only Henri Bergson but also Husserl decided to focus on these immediate data from the psychological life, while Herman Keyserling stated that he had been noticing a "progressive and dangerous mechanization and intellectualization of Man." Before them, Kant had already declared that an individual could "prove" anything through reasoning and then use the same facts to arrive at a completely opposite conclusion (Kant: *Critique of Pure Reason* and *Critique of Practical Reason*). This is because we think that we are gods, the creators of truth (Theomania). We only believe what we think but this is temporary thinking and as we are in infinity we become considerably mediocre when we replace the eternal with the temporary.

The field of psychotherapy is not biological (medical) nor is it social (a term that has been frequently exploited by psychologists) or religious. If it were any one of these there would be no more difficulties in the world. It is also not philosophical only but a mixture of the three: religious, philosophical and scientific, and these together form the real human being. Isn't it Gestalt (Ehrenfels) that says that the whole is greater than just the sum of its parts? The same can be said of the human being; he is not the feeling or the thought or the action, but all of these, forming something much greater.

We have put the attitude of creating fantasies (which is typical of sickly conduct) in opposition to reality, and so we have imagination created by us (with all its daydreams) on one hand and, truth (everything that is) on the other hand. However, the latter need not, nor can it ever be, proved by us because it is above the intellect and knowledge. These latter constitute parts of the truth but cannot fully contain it. When the word "truth" is mentioned to someone, he automatically relates it to everything that exists, principally to a formidable cosmic force that is given several names, including Jehovah, Allah, God, Infinite Power, etc. We have what we might call "flashes", quick perceptions, but above all we have the consciousness that we can rest on this force. All of our denial can only be related to something that exists; we cannot deny a denial. Just the fact that we can say no implies the necessity for the existence of a reality that can be denied. Indeed, we can only fight against truth; it would not be a fight otherwise. We cannot fight against the meaningless words "tarop" or "larip" because they are nothing and therefore do not offer any reason for opposition.

In many parts of the world there are groups of thinkers, religious people and scientists who are beginning to denounce all the errors that the sicker groups have inflicted on the whole of society. These thinkers are bringing to society the consciousness it has lacked, especially the consciousness of all the riches that exist not only in material properties but also mainly in our inner self. At the moment such a task seems difficult but many individuals are appearing who are willing to assume this responsibility. In any event, with the continuous reduction of perishable values, those that are imperishable (the psychological) are beginning to take precedence. There is, actually, no other way for Mankind to go. Is another really necessary? We have little desire to realize how we trample on all beauty and truth like flowers strewn on the ground. We step as if we were blind. If, for just one moment, we could tear off this veil of obscuration and

see truth, we would certainly be dazzled by so much beauty, as was the Apostle Paul, and we would give up our attachment to the immediate, as Thomas Aquinas did when he wanted to burn all his writings, thinking them to be as nothing compared to the flame of love he had in his heart when contemplating the eternal truth.

I used to think that it was very difficult to attach ourselves to God, but now I see that all of us are linked to Him and our problem is exactly the contrary: we do not want to accept this. The human being cannot adopt an attitude because it is not in accordance with truth. Every time a person performs an action it is through Pure Act (as Aristotle called it), but every time he denies, omits or alters the action, this creates the strongly dissatisfied sick man, as psychopathology confirms for us. As Man is made in the image and likeness of God, who is the essence of truth, beauty and goodness, if we oppose these essential qualities, we are in fact opposing ourselves. The human being is similar to God so we cannot oppose truth, beauty and goodness or we oppose ourselves. Goodness, truth, and beauty are also in our inner self (Socrates, Augustine); we do not have to do anything but accept what we already have, which was not created by us. We were endowed with incredible gifts and if we accepted them, we would already be the "Homo Divinas" speculated by the evolutionists.

Now, you may ask, "Is what you're talking about correct?" Well, I would answer, science says that it is the results that reveal the true science, and our clients are very happy. I believe that this is the most significant factor.

## THIRD PART

### Summary

From the beginning of my analytical work, I made use of logotherapy combined with orthodox Freudian psychoanalysis; after eight years, I used the discoveries of Melanie Klein and finally I followed W. R Bion's orientation. As I studied the other methods of psychotherapy, I observed that all of them tried to fit the client into a certain line of behaviour in an attitude of teaching, directing and leading.

The first and probably most decisive discovery I made was the perception that we have inside the consciousness of reality independent of our own will. Now, if we have such an element, it is because we also have the truth firmly rooted within us. This means we do not have to build or do anything but accept the truth and let it flow through our lives. Obviously, this discovery was made during the sessions of analysis, mainly with the more anguished people.

The idea that there is an inner factor that can cause illness, whether it's the unconscious or instincts of danger, death, aggression, etc., will cause anyone to feel enormous affliction, pretty much maintaining the medieval idea that it's devils in our inner self that bring us evil.

The psychoanalytical theory that it's the unconscious that generates neuroses could be the greatest deception of the twentieth century, and it provides us with the idea that we have unlimited power. Carl Gustav Jung extended this power to a collective unconscious and made the unconscious even more powerful. Completing the triad was Alfred Adler who stated that we are victims of an inferiority complex, and so I will declare that we give ourselves airs owing only to an enormous superiority complex of megalomania. As a matter of fact, Transactional Analysis starts from this point and completes the human being's alienation. A basic and initial wickedness does not exist. What we do have is an attitude of opposition to reality (which is good) that prevents reality from manifesting. This is our illness. We do not have, fiends and demons inside us that should be destroyed, but we do have an attitude of opposing what exists, and it's this that causes us affliction.

If we talk about unbalance, we imply that there is an attitude of removing balance; when we talk about insanity we are saying that we go against sanity. It's etymology itself that shows us this.

What I mean is that so-called human civilization has been organized in a manner that is the opposite of the true one in all aspects: philosophical, religious and scientific, although reality still forms the base and supports everything. For example, in the area of thought, the idea abounds that truth is something boring and sombre while fantasy is necessary to life, a kind of lenitive balsam. In the religious area, we want to believe that faith is something we should build rather than accepting as something that already exists, even inside us. In the area of science, we want to believe that we are the constructors of human existence. For a long time, I have noticed that nature itself experiences serious disturbances, like earthquakes, hurricanes and storms. Plants themselves have defects and illnesses that can be catastrophic to them. Numerous times, animals adopt erroneous attitudes when ingesting dangerous objects and poisoned food, or even in their sexual lives where we can observe cases of aberration, homosexuality, etc. Thus, the physical, physiological, world is always subject to real ravages.

In the case of human beings, what we observe is that we are in the same situation as that of nature, subject to the same misfortunes (illnesses, aberrations and

death), even if we are different from it in some points. Then, we have to believe that there is something wrong with us.

The first thing that occurs to my mind is the fact that we are in a privileged position, as we are practically the only beings gifted with consciousness, reasoning and will, "owners" of the physical, vegetable and animal world; yet, we suffer from the same pains as animals and plants do. I believe that we are living what I call an error of perspective. We disagree with our real structure (essence), we are in opposition to what we really are and we do not allow ourselves to be what we really are. I attribute this phase displacement to the fact that we want to be gods (and not to live with God). And, as we can only really be what we are if yoked to the Creator, and we do not accept Him, we are living on an inferior level. Does our brain not work with only five or eight percent of its capability? I am trying to point out that, when "separated" (in terms) from God, we are no longer human beings. For this reason, almost everything that man does aims at proving that he can be, without the Creator.

I used the expression "to yoke " to imply that we are indefectibly linked with the Creator to accomplish a divine task, but what we are actually doing is animal work, totally without value to mankind proper. It seems to me that when a religious man says "man's sin", he is referring to the fact that one does not want to live as a human being (by refusing God), living like an animal (without consciousness of divinity), in an eternal attitude of being right and wrong. Thus, we can affirm that our great error is that of rejecting consciousness. For this reason, Freudism (in the same way as Marxism and Einstein's relativity theory) was the result of centuries of enthusiasm for the human being's creative power, which is being demolished now that it is being put to the confirmation.

There is the idea that one could cause serious damage to the world and everyone by adopting a pathological conduct just like Faust (Goethe), who saw enormous possibilities before him, by selling his soul to the devil; or like Satan approaching Christ and saying: "Adore me, and I will give thee the whole world, with its riches." And think that he was talking to the very owner of the universe and all its riches. Thus is the sickly mind when intending to see infinite power in its evil attitudes—forgetting that in health we are like the sun, and in illness like the same sun except that now it is out.

I believe that every true science emanates from the same point, from which true religion and philosophy arise. Thus, there is no inconsistency between one and the other. Indeed, if there is discordance, it is a sign that one of them is wrong. But it is only by experience (since we are corporal beings) that we shall be able to test the correctness of ideas and feelings; let us say that one needs the other, but only the result will tell us how right or wrong we are. I would like to tell you that we do not consider philosophy, religion and science as united, but as a trinomial, or rather, as integrated.

The human being looks at himself and sees inherent truth, beauty and goodness. If he likes it and accepts what he sees, he develops to infinity. But, in order to love himself, he has to accept the love, beauty and truth that exist by themselves within himself and which reflect the divine within himself. In other words, we have to accept the Creator in order to be what we are, because we cannot really be human beings unless we love the divine being, in whose image and likeness we were made.

If we look at ourselves and do not accept what we see, it is because we must admit that what we have depends on the existence of infinite truth, beauty and goodness, which we did not create. When we begin to oppose, inverting what we are, rejecting all the light that floods us, we fall into darkness. In the parent-child

relationship, when the child accepts its qualities, it accomplishes the right dialectical process and grows up. However, when it opposes, alters or denies what it truly is, it becomes afflicted.

All the brightness of stars is in our inner self, and much more. In it there is such rightness that, if we permit its existence, we shall be like the most beautiful and refulgent lights of space. For this reason, we can say that the act of hate is an attack against the sight of God that we see in others or in ourselves.

The present age, called permissive, shows a good psychosocial development by giving the human being the opportunity to carry out his right to be virtuous. We know that something forbidden (by social laws), becomes more attractive to Man—and we might say that the very fact that it is forbidden indicates that it has been overvalued. On the other hand, not to do something just because of a social rule is no merit at all. The most permissive being that exists is the Creator, for to Him everything is permitted, since He is the whole of what exists. We, created in His image and resemblance, also have all His permissiveness to live what life is, but fail to enjoy life owing to our denial, omission or distortion of what is real. We were created in a paradise and we have everything live in it. All we have to do is accept it and not reject it.

To those who object strongly to our discoveries, what I have to say is that in the therapy field all the sick people who did analysis with us recovered—from either psychological or organic illnesses. And not just simple illnesses, but even serious ones: people carrying tumours (malignant or not), leukaemia, convulsions, ulcers in different parts of the body. During the years I worked with Hospital das Clinicas (the largest one in Latin America), I only had cases that medicine had given up, and all of them recovered.

Anyway, theories are theories, and there is no one who can really say what man is, because he is much greater than anything one thinks of him; any definition deals only with a part of him and, as a consequence, is inferior to what he is.

## **PRACTICAL CASES OF CLIENT ANALYSIS THROUGH THE METHODOLOGY OF INTEGRAL PSYCHOANALYSIS**

*The following are translations into English of original, verbatim transcriptions in Portuguese of actual sessions of Integral Psychoanalysis performed by Dr. Norberto Keppe with various patients, including a manic depressive and a suicidal patient.*

Client M.M has been sick for 12 years. She has been an in-patient in intermittent periods for the last three years.

Origin: Hungarian

She has been doing Integral Psychoanalysis for a year.

M. M. (First recorded session)

M— I. says that she hasn't any time left.

K— Pardon?

M— I. says that she hasn't any time left. I'm selfish, yes, lazy... I suffer.

K— Look, you are talking about yourself through I.

M— I know this, doctor. I've already mentioned this to you.

K— Except that you are censoring this consciousness.

M— Have you censored me?

K— You want to censor this consciousness.  
M— I don't understand this.  
K— Censor the consciousness of this.  
M— I don 't understand.  
K— Give me an idea without understanding.  
M— Reject? Doctor, I don't know what to say. The doctor is in danger.  
K— What is this danger?  
M SILENCE  
K— What, for example?  
M— I don 't know.  
K— Give me an idea of what you could do that might be dangerous.  
M— It's suicide, isn't it?  
K— Then, what is this in your inner psychological self: to commit suicide?  
M— Ah! That I don't know, either.  
K— Say it anyway.  
M— To put an end to everything.  
K— Then, see, you want to put an end to everything. Put an end to the whole world.  
M— No, that I don't want to do. I have nothing to do with the world. The world has something to do with me, but I... who am I to put an end to the world? That is nonsense. No, not that.  
K— You said that the world has something to do with you, but you have nothing to do with the world. Look. You think it is the world that owes you an obligation. You have nothing to do with that. You talk as if you were a goddess.  
M— God worries about the world...  
K— You have this idea that you can put an end to the whole world by committing suicide.  
M— No.  
K— An idea, such as attacking the world, putting an end to everything that exists, with life, with truth, with beauty.  
M— But I am an obstacle, I am an obstacle to my family. I act foolishly at the cost of others.  
K— You're saying that the world is an obstacle, that your family, everything that exists is an obstacle to your getting what you really want.  
M— Dr. Keppe, you are going against me. Whatever I say, you begin to go against. I have observed this for a long time.  
K— I am showing you that you are the one who is doing that.  
M— I, during the weekend... I don't know why... I don't know. I don't know why. I don't know why. I don't know.  
K— What do you think about the weekend? What do you think is going to happen?  
M— I don' t know. I don't know. I'm going to irritate everybody and then.. .  
K— Or you are going to irritate yourself, aren't you?  
M— Yes.  
K— Right, but why are you going to irritate yourself so much?  
M— I don't know, doctor. I don 't know.  
K— Give me an idea, anyway.  
M— With negative thoughts.  
K— For example?  
M— I'm anxious. I become nervous. I become irritated. I become ...

K- What do you think negatively about?  
M- About everything.  
K- For example.  
M- About my life.  
K- About what in your life?  
M- I'm a coward.  
K- What do you want to do with your life?  
M- I have spoilt... of my life.. .  
K- You didn't spoil your life. Your whole life is there. It is beautiful and delightful. It's all there.  
M- Yes, I know.  
K- You didn't succeed in spoiling life. It is not possible to do so.  
M SILENCE  
K- Observe that your intention is to spoil life. It is to fight against life and you don't succeed in doing so because life goes on existing.  
(The patient sighed deeply) – (ten-minute pause)  
K- Have you calmed down a little?  
M SILENCE  
K- What did you say?  
M SILENCE  
K- You really have calmed down and you don 't want to admit that analysis has been good for you. Analysis is life itself, consciousness itself that gives good things. You don't want to see the good things that life has to offer you.  
K- You see? If you stop for a moment to consider a little your ingratitude toward life... this, you want to throw away all this that you have, this beauty, which you have, you want to throw away. . . excessive envy... which you have. . . you see this for a while... because it is not a problem... there is no problem. You are the one who creates problems. You are denying, altering, rejecting life. The problem is this: the rejection of consciousness . . .

M. M. (Second recorded session — 03-03-80)

M SPEAKING QUIETLY  
K— Pardon?  
M SILENCE  
K— What do you have there? Your knife? What happened?  
M— Rope.  
K— Rope? Have you tried to hang yourself? Tell me what happened.  
M— No. No. It will become difficult on a nail. No. It's also only a skipping rope. And I haven't ... found the name for .. .  
K— Where did you hang the rope?  
M- Ah, there isn't either... it is in the ... on the wardrobe door.  
K- And did the rope break?  
M- No! It pulled tight, but it didn't pull tight this way so I only ended up by vomiting.  
K— And then, you got up.  
M— And nobody... Nobody... and then, I... I... I said that I had brushed myself with the hair brush and hurt myself but I don't know if they believe it or not.  
K- So, it's a sign that you, in fact, didn't want to kill yourself.  
M SILENCE  
K— But lie down to have yourself analysed.

M— Doctor, I say that the body ... then my husband was going to give a lift to the maid, taking a little table that she had bought for her family.

K— Speak louder.

M— I went out. I was at the end, wasn't I, of the car and when eh! My husband promised the maid he would take her with a little table that she had bought. She lives there at, at Jardim Santa Emilia, there, where you find that bus from here. I went along, because he asked me so much, to go out. I went along. Dad went. We came back. I was in a sweat then, after such a long time. I took Mum the clothes, and... and washed them. Then I went shopping at the supermarket with my mother. I got some drinks, soft drinks and I don't know what. I carried everything like a fool, worked. At night, R's and E's friends arrived... till they went out to... to dance and I was there all... Then I laughed doctor. I laughed. I talked and... and... and... and after I washed the little crockery that was left.

At eleven o'clock, I went to bed and with father everything and... and doctor I didn't sleep a wink on that night from Saturday to Sunday, not a wink. I only walked. I got up, went to bed, went to... went to the girl's room. There is a little lipstick there. I went to look outside and then father also woke up. He went to make coffee at half past four in the morning. Later R. arrived with J. She was feeling bad, and, we put her to bed and... she felt sick in the car and she hadn't drunk any alcohol and nothing like it. On Sunday, I was working and... and everything doctor. (Whining). That night I slept but doctor that I just can't do again. I was scared. At nine o'clock my mother came to get me out of bed. I didn't want to get up. I was scared again doctor. What is happening to me?

K— But when did you attempt to commit suicide?

M— Friday.

K— On Friday, why Friday?

M— Yes, one doesn't know which. . . but it doesn't work!

K— But then, on Saturday you went shopping and everything and didn't sleep at night.

M— Hum, hum, not even for a while.

K— Why? What was it that you kept on thinking about at night?

M— I don't know. I was nervous, apathetic, with R., and... and I couldn't... I couldn't sleep, in the morning and... and I don't know and... and in the morning I worked too and... Ah! I washed a blanket! My blanket that was. . . and then I took the opportunity ... and took off the strip... around it and which was damaged... and put it in the bathtub and cleaned it with this... cleaned it with the... and I took advantage of the sun, everything and... Oh! and I was happy as a lark because even though I hadn't slept, I was (whining) happy as a lark because I was enjoying that ... that I... I was working and father was happy and everything and... and... Now I am scared again and I don't... don't... I don't want to do anything and... and I wept this morning when I was having breakfast. Dona M. came. It was about 9 o'clock or more and I was crying. Tears are not life doctor. Then L., you know yesterday, she... she said that she didn't want to study anymore, that she doesn't do her homework, that she passed her driving school test, says that she is a good student, does parking and everything, she doesn't knock down anything and... so, I don't know doctor, no way!

K— What do you think about I.'s attitude?

M— I..... makes me become so nervous. I get irritated. Sometimes, she says that she doesn't believe anymore in that house. Someday, she is going to pack her suitcase and leave, doctor.

- K— So, but what do you think about I.'s attitude?
- M— Ah! She, the always... something, she says that she is not going to French classes anymore. She says that she is going... going to try to get back the money she paid for the registration fee and everything. She says it 's no use because... and she wanted so much to continue everything and it's a sacrifice to pay because everything is so expensive and everything. And she starts having her own things, and... and finishes us off and everybody. Now, I came to know that it is not only in my house that there are problems. There are problems in every house. M. told me about the others.
- K— Then, but you see... that your daughter I., she is refusing, she is refusing driving school, refusing university, refusing French lessons. The difficulty. . . is in refusing the things that she has, refusing life itself. The difficulty comes because of the refusal of life, not because of what may happen.
- M— I should go to the dentist. I have loose teeth. Without... without doing anything they are loose. I'm always touching there. I can't bear it doctor. No, I don't have the courage to make an appointment with the dentist because I... I (whining). It is at Boa Vista. I don't... I don't... I don't want to go now. I don 't want to get up in the morning again doctor.
- K— Why do you keep on touching this tooth with your tongue?
- M— (whining) I have been doing this for so long, inserting... It is already possible to take it with my fingers and remove it.
- K— Then, but why do you do this with the tongue on your tooth?
- M— I do it up there, on the gums, on the...
- K— Do you notice that it's you who is destroying your teeth?
- M— Yes... I know.
- K— So, it is an example of what you do with your life.
- M— Doctor, where did that come from... doctor?
- K— Give me an idea.
- M— I don 't know. . . I don't know. It was suddenly... I went yesterday at six o'clock. It was about six o'clock. I, I took the... went for a walk with her... she saw... It's been so long, such a long time that I haven't gone with the... I thought that I was going to continue. What nonsense doctor (weeping)! I can't again doctor (weeping). Oh! My God. . . doctor. . .
- K— But try to see all these interpretations I gave you. You didn't stop to think about any of them. Didn't you say that on Saturday you had gone to the Supermarket, went shopping, you worked, did a lot of things? It means that you have begun to accept life. Then you began to deny what is... This is the depressing attitude, the attitude of depressing life.
- M— But doctor why?
- K— Why what?
- M— Why just like the other time I slept... Why did I get up by the door. I woke up by the door afraid and everything doctor: Why?
- K— So you talked about yourself through I. Didn't you say that I. doesn't want to go to university, she doesn't want French lessons, doesn't want to have driving classes. You are just the same. You want nothing more to do with life. Now it's me that is asking. Why?
- M— Because I think it is so difficult. I did doctor. I made plans. I started speaking about you, saying that you performed miracles. Then I saw that... going with a friend of mine... with the... that now... and doesn't come back anymore, does it. She said that she has a house at the beach and that if she doesn't go... she also

comes and goes and I wanted to go with her to the beach and... and I wanted to renew my driver's license and everything... everything... everything... everything.

K— You deny everything too, don't you? You didn't take any more medicines, did you? Have you been taking medicines? Psicosedin?

M

K— So.

M— But doctor I lost my cool and went into euphoria.

K— You can see that medicine harms you much more than it helps and it produces an artificial state like this of great madness. You can see that it is harmful.

M— But it is to calm me down.

K— Didn't you become euphoric?

M— But, but I think that this doesn't have anything to do with Psicosedin, does it?

K— Yes, it does.

M— How is that? That is to calm people down!

K— Then you see that the result is the opposite. The medicine is the alienation that you don't, in any way, want to give up.

M— Doctor, my house is a house of mad people doctor.

K— You said: "My house is a house of mad people." You are talking about your inner self, that you see a lot of madness in your inner self. This house is your psychic house.

M— Oh, doctor! I'm mad. Everybody is mad there.

K— Speak louder. What?

M— Everybody is together with me there. Yes everybody together there... everybody doctor.

K— Is everybody mad?

M— Yes, each one has... has his own tic... has his... doctor.

K— Yes, but each one must see his own madness, his own tics.

M— Then why... why... is my husband so gentle and everything one day and then a rascal the next, doctor?

K— Why?

M— ... through this question I'm trying to get at why I. says that he's the one who commits brutalities.

K— In what way?

M— She says that I'm here because of him. I didn't want to talk about.. .

K— About the brutalities you commit against your own self. The brutalities you commit against your life.

M— I. was attacking me and... and... I've already told you that I'm no longer her mother... she is right, doctor. I (weeping) have abandoned everything.

K— So, I. shows you the consciousness of your attitude of rejecting everything. You say that you have nothing else to do with this, that you are not the mother of this consciousness that you don't want. Whether you feel it or not, you have sanity inside you, but with your attitude you damage the sanity you have.

M— Why? What is it you keep thinking so much about?

K— About sanity?

M— Yes.

K— This is what you do with your sanity. You damage it.

M— No. But the sanity.

K— This is what you do against your life, wanting to finish your life off, finish life off, isn't that it? You don't want to be grateful to life.

M— But I ask why I became like this. Why has everything happened to me to make me (weeping) like this (weeping).

K— Nothing has happened to you. It 's you that does it. You are not a victim of anything. You have everything good that exists, but it's you who destroys it, who fights against it. Do you know why?

M— No.

K— Because you have sanity, you have truth, beauty, goodness in your inner self. What does this goodness remind you of? Speak without stopping to think.

M— I don 't know.

K— But say it even without knowing. Say it.

M— Goodness reminds me more... I don't know doctor.

K— But say it. What do these qualities of goodness, truth and beauty that exist in your inner self, remind you of? Say it.

M— Love.

K— And love, what does it remind you of? Say it.

M— (Weeping).

K— So all this makes you think of what? Don't you want to say it?

M— About life.

K— What?

K— About life (whispering) about life (louder).

K— Life? And what is life?

M— That which God has offered us.

K— So, what God has given. It's this that you don't want to admit.

M— Doctor (weeping).. .

K— You have all that's good and fight against it.

M— (Weeping).

K— Fighting against all the good things that exist.

M— Oh, doctor! (weeping).

K

M— Oh, doctor! (weeping).

K— You don' t have an illness, you have an attitude of creating illness, of fighting against goodness.

M— But why? (weeping).

K— . . . .

M— (Weeping).

**M. M. — 3<sup>rd</sup> Session — 05-03-80**

M— I almost couldn't get here. Everything was under water.

K— Flooded.

M— Almost missed my appointment. Doc, I'm not well at all.

K— Then let's analyse you.

M— It has been a horrible day doctor.

K— Let's analyse why. Lie down to be analysed. Tell me about this horrible day.

M— No. It 's an anxiety I have, Doc. My period has started, Doc. I don't think I have treatment for menopause.

K— Talk about the.. .

M— There isn't anything to say. I was very anxious. I still am... am, except that I want to do something doctor. I can't stand my present state, I... I... I can 't stand it. I couldn't eat anything for lunch. I felt as if I was going to be sick. This has been happening to me lately. I've lost weight. I can 't use *any of* my clothes any more.

K— Do you think that your menopause is causing you anxiety?

M— I don't think so, but it's everybody, my mother, Dona M. Everybody is picking on me, but it must be my menopause too that's bothering me and I don't know what else.

K— Then, what do you think is making you anxious?

M— I don't know. Everyday I keep pushing this blister that I have up here on my gum and I keep pushing all day long and... and... this little thing that I have here, you know?

K— Why do you do that?

M— When I'm nervous I do it, so I just keep on doing it, Doc. It forms a blister and I keep playing about with it with my tongue. But this is nothing new.

K— Do you want to destroy your teeth?

M— I've spoilt them.

K— Do you want to spoil your teeth?

M— But doctor, it's not a tic.

K— Why do you have this tic?

M— SILENCE

K— Then why do you have it?

M— Ah! Why I don't know but... but it gives me... it gives me that wish to... to...to... that wish that I can't... I can't control.

K— Why do you want to take your teeth out?

M— I don't want to Doc. I have... I... Look, I've already cried. I don't want to lose my teeth doctor. Why am I vomiting doctor? Why do I keep feeling that I'm going to be sick lately?

K— What does "to be sick " mean in a psychological sense?

M— Ah! That I don't know.

K— Suggest something.

M— I don't know doctor.

K— It doesn't matter. I only wanted a suggestion.

M— Throwing away.

K— Throwing away what?

M— Throwing away.

K— Throwing away what?

M— Useless things.

K— You want to get rid of useless things.

K— Yes, but to vomit food... Isn't food a good thing?

M— Yes, it is.

K— Well then. It's to throw away a good thing, to throw it away.

M— Doctor, I... I'll never get better, doctor. I need the help of... of... of medicines, Doc.

K— What do you mean when you talk about "being well" ?

M— It's to be normal.

K— Tell me in practice, what does it mean: to be normal?

M— Well, it's to be... work.. .

K— Do you think that at that time, when you took medicines, you were better?

M— To some extent but I don't know. Sometimes I was able to produce.

K— Because of the medicines?

M— Yes, they helped me.

K— What did you produce at that time?

M— I worked, didn't I?

K— What did you do?  
M— I did knitting, embroidery, went to the bank.  
K— You yourself said that you left the knitting for M., for your mother.  
M— Yes, when I didn't want to do it anymore, I handed it over to M., didn't I?  
K— So then, you never did any real work, work that you should have done.  
M— . . . household work. . .  
K— Yes, carry on. . .  
M— Today my mother said, and everybody else, that I wanted to wash up for her. She said that it is the mother's obligation when the maid was not there. The mother is the one who has to do it and not she, the grandmother. It's not she who should be doing the drudgery and she said that I, Doc, am only pretending to be ill. She said it is all pretence out of laziness, that I look like a loony when I begin to make faces and really I do, doctor.  
K— You think that your illness is more pretence than anything else.  
M— No. My mother thinks so and so does I.  
K-- But you are talking about yourself through I. and your mother.  
M— That's not true.  
K— You are saying that it is true.  
M— No. I have a big problem. I can 't live. I'm vegetating at the expense of others.  
Vegetating at the expense of others.  
K— You want to vegetate and not live.  
M— No. I don't want to vegetate. I would rather not live. I can't. For me, everything becomes a problem, everything. I have difficulty, great difficulty. I'm scared. I'm very scared. I'm anxious and afraid, Doc.  
K— Afraid of what?  
M— Afraid of life.  
K— What is it that life is doing to you?  
M— Stirring me up.  
K— Life is not persecuting you.  
M— It is.  
K— It's you that is persecuting life.  
M— I want to undergo a course of treatment.  
K— What course of treatment?  
M— Treatment to get better.  
K— To get better from what?  
M— From my state.  
K— But you are a victim of your attitude.  
M— But I can't get away from it.  
K— You want to get away from life. You are fighting against life. Don't you realize that you are fighting against life? Fighting practically against God.  
M— I'm fighting against life.  
K— So, your illness is this: You are fighting against life.  
M— I'm going to go mad, Doc.  
K— Mad with anger. What you are going to do is to realize that you are mad with anger against life. You are already mad with anger. What is it that life has done to you?  
That's why you are rebelling against life.  
M— I would like to know the reason why.  
K— You are mad at life, are mad at God. You envy God.  
LONG PAUSE.  
K— You have thrown life away.

M— Yes, thrown it away.

**M. M. — 4<sup>th</sup> Session — 18-08-80**

K— Please, go to the couch.

M SILENCE

K— Please, lie down on the couch.

M— Doctor, what despair I feel (crying to herself).

K— Why don' t you want to go to the couch?

M— I ask why there are so many things that I don't want.

A THREE-MINUTE PAUSE

M— Doc, I made an effort, curled my hair, took a blanket and started to crochet around it, but that's as far as it got, Doc (short pause). How far will this laziness go Doc?

K— Is it laziness that bothers you?

M— I'm thinking, aren't I? If I don't have these resources and this help that I have, what am I going to do Doc? Why don't I want to work, Doc, why? (lamenting).

K— I think that you work too much, do you hear! In the opposite direction. Do you know how?

M— Against life, is that it?

K— Yes. You make a violent effort against everything.

M— Have you told my husband that?

K— Why?

M— That is what I'm asking (brief pause). But have you told him doctor?

K—What?

M— Pardon?

K— For what reason?

M— Why do I ask?

K— Yes.

M— Ah, because I think it's interesting to know, don't you think?

K— Why do you think it's interesting to know? Do you want him to know or don't you want him to know?

M— I don't think that I want him to know, do I?

K— Why?

M— Then he'll go for me, doctor. Now, I... I already... I've already said that sometimes at home. I said that you think that I reject everything, isn't that true? That I've already told, for example, doctor, that I want to get up early in the morning.. .

K— Now, you asking this through your husband, this "husband of yours" is you yourself, you ask: Can M. know about this? This husband that goes for you is you censoring yourself. You attack this perception, this consciousness.

A ONE-MINUTE PAUSE

M— I see how others work for me. Because of this, I feel desperate. So, I want to do something, but I don't do anything, Doc. I disappear. So, I disappear.

K— Look, Mrs. M., you make a tremendous effort to deny what you want to do, to disappear. This is what calls for a lot of effort.

M— To disappear?

K— You know that when you do something, especially for yourself, you feel good.

M— How so, doctor? What do you mean?

K— When you do something, are you doing it for others? When you show somebody affection, is it really the other who is receiving this affection?

M— What is affection?

K— Or is it you who are doing it for yourself, that is permitting yourself to feel affection, permitting yourself to benefit from this? What do you think?

M— If that's the case then I don't want to do anything to anyone.

K— But is it to others that you're doing it?

#### A ONE-MINUTE PAUSE

M— I think so. I didn't like to do it, with my family. Now, now, it's complete. I used only to get up early, very early. This was the... and the... here in Brazil with me for 22 years. I've been here for 25 years, Doc. I've been married to him for twenty-five years. Tomorrow is the nineteenth, isn't it? Ah, what a marriage my husband made with me, Doc! What has he got today, now?

K— You think that getting married, getting united to your inner self is disadvantageous to you?

M— Getting married?

K— Is it a disadvantage for you to accept your inner self?

M— I don't think so, Doc, how can it be?

K— But you are saying that it is to your disadvantage.

M— But this laziness Doc? Now here is something new. I ... I don't want young people coming into my home, Doc. I now has a friend that... friend, you know? It was on that... on that night when I was... was all excited. He came for the first time. He is a colleague of R's, from her job, in the afternoon, a very nice boy, intelligent. He speaks I don't know how many languages, and everything. I think four or five, and he is 25 years old and he... He is I's friend, not a boyfriend. He is just a friend, except that he began to come to my house almost everyday. They go out, go out to Aliança Francesa. They go out together. They play other games at home and everything. Ah, Doc! it irritates me so much! She phoned him and I don't want anyone to come to my home. Doc, I don't want it. I don't want anything.

K— What does this boy entering your house represent? What is this in your inner self?

M— I don't know.

K— This cultured boy, speaks four languages, pleasant, nice.. .

M— I had taken to him and everything, and suddenly, now I'm angry with him, Doc.

K— What's that in your inner self?

M— I don't know.

K— Pleasant, cultured. What is this inside you that you are so angry about?

M— I think it is too much... if he came once in a while, but he's always there, almost every day Doc.

K— But what is this in you, that you detest? You are saying that you detest culture, that you detest pleasantness.

M— That's right, I have become a monster.

K— Qualities, gifts.. .

M— That's right.

K— You detest them.

M— That's right doctor, I have become an incredible person, a person, an unpleasant person, a useless person, a person.. .

- K— But to whom in particular? To the others? Your husband is there at the office all day. Your mother is there minding her own business. Your daughters are working. With whom are you being so unpleasant?
- M— Hum. . . it's with myself, isn't it?
- K— Of course. You don't want to be good, do you? You realize that you must be a good person but you don't want to be, isn't that so? To live life at its best you have to be good.
- M— My husband said that I was already. . . When I was younger, I was already like this, but I wasn't like this. I invited people, and everything, except that he wanted me to give dinners frequently, that kind of thing, but I refused to do it. I said: "Look, here, I'm not going to become a maid for others."
- K— What is "to be a maid for others"? What does this mean in terms of yourself?
- M— It's to live only for others. It's to serve only other people.
- K— What does this mean, "others" inside you? Tell me.
- M— I took care of my friend, the one who died of kidney failure when he was 48 years old. I was there day and night. I took care of him, helped his wife and everything. I did everything... it will soon be 4 years since H. died (crying to herself). . . now I don't know why I have become a person like this, I don't know. . .
- K— Then, when you stopped taking care of yourself, you became desperate like this. Didn't you feel good when you were taking care of your H.?
- M— I felt deeply satisfied.
- K— Because you were taking care of yourself. What happens outside is a reflection of what happens inside, of your own inner self. What you do socially is what you do to your inner self.
- M— But Doc, what changed me into a monster like this, Doc?
- K— Have you become a monster, or do you do monstrosities?
- M— Doc, does that make any difference? Does it make any difference?
- K— The difference is fundamental.

#### A ONE-MINUTE PAUSE

- M— When... I used to take medicines, I was all excited, so I used to do everything for everybody Doc.
- K— So you used to go to the department store and steal things, didn't you? You made a fool of yourself in the streets. In the clinic, you made a nuisance of yourself. You were alienated. You didn't realize it, but everybody had to put up with your madness.
- M— And now?
- K— And now it's you who are putting up with yourself.
- M— As the others are having to as well, Doc.
- K— And you don't like that very much, do you? You'd like just the others to have to put up with you. When you see it's not like that you get angry like that. You want to take medicines to become totally alienated, to get right away from it all.
- M— No Doc! I work when I'm like that.
- K— But flight is not work. Taking on a lot of things to do, that's not work. That's obsession. That's despair. You work every day, you keep on working, day after day, routinely, on automatic, like a sheep, working obsessively.

(The client said nothing more up to the end of the session, by which time about 10 minutes had elapsed).

Mrs. A. H. has been analysed for two years. She is 44 years old and hopes to be a psychoanalyst. She studies psychology. She is very aggressive.

A- Why is it that when, when I talk. . . She is very well, isn't she?

K- Your daughter?

A-. Yes.

K- Why?

A- Because, because it seems to me... she has been doing analysis for a long time. She is very well and she considers herself a psychoanalyst, and when I talk to her I feel desperate. She goes to school. I can't stand the desire to cry, my goodness! I get desperate. I keep thinking, but if she behaved like that with her patients, she is going to destroy a lot of people. She won't help anybody.

K- But, what did she say that you got so desperate?

A- It's the maid that says that she is quitting because she earns too little and so I get angry, because when I come back from the university, the two of them are in the kitchen, laughing and chatting. That maid... she used to be like an animal from the jungle, impolite as a pig. Now then... it seems as though she became a big lady, a big deal and she and R., the two of them get along well. So it seems that she gives more support to the maid than to her family. So I start thinking: "No, I'm not going to talk to R." because, I don't know, it seems there exists a conflict between the two of us. She starts to irritate me, starts to throw everything I say back in my face. Therefore, I start thinking: she identifies herself with the maid or I identify myself with the maid, or. . . but there is a confusion within me. Then, I was saying that I won't be able to pay what she wants. I already fired the other maid. This one here wants to earn more. So R said: "Yes, if you don't pay her, she will go away right away, right away." It seems as though she is on the maid's side . . . Damn it!

SHORT PAUSE

K- But, what does the maid mean within your inner self, within you? What does she mean?

A- Somebody who wants to improve, earn more, live better.. .

K- Then, what are you saying about yourself through the maid, through R, through her contact with the maid, pleasing the maid and you, the contact with what within yourself?

A - With the humble side.

K- The humble side. The maid works at your house. Your humble side that works, that produces, that wants to do things better, improve. You are saying that that is bad.

A- Yes, I also feel that, when I think, analyse in all ways, I also find this, but I also find that there is a structure there at home that has to be modified completely. One can't live the way one lives! One can't really! Therefore, I get the impression that I will have to fire all the employees, gardener, cook, washing woman and ironing woman and everything that is no good. If I don't pay, she quits. If I pay, then I will have to ask my husband to give me more money. Then he starts with that same old story that he does not have enough—that he spends all his money on analysis. So I keep on thinking that we could go to a smaller place, have fewer employees, spend less money and damn it... that money. . . but I don't know. I can't manage to speak to him. He doesn't understand me fully, and, I don't know.. .

K- Then, he is yourself again. You think that spending a lot is wasteful. You would rather dedicate more time and expense to more important things. You don't

manage to convince yourself about this. It's not about convincing your husband.  
It's about convincing yourself.

SHORT PAUSE

A– Deep within me, I think I don't deserve.. .

K– But, you don't deserve what?

A– That. What we pay for psychoanalytical treatment.

K– What does it mean to pay for psychoanalytical treatment? Paying for everything that you receive. What does this mean in the psychological sense?

SHORT PAUSE

A– Paying in order to evolve.

K– Because there, you know, you give the impression that you don't want to be grateful for what you receive.

A– I don't want to really. I don't want to do anything at home. I don't want anybody to see anything. I don't want that. I only want to be helped but don't want to do anything.

K– But that "at home" lies in your inner self life. That home is your own self.

PAUSE

K– It's your own life that you refuse. It 's all there for you to take advantage of, for you to accept, and you don't accept it.

PAUSE

A— My husband stays at home on Saturday. On Sunday, he goes out to the back yard. The swimming pool is dirty. The water is green. The plants are all abandoned. Everything is on the floor and the back yard all soiled. The house is all in disorder with everything out of place: "Did you talk to the gardener? Did you ask him how many hours he left the pump turned on? Did you take my shoes to the shoemaker? Did you already do this? Did you already do that? " But, I don't, I don't want anything to do with that. I don't. I don't. I won't lift a finger even if they threaten to kill me. I won't do anything. Let him go to hell. I really will not talk!

K– But what does it mean, your husband saying that to you? Is it really your husband?

A— No, it's my own self talking to me.

K— Saying what to yourself?

A— That I'm really careless. I can no longer manage to control my home. I can 't manage to control the employees, can't manage anything else.

K— There I get the impression also that only now are you managing to see this. Were you like that before, such a hard-working person?

A— I was.

K— Were you?

A— No.

K– Or are you just imagining that? Because the past, in the imagination, is always prettier than it really was, than what one thinks.

A– It wasn't perfect, but I wasn't so careless as I am now.

PAUSE

K— Why do you think that you have become careless now?

A— I'm thinking... I only think about myself, only want to study. I only want to read, although I don't understand anything. I only keep on wanting. . .

K— Or formerly you used to waste time with superflousness and now you dedicate more time to more important things, more essential things, because the clean swimming pool, the trees well kept, the house well kept, this gives an idea of a big mask, doesn't it? Don't swing too much to one side or the other. You have to find equilibrium. You used to keep doing this a lot, being interested only in appearances. That is why it is necessary that when the wife does analysis, the husband should too, or when the husband does analysis, the wife follows. Because otherwise one improves and the other one just lags behind. Your daughter said that he is taking medicines, a lot of medicines.

A— When I speak about analysis to him, he says that I'm crazy, that we do not have enough money anymore. Just imagine him doing analysis.

#### SHORT PAUSE

K— If he himself wanted to do analysis, he would do it. We even have a clinic for needy people. He could go there. There is no lack of analysis. As a matter of fact, didn't he undergo psychiatric treatment all his life?

#### A THREE-MINUTE PAUSE

A— What is psychiatry?

K— What?

A— What is psychiatry? Psychiatry, treatment?

K— Didn't he undergo treatment with a psychiatrist?

A— He did.

K— Then, the psychiatrist gave him medicines all the time, didn't he?

A— No, he did analysis without taking medicines.

K— And the medicines that he always took?

A— Oh, he took them at the beginning, when he became very ill. Afterwards, his spine became crooked and so he didn't manage to do anything, didn't even have the equilibrium to walk. I had to pick him up at work. I picked him up, took him there. It was I who drove the car when we used to go out.

K— And who used to give him the medicines?

A— He used to go to several doctors, neurologists. They gave him... gave him medicines. One of them said that he needed medicine afterwards in order to have mental stability. He needed to go to the psychiatrist and not to give up all those sedatives, and it was this way, getting better little by little, but still even now, when he sees himself in danger, he turns his head and slumps it on his shoulders. He remains withdrawn like this, desperate. But he stopped going to that psychiatrist four years ago. Then he went to the cardiologist because he was going to have a heart attack. Then he had the heart attack and so then the doctor gave him millions of medicines and... his blood pressure was bad and I don't know what else. It was 120 by 110, something like that. Then they gave him medicines for the heart, medicines for his blood pressure...

K— So, all that is due to the nervous system. It's the psychic life that is unsettled.

A— And now he went to do a check up there at the firm and then they still gave sedatives and so he sits down to eat, puts four, five pills on the plate at lunch time and I don't know how many pills after lunch...

K— What do you think about a person like that?

A— Mrs. A. behaves in the same way. Why is it that when I 'm talking about others I feel that I'm talking about myself?

K— What is that attitude of defense?

A— I don't know.

K— You don't accept what I say to defend yourself.

A— From what?

K— From something external that you think is going to attack you.

#### **Mrs. A. H. — 4th Recording — 27-03-1980**

A— Something always happens to me. Again today, I wished to talk... On Friday gee... I was so fed up with everything, wishing to go away, angry because you wouldn't say anything. I tried to say something silly, something stupid. I'm leaving before... I got irritated. I was angry because you didn't co-operate. You stay there, sitting down without opening your mouth, without helping anybody. Afterwards, I was asking myself that... I am also like this. I don't say anything.

K— You are also that way or were you seeing yourself in me? You never help anyone. I mean you never help yourself as you should.

A— Sometimes I feel like talking, but I feel something, a terrible fear. Afterwards, I feel very lazy, talk about the psychiatrist and about laziness... authentic treatment because in reality I had to shake him violently. I had to say everything that I had in my mind that I had there... to go and get medical advice... once more... afterwards ohh... He was talking: Oh! come on, a psychiatrist is not people... I wanted to shake him up violently, but it's not possible. I was afraid. Look, if somebody starts talking about what I am doing... I don't know what. So, I was still angry with you, psychoanalysis... Why don't you talk. I don't know what. I don't know what, gee... When I left here, I was so angry. It seems as though you help those who don't need it so much and you don't help those who are in need.

K— So what do you think about this psychiatrist, about the way he is?

#### **SHORT PAUSE**

A— I think he is a guy like this... that married a woman with a face like a frog, very ugly... well, apart from that, I think he is a guy. I don't know, I mean, he is...

K— Then put his psychiatrist within you. What does this situation represent inside you? A guy who married an ugly woman, with a face like a frog. What would this marriage mean within you in the psychological sense?

A— Ah! I think that I married.. .

K— Isn't it one of your ugly aspects, one of your ugly attitudes, that you think you shouldn't have?

A— Another thing that I want to say.. .

K— No, but finish the interpretation, and Mrs. MG, what do you think about her?

A— I was also thinking about that the other day, trying to analyse, trying to understand. I think she is a shameless prostitute, who leaves her husband, found herself a lover. However, afterwards I thought: My God, but what if we were to see this from the psychoanalytical point of view? If we started thinking that the patients are like that, people are anybody, then nobody will ever be able to help anybody.

What is important is to help others, because if people come for psychoanalysis, it is because they are suffering. Sometimes a psychic pain hurts much more than a physical one. But also from the other point of view I think: but I think that if a person is not shameless, as bad as she could be, she doesn't get to the point of practising prostitution, for example, as far as I got. I had something wrong with me and it wasn't anything. It wasn't by making love to (fucking with) other men that I was going to manage to cure myself or something like that. Then I think that condemning and not condemning... goodness gracious! It's so complicated!

K— Then, you are saying that Mrs. MG. is your most ill aspect. It is exactly that which you don't want to take care of; that which you censure, censure, censure. You don't want to help yourself in that sense. You censure what any person does. You don't want to help. You also don't want to help yourself, or deal with your real difficulties.

PAUSE

A— I was thinking today at school. The teacher keeps on taking notes there of the students. All who say something get a point, but I don't have the courage to open my mouth and I kept thinking, but why, why don't I treat that as if it were a chat? Then, I feel as if it were a test to see who is more stupid or who is smarter. So I'm afraid to talk so that they do not perceive that as stupid or then it is a test for the best or the worst. So, gee whiz...

PAUSE

K— Then, you are saying that if she gives points according to the persons' manifestations, you don't manifest yourself. You don't do anything to improve, to help yourself. That's what you're talking about.

A— I can't manage to... (whimpering) I would rather die! I can't manage to speak in front of others.

K— If you speak in front of others, what happens?

SHORT PAUSE

A— Nothing.

2 - MINUTE PAUSE

K— What does it mean, talking to others? Isn't it talking to yourself?

A— Yes (Pause). It is I who am too insecure to expose myself at the board, to comment, to talk, being afraid of making errors, of not knowing.

K— Of seeing your mistakes. You are saying that you don't want any contact with the mistakes that you commit.

SHORT PAUSE

A— I am irresponsible because I took Mrs. R.S.'s invitations to sell them, I took them to Mrs. D. I gave her the two invitations, but it seems as though she lives up in the moon, she took them, put them away in her bag, she said: "Thank you." I said: "No, you don't have to thank me, you will have to pay." But it's hard to maintain contact with her. It's like talking to a brick wall. With her it is the same thing, and

today it seems that she came down to earth a little. So I said: "Listen did you bring the money for the invitations?"

She: "What money?"

I: "The invitations that I gave you yesterday."

She: "But that was just a written paper."

I said: "It's not a written paper, they were two invitations, you owe me twelve hundred cruzeiros."

She: "I'm not going to pay a thing, I'm not going to any conference. Who knows what kind of papers you gave me!"

Oh, but I wanted to cry so badly. Now I will have to pay for the invitations that she took. Then I thought, but what an irresponsible woman! But I also thought, to give this way without charging, too, is an irresponsibility of mine. Then she looked for the invitations in her bag but didn't find them. Then I said, "Perhaps, who knows, you left them there at your house."

K— In fact, she must be a very alienated person. Isn't she that way?

A— Yes.

K— You see.

A— Very individualistic, only thinks of herself.

K— Then, you are saying that you don't know how to work with this aspect of yours.

A— Mrs. D., when she needs something like that... invitations... she doesn't even hear what is said.

K— When you need somebody, you listen. When you don't need anybody, you don't.

### **Mrs. J. J. — Of Japanese descent — Age: 26**

The client came to psychoanalysis to get the strength to divorce her husband. She suffers from a high degree of paranoid schizophrenia. She has been doing analysis for eight months.

### **First Recording — 27-03-80**

J— Today you are so happy, I'm so sad (little laugh). I don't even know what to analyse today, you see, doctor? Let's see what is more urgent.

K—What are you sad about?

J— I'm sad because C. told me something just now. I . . . I was going to analyse something else, then she said something that really was it, you know. It made me so sad. . .

K—What did she say?

A— It was because today I was supposed to have brought my brother--in-law with me. Last Friday he did analysis and at the end of the session C. called me and said: Look, J., Y. has been interned, but as he is coming out on Wednesday, then, as soon as he can, bring him to do analysis. I said: "All right". Then it was settled: he would come with me today. C. arranged an appointment about the same time as mine. Then, this afternoon, damn, I was sure that he would be at home, because it was like this: on Monday he would be interned and on Wednesday he would come out. So I'm sure that he is at home and I phone in the early evening to find out, so

that we might confirm that he would come today. Then my sister-in-law said: "Ah, he...he can't leave hospital today because he did physiotherapy and we don't know if he is coming out today or tomorrow or on Monday, because he is going to take some physiological salt solution." He is really weak. Then I said: "Damn, but wasn't he coming out yesterday?"

She: "Yes, but it didn't work out, and I don't know what and so. . ."

I said: "Well then, you ring me up as soon as you know when he is coming out. In other words if he leaves today, you phone me tomorrow, so that we can make an appointment as soon as possible, because he really liked analysis and so..."

She: "All right, so I'll phone you." She also seemed to be in higher spirits. So, ok, I agreed, all right. Then let's see if we can make this appointment soon, as soon as possible. Just now, C. said to me, "Your brother-in-law didn't come, after all." I said, "That's right, because he has still got to leave hospital."

She: "I see, but I think that he really... I think that's what I feared: that he wouldn't come today, that he is really asking for death." I felt it even without C. having said that to me. I felt it in the talks I've had with him these days. He is really... he even told me that he can't bear it any more, that he is suffering a lot and that he really wants to die. Then, I ... Well, in that talk I had with him, I don't know, I was trying to encourage him to live, to do something, not to give in like this. And now C. mentioned it. This is something that discourages me, not like this... not in the sense... I must indeed accept the fact that this guy is going to die, you know. Why do I become like this, so... why does this upset me so much, don't you agree?

K— But what do you see in him? What do you think of him?

J— I see him like this... in his life... I said that... I said: "Look, I think that you have undervalued your life very much. You threw it away a long time ago, maybe you haven't even..." That is, to me, he is the prototype of the guy who has pretended to be a victim all his life and I'm angry at this. I'm angry with people who pretend to be victims, because maybe I am like them in what I say and do. Then I think that all this kind of thing shows very much this illness of mine, my... Furthermore, afterwards I also began to remember that lecture by C., which covers psychopathological types, each with its aspects and its major characteristics, so, so, so... You know this really demonstrates just how sick we have become. There are thousands of mental illnesses. However, maybe we don't even... don't give... don't give much importance to them. For example, a low degree of importance was given to these illnesses, you know!

K—Then, what is it that you are saying about yourself when you talk about your brother-in-law, who is dying?

PAUSE

J— Yes. It's what I've been doing all my life. Revolt, anger, it was that. I understand clearly that that's what I did.

K—You have spoilt your life so much and now you get desperate at the sight of it all. You have spoiled so many things in your own life, haven't you? Your brother-in-law is this consciousness to you, this mirror to you, of what you've done to your own self.

PAUSE

J— And maybe deep inside, this anguish at seeing it... the feeling that I've been smothering my consciousness. But at the same time, I want to rescue, you see, I want to rescue all these things that I think are so heavy. It's because, you know it was never so clear to me, in all my life before as it has been in the last two years. It was never so clear to me how much I've thrown away, how much I spoilt indeed. Maybe with my daughter's birth... to me it was like a 300°, a 180 turn, a turn like that. All right, sometimes I keep thinking that I'm coming back to the starting point. I come back, many times, to the starting point. But I feel that I . . . in my life this... my life has changed a lot. Maybe my daughter has woken me up to many things that I couldn't see. That's why I think that her birth was a milestone in my life. To me, I had been much too fanciful, without any control. With her birth, I was almost forced to stop, to think it over. And then I was in a very big conflict: Between fantasy and reality, and every time, every time, it comes to my mind.

K—You mean, it was with her birth that you saw this conflict that you construct, this conflict with reality that you construct.

J— It's fantasy, isn't it, meaningless.. .

PAUSE

J— And afterwards C. said something that is exactly the same, too. She said that he worked for 30 years, and that he always wished to get ill. He wished to get some sort of illness to get rid of it all. It means, then, that... you see the move, don't you? Perhaps he, I don't know, certainly did so. Maybe, who knows, some illness may relieve me from this burden that I have imposed on myself, because it was he who imposed this burden on himself, nobody else. Just as I have also imposed a certain burden on myself, damn it.. .

K—What do you associate work with?

J— Look... to me work was something strange. Up to now I think it really was. . . When I began to work, there was a hell of a quarrel in my family. You know, it wasn't that sort of job that people take when they're prepared: look, let 's work! It wasn't... it was something forced. Such was the atmosphere in my home, there was so much tension so much confusion, so much neurosis, so much misfortune, I don't know, that I think hell might be a little better. Then when I was sixteen years old, I didn't know how to do anything, sixteen years old... I didn't have any special work skills or training. So I started to learn how to type when I was fifteen years old. Then I started typing, so... so I was kind of... well even the teacher always said: "You are good." Then, in all this confusion at home, I thought: "My God, I need to work, I need to study, but I also need to work," and I started to study at night and work during the day. But you know, I think it wasn't a job that I was accepting. I felt angry at work. I'll give you an idea what it's like. It's even laughable, you know, but in a small city for me to work... all of a sudden. My father seemed to be the owner of the city. All of a sudden, I was like... you know that sensation like that: "You are all right... you studied at the best school. All right, so... so suddenly you go to work and it seems that you are worthless. I felt as if I was worthless. You know, it's like jumping from one condition, from one day to the next, to a totally different condition. It's not something that changes

gradually. Suddenly, bang! Then, I started to work angry, ashamed, with a feeling of revenge. So, to me that city was horrible. I couldn't wait to leave that city.

K– What did you think about the city?

J– A city that made me fed up, you know? Totally futile.

K– Then, put that city in J. How does that feel?

PAUSE

J– I don't know, it is something that I wanted to leave, but it seems that I never managed to.

K– Isn't it a view of your futility?

J– It was a city where it seems that you couldn't do anything. It gave the impression that all the population there was futile. No, of course, it was not all futile. It had futile people and it had some people who worked.

K– Then, you didn't want to see this sight of your own futility.

J– I didn't want to admit that I was?

K– You didn't want to see. You didn't want to see in order to continue in your futility.

PAUSE

J– I didn't want to see in order to continue... It 's funny... I get so angry with futile people. They annoy me. Now, one has to see why, doesn't one? Why? I don't know why it bugs me. And it is an incredible struggle. It seems like something that you admire, but at the same time you think that it's worthless. It is something rather like that.. .

PAUSE

J– It's like you said once in one analysis, some time ago: "You don't envy alienated people, you envy those who do something."

K– Then, you are saying that you envy God and not the Devil.

PAUSE

J– Yes, in fact I really need to do something like that – something useful, something fulfilling. To work nobly. I don't know. I've pretensions, you know. I don't know exactly what I want, what I like, what I can... I think that 's because I have never wanted to do anything, never carried on anything. Then sometimes I feel myself empty. I keep thinking: Well, staying at the shop, doesn't work. It is up to a certain point a satisfaction having a job.

K– But look, it's not that you never carried on with anything. It's that you have always prevented things from going ahead in your life. It's because of this that you talked about envy.

J– I've always prevented things from going ahead.. .

K– It's J's will to stop herself.

J– Of wanting to stop? But why do we do that?

K– Through envy, you said.

J– Of God?

K– Including the envy of the God of your inner self, of the good that is in your inner self.

**Mr. C. Y. – Age: 46 years old**

Did analysis for six months and then stopped. Returned now because he was feeling very anguished.

**First Recording – 07-04-1980**

C— When you told me that I should come today, I became very tense. Over the last few days, I have had arterial hypertension. It seems that I could feel my high blood pressure, and I started to have violent dreams, which is something I hadn't done for months. In just one night I had three dreams. In one of the dreams I had, which was the first, I think, I was in a big school, going down a staircase with one of my pupils (a girl). I went down with my arm around her. And Mrs. S., who works in the consulting room was there downstairs waiting for me. She was all made-up, very made-up. She kissed me on the mouth and smudged my lips with lipstick and I took her out of my way with my arm, like this slowly and I told her: "My sister-in-law is there outside," who was G's wife. However, when I got to the door, I didn't see her. Then when I looked to the right, I saw her children inside the car. They were hiding from me, and she came out of the car, asking me to lend her three hundred and twenty thousand cruzeiros. I realized that I'd had many relationships with women.

K— What is that house in which you were, the huge house? What does that represent within you?

C— This huge house is my psychic life.

K— Your perception of the size of your psychic life, the big size of your psychic life. And this girl that was with you, what idea do you have of her?

C— Something good, my affectionate part, my feminine part.

K— You in contact with your affectionate life. And that girl that waited there outside?

C— My sister-in-law?

K— What do you think about her?

C— I think she is a little, no, not a little, very, I think she is very disaffected, disloyal. She really competes with me. Sometimes I really reject her.

K— Do you reject the perception of this? You get her out of your way.

PAUSE

C— I also dreamt that I was here at the clinic, and I went upstairs to talk with you and you told me this: "Sit here by my side because this person is typing something." And here, where I used to lie down, I saw all the walls were cracked. Pieces were falling flat on the floor and you didn't care about it, but I was worried and I saw a board over there, that said, Capital of the Society: ten billion cruzeiros. Dr. Keppe's capital: six billion cruzeiros, and the rest divided between the analysts.

K— How do you analyse this?

C— You are my consciousness. The clinic for me is an asset. It is riches, wealth and something good for me.

K— The wealth in your inner self.

PAUSE

C— That capital represented these riches, this wealth, this good thing.

K— But its walls were falling, falling to pieces. What is this within you?

C— It is my psychic life detaching itself. I felt this.

K— Your resistance diminishing?

PAUSE

C— It's interesting. The wall, by itself alone, is already a resistance. Broken, it is giving up its resistance; it is detaching itself, allowing itself.

K— It is the resistance becoming smaller. You have returned to do analysis, you have come back to search your consciousness again. This what you said at the beginning of the session. How do you analyse the fact that since I scheduled this session you started to have hypertension.

C— I started because I contacted, that is, I entered in contact with my consciousness I was resisting. I was feeling even absurd. Then I began to conscientize at home, seated in an arm-chair. I began to hold my head in my hands: "My God, why am I like this? Dr. Keppe told me: there is an appointment on Monday at 6 o'clock. Then I felt something almost unreal. I felt that it wasn't possible for me to come back. Then afterwards, I made the first contact and then my pressure went down and I returned to my normal state.

K— You said that as you were accepting, you went back to your normal state. As you started accepting your return to analysis, to consciousness, to reality, you went back to your normal state.

C— I did something that I hadn't done for almost twenty years I went to Sao Francisco Church. I went to fetch my father-in-law. He had gone to attend mass and before that I looked for a Franciscan priest and asked him for a blessing. I have always liked this. I like nuns and friars very much and so I attended mass, seated in the third pew and I felt good by my father-in-law's side. He's a very peaceful man, very simple, very good. It seemed that he was thirty years old. I like to do anything for him, I do... (of L's family, on my wife's side) I do anything him. I have already lent him money to set up a stall in an open-air market. I've already bought a little barrow for him. He always tells me that he prays for me. He can't pay me back but he always send me some fruits. He is a great fellow. And yesterday I felt in a depressive state near him. I felt like crying. Inside the church, I started to shed tears and he said something very beautiful to me. He told me to live in harmony with nature, to accept everything in life as a natural factor, working with my thoughts raised to God and not to bother with others. Even though he had no schooling, not even a primary school education, he has such strength of character." I spent a very beautiful day, a great day. Then I took him to have lunch with me at home and we agreed to return to Church next Sunday. I felt in him much simplicity, much humbleness, much consciousness. I have always gotten along well with him.

K— Put him in your inner self, what is he within you?

C— He's my poverty, my humbleness.

K— Simplicity.

C— My simplicity.

K— When you contact that simplicity, you feel well.

C— What made me a little shocked today when I woke up, is that since Friday I have been dreaming a lot. I had these three dreams. And this other that I have not told you about: I was in a very big German-style house and I was inside it with three German soldiers in civilian clothes, and inside there were many torsos of corpses. There was a German that wanted to enter. In order to get out of the way, I held the

door open and we found a trapdoor and we hid ourselves in it, me and the three Germans. And also the torsos, the thoraxes, you know, of human corpses. I found that very cruel, very shocking. I woke up startled.

K— How do you analyse that?

C— Evidently, everything in this dream represents me. That part of death, the invasion wanting to enter my psychic house is my resistance.

K— You see conscientizing as an invasion, as a loss.

PAUSE

C— It's interesting that as I contact with one thing, the problem to me already becomes normal, whereas *when* I escape, I get very anguished.

K— You are seeing that the problem is not accepting contact with the thing.

C— It's interesting that when I contact it, it becomes soluble. It becomes mild. And as soon as I want to distance myself from it, I feel bad.

K— So, that is because everything that exists is mild. When you contact it, everything is mild. When you avoid contact, you become anguished, because pathology, illness comes from escaping from contact with reality, whatever it is.

## **THE USE OF THE DIALECTIC TECHNIQUE IN INTEGRAL PSYCHOANALYSIS**

***CLAUDIA BERNHARDT PACHECO***

### **Introduction**

Integral Psychoanalysis is the method that deals with man's consciousness. As all scientific methods, it is experimental and precise.

When one talks about consciousness in theory, the idea one has is very abstract. However, through the dialectical technique, Integral Psychoanalysis always arrives at the truth which the person is denying. In fact, it is precisely the person's denial of the truth that causes his or her illness. Keppe considers acceptance of consciousness in itself as fundamental, and as the only factor necessary for the person's healing.

Since consciousness, as Frankl affirms, is something that contains in itself the meaning of responsibility, Keppe noticed that it is not necessary to teach the person healthy conduct. Sanity and truth are in Man's inner self, as well as the attitudes he adopts against them. Therefore, it is only necessary to encourage him to see his reality, for thus he will know how to "separate the wheat from the chaff."

The Dialectic Technique serves as eyes to see what already exists in man's inner self, not only his pathological attitudes but mainly his enormous possibilities in sanity.

We suffer because we do not accept the meaning our life already has, wanting to give it another meaning created by our will (and imagination). Certain philosophical schools reach the maximum of this diabolic attitude, rejecting the real meaning of life (our link with God) to create another, or simply for the pleasure of denying it. "Hell is other people," said Sartre, but what happens is that we project onto life, onto reality, our Satanic attitudes.

Keppe has not built a new religion, but through scientific experimentation, he has arrived at conclusions identical to those of revelation and of philosophy. Integral

Psychoanalysis is a trilogy when it works with science (action), philosophy (thought) and religion (feeling).

### **The Dialectic Technique in Integral Psychoanalysis (How to deal with Theomania)**

How should we behave when we have people who come to us to treat their psychic or psychosomatic illnesses or even improve their lives in the affective, social, professional, religious, etc. fields?

Some schools of psychotherapy (mainly psychoanalysis) believe that we should fix our attention on the negative aspects and emphasize the perception of the illness, considering the individual as condemned by his evil destructive tendencies, in a pessimistic fatalism — and this does not lead to any healthy results.

Others prefer to deal with what is "good" in man, encouraging him to cultivate his qualities and believe that the conscientising of pathology is something negative, which would lead him to depression and feelings of inferiority. This viewpoint leads the client to great alienation, making his problems worse.

Both the first approach and the second one are partial. Man is dialectical in his attitudes, and this must be constantly conscientized to ensure complete personal growth. Dr. Keppe considers that man is originally sane but causes damage to himself by the erroneous use of his will.

In other words, that which is real in man and which exists without his interference, is good, but owing to his willful denial, omission or alteration of reality, he builds up an erroneous dialectic in his mind (reality and fantasy), which makes him ill.

Keppe then realized that the basic reality of the individual is sanity, but that he effectively alters it with his erroneous attitude. Moreover, it is this attitude that must be dealt with in the process of therapy. However, we must always make the person see that he does not suffer from any illness, but that he is spoiling the beauty of his existence with a sickly attitude. In other words, hatred, rejection, envy, laziness, aggression are attitudes of denial of the affection, the inner beauty, the work, the accomplishment, the consciousness that exist in our inner self.

Integral Psychoanalysis takes into account the factor of the *will* and therein lies a basic difference between Keppe's approach and other psychotherapies. Through the will, we can deny our sanity, which was given to us and which we have replaced with our fantasies — our own creation — and this is what makes us ill.

There is a great difference between thinking that we have a sickly basis (taking the position of victim) and knowing that our illness is the attitude of rejection of conscientization and sanity (active position). The concept of illness in medicine is not different from ours: there can only exist illness where there exists health. Therefore, bad feelings or death instincts, sickly tendencies or impulses ("Trieb " in German), etc. are not natural.

The analytical process cannot be one of "teaching" sane conduct or formulating patterns of behaviour or abandoning the person as incurable, in a tragic fatalism, but that of making the person conscious of this pathological attitude which he is adopting to his own detriment. However, we cannot have any sanity in our conduct if we do not have any contact with the sanity in our inner self. It is the analyst's task to make this contact possible.

Whenever a patient comes to us, he is deeply anguished because he believes that he has to modify himself, "to change" things in his life, believing that he will improve his conduct. Existentialism says that essence depends upon existence — therefore the conduct which one adopts will determine one's reality. This immanentist and theomaniac

position as the Creators of Truth causes us deep anguish. The most difficult thing for a psychotic or neurotic is to abandon the idea of wanting to change things and begin to accept what already exists, and work with it. But when he realizes that reality is already there, magnificent and beautiful, and that nothing can be added to it — one has only to enjoy it — he immediately calms down, for he takes off his shoulders an enormous burden that he himself had placed there. All that struggle to search for something that he himself does not know comes to an end, letting his sanity appear, which had been hidden because of his attitude.

Owing to our envy of the Creator, we make an inversion: we see reality (Divine Creation) as bad and our fantasies (Our Creation) as good.

Dr. Keppe explains this rejection of all the plenitude in our inner self as being caused by our envy towards the Creator. Everything that we possess was given to us by Him: intelligence, consciousness, intuition, affection, aptitudes, every gift. Through envy, we refuse all this and want, instead, to do something our own way, through imagination (and this is our Theomania).

Thus we come to understand the fact that we see life in a pessimistic way. The sick person imagines that by denying he can reduce all the wonder of the universe and of life to something meaningless and tragic (at least in his mind he does so). "Evil always wins" — this is his motto. He does not realize that the only thing that he is able to obliterate is himself, and understanding this will allow him to accept the value of truth and health. Mentally sick people are like real demons that, far from being brilliant, are anguished and dull-witted. What they want to do to life, they do to themselves.

### **Illness is the erroneous dialectic that we build up through the use of will**

Keppe says that our illness comes from this erroneous dialectic which we adopt — that is — the "Yes" and "No" dialectic (thesis and antithesis). In fact, everything that exists by itself in reality is good, sane, true (Yes) and when we oppose ourselves to this through denial, omission or alteration of the truth, we create fantasies (No). There can be no combination of illness (antithesis) and health (thesis) to achieve balance. This erroneous combination occurs when we refuse the consciousness that this is an erroneous dialectic forged by us. All social and scientific directions have been based on these Hegelian, Marxist and originally Platonic dialectics as a consequence of a unilateral and sickly attitude of mankind. As a matter of fact, this attitude is typical of the schizophrenic, manic depressive and other serious mental conditions. Hatred, envy, laziness and bad feelings do not exist by themselves.

They consist of the privation of love, of consciousness, of accomplishment. The dialectics of Integral Psychoanalysis always work by considering the positive aspects as the real ones, existing by themselves and by considering the negative ones as our fantasies.

### **Psychotherapy deals with the consciousness of fantasies so that we may enjoy sanity**

As we have a sane inner basis, we do not need to worry about teaching the client what sanity is. This brings great tranquillity to the analyst, who no longer sees himself as the bestower of his client's truth. This very pretentious position has also been very onerous to us.

Keppe starts from the Socratic principle that truth is printed in man's inner self and that, through dialogue, we eliminate false ideas, little by little, until we get to the truth. This contact with truth happens through intuition and consciousness and not only through reasoning.

Integral Psychoanalysis, deals with the obvious, which every individual has abandoned because of his Theomania. We make use of intuition mainly, because theorization in psychoanalysis makes the sick person move further away from his reality and leads him through psychoanalytical fantasies. The client diverts his attention from himself in order to pay attention to intellectualized explanations, often impossible to understand. It is for this reason that so many people see psychoanalysis as dogmatic (Karl Jaspers is an example), where the client who refuses to respect such a dogma is seen as resistant. Freud himself already quoted intellectualization as an enemy of conscientization.

Some analytical schools have usually considered unconscious factors as the origin of all problems (Freud, Melanie Klein, Bion, Lacan, Reich) while others give more emphasis to environmental influences (From, K. Homey, etc.). Keppe, as does Frankl, emphasizes consciousness — not only the consciousness of external factors, but mainly the consciousness of our inner life.

Despite the wealth of information given by science, pedagogy, philosophy and religion alerting Man as to the dangers and consequences of his destructive behaviour, Man continues to be destructive. Similarly, social studies have failed to improve the disordered conduct of mankind. Social injustices proliferate, wars kill and the world's tension increases. Therefore, Keppe came to the conclusion that the consciousness of external problems does not help us to improve feelings of persecution, making us see every evil as coming from outside.

### **Interiorisation as the way to health**

It is a curious fact that I have never found in the best Portuguese, English and German dictionaries the term "to interiorise." However, I have found the term "to exteriorise." There seems to be a clear intention on the part of Man to eliminate the perception of his psychic life totally, projecting everything of his inner self into his environment. The main key to Integral Psychoanalysis is the process of interiorisation.

### **The Interiorized Man is a Sane Man**

The beauty of man's body, of his muscles, of his brain, of his face, is a pale reflection of the perfection that exists in his inner self. The beauty of animals, of nature, of stars and of the universe pale in comparison with the beauty that exists within the human being. In our inner self, besides Beauty, there exists Love, which does not exist in external reality. No matter how hard we try, our imagination will never reach the delight and joy which inner Sanity will bring us, if we accept it completely.

Integral Psychoanalysis has developed a technique of interiorisation which makes this contact possible. It is the comparative technique where each element of the external world is transported, dialectically, to Man's inner self. Thus, when we put "the others" into the client's psychic life, he calms down, recognizing the value which he has in his inner self, the enormous world that he has within himself, softening his envy. If we see evil as coming from others, we do the same with good, envying what we imagine that we do not have, but if we recognize it in ourselves, we soon calm down.

From the moment that Man starts to accept this return to his inner self, the healing process starts. And the more he does so, the wider his horizons become. The highly interiorised man gets to realize things inside himself that do not have their counterpart in the external universe, for his inner self is more perfect than the whole of creation.

If we have this marvel within ourselves, then why do we not enjoy it? Keppe explains this denial by considering our inner self as the reflection of divine beauty. The sanity that we see inside us is not our accomplishment, and before such greatness and such a marvel, we are blinded by the terrible envy we feel towards the One who gave it to us. Thus Mankind began to see life as something ugly, painful, meaningless and anguishing, and the "role" that we play is far from being the expression of our inner reality. From beings created in God's resemblance we reduce ourselves to murderers, criminals, sick, anguished people.

The comparative technique has solved many problems in the practice of Psychoanalysis and has favoured the quick recovery of the patient. Dr. Keppe noticed that those who come to analysis never talk about themselves in a direct manner. He realized that when they talked about themselves they lied, or, at best, just talked about the fantasies which they had built up about themselves. But, in contrast, they revealed themselves when they talked about others — then they really were sincere. For this reason he started to use only the comparative technique because then he obtained better material for interpretation. A person needs a mirror to be able to see himself or herself as he or she is: both in the physical and in the psychic world.

This was an insurmountable difficulty in the other psychotherapeutic methods. There were no possibilities of taking the client out of that vicious circle represented by his constantly talking about how he imagines he is, in a real act of self worship. Every interpretation based on the information given by the client regarding himself, ran the risk of being false and of reinforcing his alienation. As a matter of fact the client had the idea that he could "deceive" his analyst by making him (the analyst) arrive at conclusions that he (the client) had planned beforehand. The fact that there exists a pre-established and single theory to define neurosis favoured the client's defense, who then began to have total command of the situation, explaining everything but conscientising nothing about his reality.

On the other hand, there existed the difficulty of gathering material for an adequate interpretation. This meant that the therapist had to wait for many entire sessions for data that would fit into his theory.

In Integral Psychoanalysis, all the material can be used at the very moment, serving as a basis for our interpretation in a safe, direct way. Each situation, each fact, is interiorized, as a reflection of the one who is talking. This was the way that enabled us to deal with the client no matter how ill he might be, avoiding that tense and delicate situation of transference, where the analyst begins to be the greatest centre of the client's projections. This made the treatment of paranoid schizophrenics impracticable — a problem which has been overcome by the dialectical technique, where the analyst represents the consciousness or the mirror of the patient's inner self.

There has been an enormous simplification of the analytical work. Attention, intuition and balance on the part of the analyst are the instruments necessary for an analysis with good clinical results. Through the dialectical or comparative technique, everything that the client says has a return to his inner self — thus the interpretation is based essentially on the material offered by the client. Thus we can give the most serious interpretations without creating a reaction of resistance or personal hostility against us, analysts, which reaction was formerly called negative transference.

In Freudian Psychoanalysis, for example, many interpretations are based on the Oedipus Complex theory. This creates situations often without solution and reinforces the patient's projection mechanism.

In Integral Psychoanalysis we act in a different way. We let the client talk a lot about us, and then we return the interpretation to his inner self, because, when talking about us, he was really talking about himself the whole time.

For example: when the client R. S., told Dr. Keppe that she was strongly against analysis and against him, this dialogue followed:

K — What do you think about me?

R — I think that you tell many truths, but you are very inconsequent and inconstant in your statements and you want all of us to follow you.

K — Then, you've just said that, in spite of having the truth in your inner self, you let yourself really be guided by your inconsequence and inconstancy.

This is the great advantage of the dialectical technique: it does not matter what the person says, about whom he talks, if what he says about others is right or not. Everything that he says is about himself. Thus, dialectics has no end, since, in fact, it is the process of perception itself on the part of the individual who, in order to understand, always compares one thing to another.

Other people are our own reflections, the same way as our body is the mirror of our psychological state. By observing our organic state, we can intuitively discover our psychic state. For this reason, due to somatisation, people who have physical ailments reveal that their minds are ill. For example, headaches of emotional origin are the result of peripheral vasoconstriction, which prevents the blood from flowing normally through the arteries. Through dialectics, we realize the force that we use in order to prevent life (our feelings and thoughts) from flowing naturally in our mind.

Our standpoint is, therefore, totally psychological, and not physical or behavioural, although the final result is a psychic, organic and social improvement. We have realized that the only way to treat social relationship and organic illness adequately is through this interiorisation.

### **Inconscientisation means fighting against consciousness**

When Keppe refers to consciousness, he does not give it an ethical or moral sense, although truth itself already contains the idea of ethics. However, we could confuse ethics with culture or customs, and this is not the case. The concepts of ethics and social morality are relative and change from people to people. But the consciousness that knows how to distinguish the real from the fantastic, the truth from a lie, the good from the ill intention — this is universal consciousness. It is this that sees the whole reality and links us directly with Truth. It is instantaneous and eternal; it exists by itself and in our inner selves.

It is against this very consciousness that we fight, trying to hide it, creating a pathological mechanism, which Keppe calls “inconscientising.” To him, a pathological unconscious does not exist; what does exist is a pathological attempt to hide that which is in our field of perception, without, however, our having any success at it.

We know ourselves perfectly, better than anyone else. We know everything about ourselves, but we do not admit it. This constant denial leads us many times to our

being distant from our consciousness, and, therefore, from our sanity. Thus, all the symptoms appear: anguish, phobias, depression and organic illness, as a result from this forced incontinenting. We see in consciousness something that harms us, destroys us, for we confuse perceiving with being. We act like an ostrich that hides its head, thinking that by doing so it will keep the danger away. It is not consciousness that destroys us, but through consciousness we realize how much we harm ourselves.

You can well observe the vicious circle created: if we confuse seeing with being, then we begin to try and hide the perception of what we are, replacing it by an image of ourselves (the way we would like to see ourselves).

People usually say that a madman is he who does not have "consciousness" of what he does. To Integral Psychoanalysis, a madman is the man who denies the consciousness he has. We have observed in our work that everybody has, deep within himself, a perfect knowledge of what he is, admitting more or less what he knows. The more a person accepts the perception of his pathological attitude, the saner he becomes.

If we work with the old idea of Psychoanalysis, from the principle that the person is unconscious of his acts, we shall be bolstering this individual's cheating and, consequently, his pathology. We do not become ill because of something we do not know, but because of hiding something we do know.

In his works, Freud considered the mechanism of repression something pathogenic. He said, however, that the same mechanism was necessary for the balance of personality. Freud himself regarded truth as a pathogenic element that attacked Man; he didn't see Man as the attacker of truth, as that this attitude made him ill. Hence, our problems do not come from the unconscious, but from the erroneous attitude we adopt against consciousness. Freud used to say that when a sick individual remembered a repressed traumatic fact and brought it to his consciousness, healing would be the consequence. We would say that from the moment the individual stops fighting against what he knows, he is automatically sane.

This was a great change in the focal standpoint of psychoanalysis. From victims of unconsciousness and repression, we have become the authors of our incontinenting and responsible for our situation because of our dishonesty in relation to our consciousness. Keppe states that Man is not dishonest because he is ill, but that he becomes ill because he is dishonest.

When we attack someone, we are always attacking the consciousness that individual brings us. For instance: Mrs. B. came to us saying that she was worried about her difficulties in relationship with her two-year-old daughter. She used to satisfy all the little girl's caprices to an absurd degree, which used to lead her to such a state of exhaustion that she would end up by getting mad and using violence and physical aggression against her little daughter. She was afraid that she might be causing serious damage to the little girl, but she was very annoyed at the daughter's disobedience.

According to our interpretation, we see that what she says means that she places her own desires above everything, that she cannot stand the slightest contrariety, and so, does not respect any laws of her inner self, which causes her serious damage. Her will is an obstacle to her good relationship with herself. When she attacks her daughter in a burst of hatred, she is trying to kill this consciousness. It would be the same as breaking the mirror in order not to see what it shows.

Man makes an inversion by regarding consciousness as aggression, and not as he himself attacking his consciousness, thus hurting himself.

In his book, *Consciousness*, Keppe makes it clear that Man sees evil in the perception of his pathological behaviour and not in the behavior itself. Thus, Man spends his whole time fighting against consciousness, and imagines that by doing so he

is keeping himself from being harmed. Man confuses the consciousness of being with being.

A thirty-year-old client, analysing the circumstances in which her labyrinthitis began, said, "I had a cousin that came from the country to live with me. I used to hate her and so I thought, 'If she really comes to live with me, I won't be able to stand it. I'll get ill.' And this is just what happened. On the day after her arrival, an unbearable noise began inside my head."

Therapist: But what is this cousin of yours like?

C: She is aggressive, has a loud voice, depends on everybody and does not work. I even had to leave her breakfast ready for her before I left for my work.

T: So, what does this mean — your cousin coming to live in your house, disturbing your peace, attacking you, talking in a loud voice with you and not wanting to work or help you within your psychic life?

C: Is this what I do to myself? Do I attack myself? Don't I want to help myself or work with my reality, and is this why I become dependent on others?

T: Your cousin is your mirror. She is the consciousness of this attitude of yours within your inner self. The only thing is that you invert and believe that you cannot stand seeing what you do, falling ill as a consequence. You believe that if you admit that there is this cousin of yours in your inner self, harming you, then you will harm yourself. You've gotten ill because you've tried to avoid this consciousness.

True dialectical analysis should deal with the consciousness of pathology (fantasy) and sanity (reality). Any therapeutic method that is based on the consciousness of pathology or of sanity only, avoids dealing with one of the sides of the human being's psyche, which is dialectical, thus causing an even bigger imbalance. Therefore, interpretations must always be dosed in such a way that man will not lose contact with his sanity or with his pathological attitude.

I will try to illustrate this with an analysis made in group by a suicidal client of Dr. Keppe's. Explaining why he no longer wanted to visit an old uncle, who had previously been his close friend, he said:

C: I was very hurt with my uncle because I learned that when I tried to commit suicide he sent me a message saying that "it was no use my trying to kill myself, because I was not irreplaceable." I was mad at him, because I really believe that he could not replace me with another nephew like me. For instance, the poetry I write and the songs I compose — nobody else can do this but me. They are unique in the whole world.

Dr. Keppe then interpreted for him:

K: You are irreplaceable and replaceable at the same time. You are unique in your sanity and completely useless in your pathological behaviour.

Continuing the same analysis, Mr. D. C. said:

C: I could never understand my uncle very well. He is a politician in his town, two-faced, a prejudiced dictator and a fascist. On the other hand, he is usually involved in charity, helping poor children and orphanages.

Dr. Keppe interpreted again:

K: You are saying that you have a two-faced attitude, that you are a dictator towards yourself, and prejudiced, but on the other hand you also have this very sane aspect of charity, goodness and love for your fellow men.

You can observe that the interpretation given was dialectical, trying to conscientize the client of his pathological attitudes as well as of his sane attitude.

His arrogance caused Man to reject the consciousness of his ill intentions, therefore making his process of healing more difficult

A client does not admit he denies his sanity, censoring this perception, for then he would have to realize he is indeed ill-intentioned, having therefore to come down from the high horse he places himself on. Deep inside, he always wants to keep the image of a well-intentioned, good fellow, and as he has to see the opposite, he does not admit it, falling into deep anguish. I will illustrate this with the session of Ms. L. D.:

C: Yesterday I felt bad. Really bad.

T: Why?

C: I was very pessimistic, sad and couldn't do anything. I know that I am denying joy through my will and I cannot change.

T: You say that you feel yourself to be the victim of your will and not the author of your ailment.

C: Oh no! I know I am damaging my life but cannot do anything about it!

T: But why don't you accept the consciousness that you are ill-intentioned regarding yourself?

C: I don't know... I think that it is because I do not want to be like this.

T: No. You say that you do not want to see that you behave like this. Because otherwise you would have to be humble and admit that in fact you are not that well-intentioned individual you imagine yourself to be.

After this interpretation, Miss L. D., who was very excited, calmed down immediately, for truth, when it is accepted — whatever truth it may be — is the only efficient sedative for the human being. The human being thinks that his illness harms others, not himself.

Man loves to cultivate the idea that with his illness he is harming others. For instance, the client, when he leaves analysis, indeed believes that he is attacking the analyst. He can never admit that he is only harming himself.

A client of mine, after having greatly improved through analysis, decided to abandon the treatment, saying that he would like to keep on paying for the sessions for some time until I could find another client to take his place. So he clearly revealed the idea that by abandoning analysis he would be harming me. In fact, I had clients waiting because my time was full up and these clients would benefit from treatment, but he did not even imagine that. After some time his family was already talking about his worsening.

Another case is of a suicidal teen-ager who revealed that her intention was always to attack her parents, brothers and sisters, going against them as much as she could. She used to tell me that when her father came back home at the end of the day, tired and wanting some peace, she would make a noise, play music very loud, quarrel with him, and was very glad when she thought that she could disturb him. I interpreted her showing her that her father, whom she did not allow any peace in order to enjoy the pleasantness of life, was herself. This made her very relieved, for whoever builds up many fantasies about being able to "destroy" life and others has many feelings of guilt due to this. When he realizes that the only individual really harmed is himself, he is surprised and at the same time immediately calms down.

When Man denies his sanity, he imagines himself to be more powerful than God. The individual believes he has great power with his illness and inverts reality, regarding sanity, good, as something transitory, and illness, evil, as the only certainty.

Mr. C. F. said that whenever he felt well, he would feel scared and measure his heartbeat, suspecting that something very bad would happen to him. He believed that his well-being was fanciful and could not see that evil was merely a cloud he would place before the Sun existing in his inner self.

Example of this fact can be seen in the films shown on TV, which give great emphasis to fantasy and illness, considering evil as something prevailing. Man can hardly admit talking about reality, for then he would have to admit the greatness of his Creator. This is why clients talk the whole time only about these negativist fantasies, ignoring the wonder at their disposal. If the analyst adopts a fatalistic position, seeing the client and himself as condemned people, he enters into an unhealthy pact in order to attack truth, whereby both are harmed. He who denies imagines that he is more powerful than God, believing he can destroy Him in his inner self.

Mrs. I. B., a very anguished lady, wracked with pain and suffering from many organic illnesses, tells in her analysis sessions that she is always very worried about keeping her house tidy, that no matter how hard she works and puts everything in the right place, she always considers her house ugly, thus getting very tired. She argues with her husband, for he tells her that their home is supposed to be used for their benefit and she should not spend the whole time tidying it up.

Our interpretation was the following: Mrs. I. B. thinks she is a Goddess who has to correct everything, to build up her sanity and her inner self (here symbolized by her house). Since she can never accomplish this, she becomes exhausted, anguished and ill. Her husband's words represent herself saying that her inner self is to be enjoyed and that she is not being able to do this because of her megalomaniac idea that she is her own sole provider.

Man believes that he himself is the sole provider of his happiness. Therefore, he attributes the satisfaction that he actually obtains from reality not to reality itself but to his own fantasy and alienation. Man imagines that fantasy or escape is what brings him happiness. Thus, because of his envy, he tries to minimize the role of the Creator and avoids feeling gratitude for the many things he receives from Truth. He sees life as a Greek gift (or a box full of bad surprises), being distrustful of his Donor.

I have a client who said the following: "Each time I feel well, calm, I think that this peace is not normal. Or rather, that I am alienated. On the contrary, when I am more in contact with reality, my work, my problems, I do not feel like this. This is why I suspect this calmness". Here you can notice the inversion the human being makes, for when he denies the contact with reality he creates many problems, feeling bad and anguished right afterwards.

Another example is the case of the drug addicts who believe that their artistic creations or pleasure in sex are caused by a chemical process. However, it is *only* their sanity that makes them feel good, and they accomplish beautiful things not because but *in spite of* the drugs. If they were not drug addicts, and accepted contact with their sanity, they would be able to accomplish much more. When an individual, for instance, smokes marijuana to have more pleasure in sex, he has decided, previously, that he will get more pleasure out of the sexual relationship. There are many people that feel an opposite "effect" when they make use of this resource, which means that there is something prior to the drug that determines their reactions. Elvis Presley is an excellent example of a great talent who destroyed himself by taking too many drugs. He became completely dependent on drugs because he projected his sanity onto them, believing that he could not survive without them. You can see the inversion: he placed good in alienation, denying it at its very source, which was his inner self, and this led him to death.

### **Man feeds his pathological behaviour thinking that he will benefit from it**

The human being nourishes the hope that one day he will feel well through fantasy and alienation. This is why he feeds his fantastic attitudes as well as those of others. The consequences, however, are always adverse to him. In Brazil we say that the smartest individual is the most honest. And in practice we see that this is true. I will illustrate this with an analysis where we can notice this deception created by human beings.

C: I have this friend who works with me and who is always borrowing some money from me and I do not have the courage to say "No". And the worst thing is that she never pays me back. Today she asked me for a lift and after that I felt very ill.

T: What is this girl like? Tell me something about her.

C: Oh, she is a liar. She must be very superficial and vain, for she is always wearing new clothes and I think that the last money I lent her was for her to spend during Carnival.

T: What do you think about Carnival?

C: It's a fantasy world, everybody all over everybody else...

T: So you mean that you feel ill because of feeding this futility, superficiality and fantasy in yourself. And, although you nourish the idea that you will never suffer any consequences behaving like this, you always get harmed because of it.

Another example:

C: I can't stand seeing beggars in the streets because I pity them and feel very anguished. I feel I should help them, give them money and food. My wife says that I should not act like that for I am feeding

their laziness. But I feel pity for them and think that in spite of all, they are suffering.

T: What is a beggar to you?

C: Well, a beggar is an alienated individual who does not want to work and for this reason ends up in misery. He thinks that other people should take care of him, and in this sense he is a megalomaniac, but even so I feel pity for him.. .

T: You mean by this that for not accepting to work with your inner richness, you become poor and suffer very much for this reason. And you feed this megalomaniac attitude of despising sanity and opting for alienation, thinking that by doing so you are helping yourself.

### **The human being thinks that he has to be loyal to his pathology, passively submitting himself to it**

The human being often inverts things, seeing value in the attitude of suffering, privation and even impoverishment. Religious ideas usually feed this way of thinking, seeing a sin both in social and in psychic wealth (mainly the latter). He does not realize that the richest being of all is God himself and that the reality he has bestowed on us is equally rich. Our sanity was given to us by God and this way, he who accepts it is the richest and happiest creature of all. It is for this reason that many clients obtain great professional and social progress while doing analysis.

Miss T. C., for instance, often feels guilty for enjoying earning money with the sales she accomplishes in her field of business, and Mr. F. S. thinks that he should not work with big companies because he is not capable enough. Both mean that they consider it wrong to take advantage of their inner riches, of their sanity, and they would profit very much by it.

Others excuse themselves saying that they do not deserve the joy and beauty of life because they have not done anything to obtain it. This is a subtle way of not wanting to recognize the generosity of reality in relation to us, offering us everything gratis.

Another curious example of how we waste our possibilities comes from a client of mine who was invited by the firm he works with to take a course in Japan, which would give him a chance to be promoted. But then he entered a state of crisis and planned to submit his resignation. He only did not do so because he realized, through analysis, that in the same way as he was rejecting professional promotion, he was rejecting his inner evolution and development.

At one of her sessions Mrs. M. I., said:

I have a very rich cousin who lives in the town where I was born and I have always envied him. He's never had to work and has spent his whole life travelling around the world. I used to feel bad and weak in his presence because he was rich and powerful. For this reason I had to move from that town. I could not stand seeing him with so many privileges and my not being able to take any advantage of them.

Our interpretation: by transferring this rich cousin, full of privileges, to Mrs. M. I.'s psychic life, we can see that she is saying she has enormous wealth and thousands of possibilities within her and that she is refusing to take advantage of them. She is also

saying that she is trying to get away from the consciousness she has of this denial of hers.

Very often, eroticism is an attitude of aggression rather than affection. Freud created great confusion in regard to sex and affection and mankind began to consider every act of eroticism as something healthy and natural. Only nowadays are people beginning to notice this mistake and realize that sex is, most of the time, used to attack one's own sanity as well as that of others. I often notice that the most genitally-oriented clients are, at the same time, the most aggressive ones. It is interesting to observe the insistence of certain individuals in believing that eroticism can really bring them some satisfaction (beyond the physical one, of course). And this inversion causes them much anguish. To illustrate:

C: I went to the Bank yesterday and there was this very attractive young lady who was looking at me the whole time. I could feel she wanted to have sexual intercourse with me. I was disturbed. Then I thought that I should not do that because of my wife, but I kept on thinking that I was missing a very good chance.

T: Say something else about this young lady. What was she like?

C: Well, she was very beautiful, but she looked like a prostitute. She was frail, dishonest and had an aggressive look.

T: Now, transplanting this young lady into your psychic life, you are saying that you become anguished when you try to have pleasure or are disturbed by your own frailness, aggressiveness and dishonesty.

C: But I'm not dishonest with other people.

T: Not with others, but aren't you dishonest with yourself?

C: Well, yes... I am dishonest with myself. So is this why every time I went to motels to sleep with my friends I felt bad and depressed afterwards? Because I was attacking myself?

T: You are saying it yourself.

Sex can be used as a factor of alienation or conscientising. Integral Psychoanalysis considers sex as the symbol of our relationship with our inner selves. It may, however, be used as a means of escape or aggression. The interpretation must always be dialectical, not linked to social facts, but to the symbolism of the person.

To illustrate: Mrs. A. S. was married and complained that sex with her husband was very depressing. After every intercourse she became anguished. In fact, she had never loved him. She said that he was very aggressive, superficial, arrogant and forbade her everything, besides criticizing her very much. We can observe that Mrs. A. S. actually had an anti-marriage, in search of the complete denial of her sanity. After a few years, she met another man whom she fell in love with. Socially, this fact is considered wrong. But let's consider the interpretation, resulting from Integral Psychoanalysis.

C: I always feel guilty because I am madly in love with R. I started to live after I met him. I am in great conflict because I should be loyal to my husband, although I have never loved him, and even in sex we have never had any affinity. Each sexual intercourse was a true sacrifice. It seemed that I was dying while still living. But I still think I am wrong and that I should have stood it to the bitter end.

T: How do you see Mr. R.?

C: To me, he represents everything wonderful that exists: maturity, balance, truth, love, my happiness, the sweetest thing, without which I cannot live.

T: Then you are saying that you have fallen in love with the loveable, sweet, truthful, balanced A. S., but in spite of this you try to remain loyal to your pathological attitude, which is censoring, critical and aggressive.

In the first case, Mrs. A. S. tried to use sex to alienate herself from life, from her sanity, and in the second case, it was a manner of conscientising her sanity. Please note that we try to limit ourselves only to the psychological aspects, leaving the social decisions for the client to make. We do not interfere with their personal freedom or with their choices. A truly interiorized man knows, better than others, how to behave socially.

### **Homosexuality is the social manifestation of a mistake in our behaviour towards our inner self**

Dr. Keppe has observed that, like any other recurrent problems, homosexuality would increase in intensity if treated in a direct manner, intensifying the client's anguish. This aspect is also treated by Integral Psychoanalysis as the expression of something belonging to the inner world of the individual. We can observe that homosexuality is neither an illness in itself nor the result of any organic cause. The hormonal and behavioral alterations are due to an erroneous attitude the individual adopts towards himself. And, by treating the true cause, the consequence will also be reached.

To illustrate, I describe below the session of a homosexual client:

C: I am in an enormous conflict. I have a friend that I have a close affective relationship with, but we have never had any physical contact. As a matter of fact, he is engaged to be married. I am in doubt because I do not know whether I should free myself and have sex with him, or if I should keep away from him for good. Yesterday we had a misunderstanding and I decided that I would not see him anymore. But then I felt great anxiety.

T: But tell me something else about this friend of yours. What is he like?

C: He is a great individual. He is happy, generous, an idealist, very affectionate.

T: You mean that you love your happiness, your generosity, your idealism, but you do not know whether to accept a closer relationship with these aspects of your inner self or not. And when you deny your sanity completely, you feel deeply anguished and persecuted.

I would like you to observe that the social aspect of this relationship was left aside so that we could limit ourselves exclusively to the client's psychic life. The gentleman in question projects onto his friend the sanity he has in his inner self, which he loves but does not want to admit.

## **Anguish is something good for the individual and should not be stifled, but treated**

In psychic life, anguish works like a fever regarding one's system. It is a defense we have against something wrong that we are doing to ourselves. If, for instance, we treat the fever before we know the cause of the disease, we shall be masking the pathological picture, with serious harm to the individual's health. If we do the same thing with anguish, trying to escape from it through medicines or amusement, we shall be exposing ourselves to the same danger.

## **He who cannot stand feeling any anguish or any type of depression is completely mad**

Behind each anxiety there is an attitude of alteration, omission or denial of our reality, which will certainly bring on harm. Therefore, therapy should work with anguish and not eliminate it summarily.

Our client P.S., for instance, feels anguished every time he is alone in his house. He cannot stand loneliness, so he goes out and looks for the company of young men for a homosexual relationship or else he drinks, expecting the anguish to vanish and feels worse afterwards. Mr. P.S. rejects the relationship with his inner self, which is the only thing that could bring him peace. He is always trying to run away from himself, whether through drinking, or through other people, thus falling into deep anguish.

## **The analysis of deliriums and hallucinations**

The greater the struggle the individual undertakes against consciousness, the more severe will be the means his inner self will have to use for Truth to prevail. This is the case of deliriums and hallucinations. Each rejected fact comes back to consciousness through symbols: delirious ideas, visions, voices, sounds, etc. that show him what he is refusing to perceive. The process of analysis of deliriums and hallucinations is the same we use to analyse other facts.

Ms. X., a schizophrenic, said once at the beginning of her treatment, that she could not stop taking drugs because of her hallucinations. She used to hear voices accusing her all the time. Dr. Keppe then asked her what the voices said. She replied: — "They call me a tramp, a mad woman, a whore and many other bad words".

Dr. Keppe interpreted her: "But it is very good for you to hear these voices. They are yourself, attacking, censoring the consciousness of your being a tramp, irresponsible, mad, everything you do against yourself. You take drugs to hide this perception, and you harm yourself by doing so".

In fact, when her family brought the young lady in for treatment, we were told that Miss X. showed completely irregular behaviour, that she had prostituted herself. She did not want to work or study and she was very aggressive. Ms. X., by denying the conscientizing of her destructive behaviour regarding life, ended up in deliriums and hallucinations, which showed her the fight she was undertaking against truth.

You can well observe that the content of these hallucinations is very important for the sick person, and one should never treat them with medicines in order to stop its voices or visions, for through them the individual can realize what wrong he is doing to himself.

Mr. C.N. told us in group analysis that he used to see the image of a beautiful young lady smiling at him tenderly and reaching out for him. He said he got scared and cried in fear, realizing he was going mad.

Dr. Keppe asked him: "What do you associate the image of this young lady with"?

He answered: "Well, with beauty, goodness, affection..."

Dr. Keppe interpreted him: "You mean you are going mad because you reject getting closer to the affection, beauty and goodness existing in your inner self." Mr. C.N. burst into tears and then felt great relief, confirming that he really always kept away from everybody, considering that feeling was something that harmed a man, and made him weak. Then he revealed the inversion he made: he saw fragility in love and could not realize he was getting weak just because he denied it.

Another client (Mr. J.A.) said that he was scared during the night, being unable to sleep because he felt that the Devil, like powerful forces, was coming to destroy him. Actually he was telling something that was happening inside himself. These "powerful forces" are the megalomaniacal fantasy of believing he is able to destroy the Sanity existing inside him. This very sanity is all the wonder and good that exist in his inner self, the consciousness of which he does not accept, adopting a demoniacal attitude against God, whom he sees reflected inside himself.

Deliriums and hallucinations are not merely fantasies that should be repressed. The client complains about something that is indeed taking place in his inner self. Therefore, the anguish he feels is perfectly justifiable, for what he says has a real existence in itself. For instance, Mr. R.G. had delirious ideas that his wife was being unfaithful to him, going out with his boss. He had a crisis of strong depression and was obliged to leave his job because everything his colleagues would say to him, he would interpret as sarcasm against himself. And he said he was sure, although he could not prove it, that his wife was betraying him and that everybody knew about it. He almost committed suicide and his family was already considering committing him to an asylum. Our interpretation was the following: his wife represented everything he had of truth, beauty and affection inside himself, a reality he was constantly betraying and destroying, for he had even lost many years of his life going after women and libidinous practices. His sexual fantasies were a treachery to his very inner reality and he perceived the gravity of this through his wife.

Mr. R.G. noticed little by little that he used to betray his affective life from childhood, always refusing to feel affection and attacking everything he had of truthful and pure inside himself. He told us that when his father played the violin, he was very moved. He could not stand the feeling it awakened in him, so he used to escape to a place where he could not hear it. Thus he revealed the attitude he had of not standing any contact with the beauty of his feelings, always trying to escape from himself. His mother had a vegetable garden in the back yard and took care of it lovingly. He said he used to urinate on the vegetables, thinking that by doing so he would be attacking his mother, who was very good. But, in fact, he was saying that he was "attacking" himself, trying to harm his own goodness, which feeds him psychically. After three weeks of analysis, he was already able to go back to work, resuming his normal life, with no need to take medicines or be interned.

### **Dreams reveal our attitudes of denial or acceptance of reality**

We analyse dreams in the same way as we analyse other facts. Each image is the symbol of an aspect of ours. After a person tells us about his or her dreams, we ask the individual to associate its components, transferring these relations to his or her psychic life.

For instance, Mrs. E.S. described the following dream to me:

C : I was told by a friend of mine that my husband was betraying me on the sly, for he was already sick and tired of being tied up to a sick woman. She told me that I should be careful because the other woman was beautiful and cheerful, and that I would lose him to her. I was very sad, because I think that if he betrayed me for this reason it would be because he doesn't love me. If he did, he would be more patient with my illness.

T: Shall we put these people of your dream into your inner self?

What does it mean, your husband being tired of being tied up to a sick woman?

C: I don't know ...

T: Your husband is yourself, who are tired of living tied up to your pathological behaviour and who want to start a new life, happier and healthier. The only thing is that you consider this a betrayal to your illness, to which you insist on being loyal.

You can observe that each character in a dream is one facet of the individual. In this case, for instance, her husband was herself, and so were her rival and her friend who warned her, representing her own self warning her of the betrayal that she was committing against herself.

Man's body shows very clearly what is happening in his inner self. Our system is the thermometer of our psyche. This means that if something is going wrong with our emotional life, some kind of organic alteration will appear. When the psychic problem is healed, the organic problem will be eliminated automatically.

People usually say that it is very difficult for an individual to heal a psychosomatic illness only through analysis, without the use of any kind of medicine. As a matter of fact, in Brazil there are a few psychosomatic practitioners who still use medicines such as sedatives and drugs for the treatment of somatised clients.

The Society of Integral Psychoanalysis has a record of several cases that were healed of several types of diseases without the use of any sort of medicine. In fact, the illnesses most easily healed through Integral Psychoanalysis are the organic ones, which right from the first sessions are considerably abated, and can easily be completely healed. Typical cases of psychosomatic diseases such as asthma, bronchitis, ulcers, colitis, allergies, headaches, migraine, tachycardia, menstrual disturbances (such as metrorrhagia, dysmenorrhea, amenorrhea), rheumatoid arthritis, skin diseases, etc., and the typically somatic diseases such as leukemia, cancer, tumours, infections, spinal disorders, disturbances of vision, ulcerative colitis, sterility and miscarriages have all been treated by Integral Psychoanalysis with excellent results in an approximate proportion of ninety healings out of one hundred cases, and most failures apply to people who abandon analysis before being healed. There is no limit to the client's age. There are cases from three- or four-month-old babies (such as the case of a little boy who ran a temperature every weekend) to people over sixty years of age.

Two years ago I had a fifty-six-year-old client from Brasilia who had a growing uterine myoma as big as an orange, with abundant hemorrhaging and cysts in the ovaries. She needed to be operated on urgently, but because her blood pressure was 240/180, the doctors were afraid she might die on the operating table. She travelled to Sao Paulo every week to attend our psychoanalysis sessions. After three months her bleeding had stopped. Her pressure had come down to 120/80. She no longer had to be operated on for her myoma had receded and disappeared completely, the same

happening to the cysts in the ovaries. Her healing was followed by specialized physicians who verified the results through gynaecological examinations and x-rays. This was not the only case of healing of myomas; there were others.

I also had another client, a young girl with leukemia, who had been regarded as a lost case by the doctors. Her death was expected at any time. I started her treatment and within three months she presented an astonishing improvement, and then was discharged by her doctor. On this occasion, she wanted to abandon analysis and her parents allowed her to. I was apprehensive, because she was a very destructive individual and her leaving analysis was precocious: her psychic problem had not yet been duly analysed. I learned after six months that she had died in an accident.

We have registered dozens of very interesting cases like the above which have been treated by several analysts, only by using the dialectical method of Integral Psychoanalysis.

### **The true conscientising is that of our resemblance to God**

The individual has got used to associating psychotherapy with the conscientising of his faults, mistakes and illnesses. But the groups that adopt such methods of therapy cause a constant feeding of the client's fantasies, which are the denial, omission and alteration of his sanity. This tragic view is common in psychoanalysis, emphasizing only the pathological aspect. This is why many people who are submitted to these treatments do not show any improvement, and even get worse.

Integral Psychoanalysis considers real conscientising as the realization that madness consists of this vain and constant attempt to destroy sanity. We always try to show our client that he is blinding himself to the sight of how wonderful his inner self is and how he is harming himself by doing so, to the point of becoming ill for not wanting to admit his resemblance to God. Believe that the moment has come for our accepting the consciousness that we are beings made in the resemblance of God and that we cannot live in a different way, under the penalty of becoming physically, psychologically and socially ill.

Keppe says that primitive peoples are not those that have not reached a more advanced level, but those that, by rejecting this more advanced condition, have retrograded, atrophying their mental and even physical capacities. And this can be applied to neurotic and psychotic individuals. I will illustrate this with a session of a client.

C: Now that you are moving your clinic farther away, I don't think I'll be able to get to the group sessions in time, for it will be a long walk.

T: Can't you get a taxi?

C: The taxi driver won't want to take me for such a short run.

T: You don't want to take yourself thus far. But what do the group sessions mean to you?

C: Well, doctor, I really don't like the group. I think that the group represents consciousness.

T: Consciousness of what?

C: Well, they show me my faults, my illness, which I want to conceal ...

T: You see that you invert things completely. You are concealing your sanity, not your illness. Madness is exactly this: our concealing

that which is most beautiful in our inner selves. You want to believe that you are a sick person, a lost case, and not that you have wonders inside yourself but do not want to make use of them, as the group has been trying to show you.

## **Conclusion**

Integral Psychoanalysis is not only psychotherapy, but also a new way of looking at the world. Through it we can see that the whole of mankind is already unified, that all peoples, from all parts of the world, of every creed or ideology, are eternally united by the inner truth, which is common to everyone. Our task would not be to discover different points among peoples in order to accomplish the great synthesis, but to realize that all men on this planet are already tied by an imperishable link, a union that is being disturbed by several fantasies Man has been building up. Brazil has helped us very much with this discovery, as it is a country of great miscegenation where Europeans, North-Americans, Latin-Americans, Orientals and Jews, in short all races, live together. In treating these clients, we have observed that there are no real divergences between any of the peoples of the world. All love and accept truth. Dissent and suffering originate only from what does not exist: our fantasies.

We have the great task of helping human beings become conscious of how much we fight against this union. In fact, this consciousness is the only way for us to succeed in enjoying the incredible reality that exists all around us and harvesting the wondrous benefits of this. A Jew could not be different from a Christian or a Muslim because all have the same nature. The difference between them lies only in their fantasies, something that will be easy to deal with, for such fantasies do not exist by themselves. We are all separated by imaginary factors and we only have to realize this for unity to prevail.

We have observed through practice, that Integral Psychoanalysis is the best method to accomplish this. We need not worry, for, even though we do not admit it, we are all only one enormous people.