



Melanie Klein Trust

### **Some Personal Reflections of Melanie Klein by James Gammill**

The following is reproduced, with kind permission, from the journal *Melanie Klein and Object Relations*. Before this, it was published as 'Quelques Souvenirs Personnels sur Mélanie Klein' in *Mélanie Klein Aujourd'hui*. Cesura Lyon Edition, 1989. The translation into English was by Monique Meloche with help from the author and Clifford Scott.

**James Gammill**, M.D., is a psychoanalyst and a training analyst who has taught child psychoanalysis and psychotherapy in many centres in the U.S.A. and France. He is a member of the British Psychoanalytic Society and a member of the Paris Psychoanalytic Society.

---

Mrs. Klein is the only person of genius with whom I have been in close contact in the course of my university, medical and psychoanalytical training.

In spite of a warm and friendly relation, which I felt was reciprocal, there was something awesome about her quality of genius, at the same time deeply inspiring and somewhat inhibiting, for with flashes of insight and intuition she could often say more in two or three sentences than many analysts could in an article. At the same time, I felt quite at ease in presenting clinical material to her. She listened attentively, but made fewer comments and suggestions on technique than I expected during the supervision of a first child analysis. She seemed mainly concerned that the principal themes and relevant emotions should be detected and deepened by interpretation. She emphasised that with a highly communicative three-year-old patient one cannot recall and follow through on all the material. However, she did want the material recalled in as much detail as possible, so that the candidate would have a feel for the extraordinary complexity of the psychic life at an early age.

She considered that many analysts working only with adults would not have come to oversimplified conclusions about the first five years of life, if they had given themselves the opportunity of working analytically with small children. In fact, in the late 1950s, she only did supervisions of child analyses of small children from 2<sup>1/2</sup> to 5 years of age, considering that she could offer more from her experience with this age group.

She once said that only a very few highly gifted analysts had been able to grasp the essence of her work without such experience, and that most analysts cannot fully understand her work without having analysed at least one small child. She added that much ignorant and misguided criticism of her work might have been altered if these critics had tried child analysis by using her technique, which aimed at favouring the development of the whole range of the young child's possibilities of communicating his emotional experience. His capacity for communicating was seen in relation to his developing ego, the functioning of which varied considerably during the day-to-day analysis and sometimes even during the same session. For instance, she advised explaining to my three-year-old patient that he had dreamed when he said: 'Mr. Gammill, last night I opened the curtains and saw murder inside'. She felt I should convey to him that the dream experience when told and thought about helped our work together.



As you know, Mrs. Klein was very concerned about the formulation of interpretations, and feared that theoretical formulations might enter to too great an extent. She once criticised an interpretation I made along the lines of 'one part of you.. and another part of you .. .' indicating that the material suggested rather 'Sometimes you may wish this; at another time you may wish that'; and that one was in the domain of ambivalence at that moment and that interpreting on the level of splitting in this context might increase splitting tendencies. I shall not discuss here her views on the technique for the interpretation of splitting, a mechanism of defense which expresses itself in so many varied forms. Its interpretation involves many different elements, i.e., timing, choice of words, and so on, all aiming to encourage maximally a gradual process of integration and to minimize the development in the patient of too precocious guilt and confusion between the good and bad, idealizing and persecutory reactions, and so on. Going into detail on this subject would require a very long paper.

She emphasised not only getting to know the specific vocabulary of a small child, but also his or her individual style of self-expression so as to formulate the interpretations in such a way that they would have the greatest possible chance of being understood and used.

She felt that the child had a right to ask the analyst for the evidence of an interpretation if the evidence did not appear clear to him or her. If something blocked the child's comprehension, he or she was entitled to ask us to try again, with the analyst making the evidence as clear as possible as well as attempting to understand the anxiety which tended to block comprehension.

In the period of my supervision with her (1957-1959), great use was being made of countertransference feelings as a source of evidence. Later, it was used more and more. In general, I had the impression that she was in agreement<sup>[1]</sup> but she emphasised that this source of evidence should render the analyst alert to detect other *evidence demonstrable to the patient* of the theme or the feelings aroused in the countertransference. Likewise, it did not seem enough in general to her that the patient should feel understood, but that he or she should also have some understanding of what made this comprehension possible. Mrs. Klein never used, in my presence, the expression of 'working alliance' but I think this was implicit in her whole attitude about technique.

However, I am concerned to be boring you by presenting things that you already have heard and know about. Perhaps something of my perception of Mrs. Klein's more personal judgements, or prejudices, about psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic personalities may be more interesting. This evocation may possibly give a certain idea of what she thought about psychoanalytic ethics and the history of the psychoanalytic movement.

When I applied for training in 1952, it was exceptional that an American should consider training in Mrs. Klein's Group in London. Mrs. Klein was interested to learn how I had come to know of her work and what had been the reaction in the United States to my decision.



I had worked as a medical student intern in the summer of 1950 with psychiatric patients at the Walter Reed Army Hospital in Washington, D.C., U.S.A.. After some reading of Federn, Fromm-Reichmann, Rosen and others, trying to understand something of these patients, I came upon an article of Hanna Segal on the analysis of a schizophrenic patient, which indicated an approach much closer to what I had observed in my brief contact with patients. The bibliography contained 'Notes on Some Schizoid Mechanisms,' the reading of which left me with the conviction of the universal applicability of Mrs. Klein's work. During the summer of 1951, I worked at the Topeka State Hospital, under the direction of Dr. Karl Menninger, with whom I discussed my project of having training in London. His reaction was immediate: 'You will never be accepted in American psychoanalysis. Mrs. Klein's theories are all wrong and contrary to accepted classical psychoanalysis!' Mrs. Klein smiled sadly with a shrug of the shoulders, saying, 'Oh, I think he was trained in Chicago, perhaps even analysed by Franz Alexander. When I was in Berlin, Franz was one of the most gifted analysts there. But he needed to have colleagues around him to discuss with and hold him in check. Two things seem to have gone to his head. First, there were two or three references with praise of him in Freud's writings. Second, he was made Director of the Chicago Institute. As an analyst, he seems to have been wrecked by too much success in America where he was idolised in the thirties. Also, I certainly did not appreciate his reference to my 'kind aunt' technique in the review he wrote on my *Psychoanalysis of Children*.<sup>[2]</sup>

I had the impression that Mrs. Klein had hoped for a more favourable review from Alexander (in fact, it appears to me somewhat more positive than negative)<sup>[3]</sup> as well as a widespread interest in her book by American psychoanalysis as it was before the extensive Viennese Society emigration which began in 1938. A favourable attitude and an important support on Alexander's part might have facilitated an acceptance of Kleinian ideas, at least in child analysis, by American analysts. American psychoanalysis had very few child analysts within its group before the immigration of many Viennese child analysts in the late 1930s.

However, she continued to maintain hope for she spoke very positively of Dr. Maxwell Gitelson, also of the Chicago Institute, with whom she had talked perhaps at the Paris Congress of 1957 a few weeks earlier, or at a previous Congress. She was pleased that as President of the I.P.A., he was concerned about the development of child analysis in America and in the world, and that he manifested respect for her work. Also, she found that his papers and discussion remarks at Congresses were always interesting and thoughtful, and marked by a true concern for his patients, though of course she was not always in agreement with his point of view. Mrs. Klein felt it was important that the President of the I.P.A. and of the component societies should be people with a deep feeling for psychoanalysis and be distinguished by their clinical and scientific work. Amongst other reasons, she emphasized their influence on candidates and younger members in terms of representing an ideal for psychoanalysis. In this respect, she expressed great esteem for Dr. Ernest Jones as President par excellence.

Jones died during the period of my supervision with Mrs. Klein. She spoke of him in very moving terms and it was evident that she was very deeply affected by his death. She greatly appreciated his support and encouragement for her work, recalling the Congress at which he asked her to contribute an article 'for his journal'<sup>[4]</sup>, *The International Journal of psychoanalysis*. However, in her rather long evocation of



## Melanie Klein Trust

Jones, she indicated one situation where he wished to be too helpful. Mrs. Klein admitted her difficulties in writing clearly of complexities and in not having a good literary style, such as Freud's. But when Jones offered once to rewrite one of her articles in the 1930s so that her thinking would be more clearly expressed, she thanked him and refused politely, saying: 'It would be clear, but it would no longer be me.' She said this with affectionate good humour but with firmness.

My supervision with Mrs. Klein was on Thursday afternoon, just after her period of afternoon rest. When the weather was good. I would often find her sitting in the garden in front of her house. One day she told me of an interesting conversation with a 'charming young woman who is my neighbour and is in analytic training'. In the course of the conversation, Mrs. Klein asked her (years later I learned 'she' was Dinora Pines) to what Group she belonged, receiving the answer that the young lady was a Freudian. Mrs. Klein then replied: 'I too am Freudian, but *not* Anna Freudian'. She commented with some bitterness that it was Anna Freud who had first attacked her views in her 1926 book, whereas everywhere in the world it was Mrs. Klein who was taken to task for attacks in the London Symposium of 1927 devoted to the discussion of Anna Freud's book. She did not mention the letter from Freud to Ernest Jones of which she would have been aware from reading the biography of Freud. She only spoke once of an implicit rivalry with Miss Freud, saying that it was such a shame that a person (whom she named) in the B Group, whom Mrs. Klein considered intelligent and gifted analytically, was not encouraged to become a training analyst, whereas Mrs. Klein felt that in her own Group she tried to identify analytic talent, and to encourage talented analysts to develop their gifts and to assume appropriate responsibilities in psychoanalysis.

Mrs. Klein laid great stress on the capacity to respect people of personal and scientific integrity, even or especially if their views differed, 'perhaps because I know only too well how hard it is, and have been myself swept by passionate feelings and at certain moments needed unconditional supporters.' In my last private conversation with her, at tea in the Connaught Hotel in June 1959, she indicated that one of her unconditional supporters had caused unnecessary difficulties with the other groups. Mrs. Klein spoke with admiration, even I would say with an affectionate attitude, of Mrs. Marianne Kris, whom she saw when Marianne Kris returned to London or at Congresses on the Continent after the war. Mrs. Kris was to her 'a true lady, of great distinction, and deeply devoted to psychoanalysis.' Mrs. Klein considered that the emigration of the Krises was a great loss to the British Society. Though she admired Ernst Kris' intelligence and vast culture, I gained the impression that he was not as much esteemed as a person as his wife.

Being truly and deeply devoted to psychoanalysis seemed to be the most essential criterion for Mrs. Klein in judging colleagues. She emphasized to me that it was a waste of time to discuss or debate her work with analysts who did not possess this basic quality. Though understanding analytically the universal tendency to idealization, she could be bitter and scathing in her remarks about analysts who had been extremely positive about her work, and later rejected and attacked it, 'often without ever having tried to apply my technique, the number of sessions necessary, or to seek the personal analysis or supervision necessary to truly understand the nature of my work, particularly with children'.



## Melanie Klein Trust

Perhaps she found pretentiousness and superficiality the human traits the most difficult to stand. Once, the day following a Society meeting at which Dr. Bion had spoken, she said: 'What on earth did (a certain analyst) mean when she said she understood perfectly what Dr. Bion meant to convey in his talk. I often have to read over several times the text of Dr. Bion's talks before I begin to grasp something of what he has to say. I have the impression that he is on to something new in psychoanalysis but it's no use pretending that it is easy and evident'.

Many of the things she said which conveyed certain fundamental attitudes are contained in Hanna Segal's book *Klein* so need not be repeated.

During the period of this supervision, I read the Fliess letters and remarked to Mrs. Klein that in one letter Freud had linked the origin of his neurosis with a frightening and persecutory mother image (a nanny) where aspects of splitting and displacement regarding his own mother were evident. She commented that this was very interesting, but that he had not been able to follow up on this in the elaboration of psychoanalytical theory, 'perhaps because he needed so much the sense of having been a loved favourite of his mother to have the courage to carry on his work. Then too, his mother did not die until 1931, so that the work of mourning was not forced upon him as with the death of his father. Valuable and useful ideas come occasionally to gifted analysts' minds, but they need much working through and checking out on oneself and with a sufficient number of patients to be confirmed and given proper weight in overall psychoanalytic theory. Helene Deutsch was an extremely gifted analyst, and was very close to discovering several things which I worked out. I think she was handicapped by a lack of experience of child analysis and too preoccupied with loyalty to Freud and his theories to make the necessary breakthrough.'

Mrs. Klein placed great importance on experience in psychoanalysis. She strongly recommended to me that I should do my second child case with Mrs. Bick, because of her vast experience in child analysis and the overall setting in which the need<sup>[5]</sup> for child analysis can arise. It so happened that Mrs. Bick at the moment when she gave her Institute seminars received the negative transference and projections of my personal analysis, so that I could not follow Mrs. Klein's suggestion. However, the supervision with Dr. Segal was extremely helpful in my evolution, and later (thanks to Mrs. Martha Harris), I was able to follow Mrs. Bick's Tavistock seminars on adolescent analysis and benefit from the extraordinary gifts of Mrs. Bick which Mrs. Klein so valued, as well as having occasional supervision by her of cases treated in France and in the United States. In addition, some of my gifted students of child analysis in France learned the technique of infant observation and the spirit of research it carries with it from Mrs. Bick. and so I have also had a feedback from this dimension.

In a discussion of material around the difference between the 'external and internal object,' Mrs. Klein evoked her only private conversation with Freud, whom she had previously seen and heard at International Congresses. At the time she saw him (probably in the early 1920s), analysts who wished to see Freud had to pass through Otto Rank, who made the appointments for Freud. She spoke to him mainly of her work with children, and was disappointed that Freud did not appear very interested in what she was telling him, nor were his few comments felt as very pertinent or enlightening. As though to excuse him, she added that now when analysts from other



## Melanie Klein Trust

countries came to see her, she was sometimes tired or preoccupied and that perhaps they did not go away with a very lively appreciation of her as a person. The point she made was that the Freud whom she 'knew' through her reading and hearing him speak (the man of genius) did not correspond very well with the Freud before her eyes. I had the impression (but this is wild analysis) that she had hoped for some enthusiasm and encouragement such as she received from Abraham.

Mrs. Phyllis Grosskurth, who was working on a biography<sup>[6]</sup> of Mrs. Klein wrote me (Aug. 17, 1982) 'I think it very interesting that in MK's autobiographical notes there is no reference to any meeting with Freud. Indeed, she has omitted almost everything that caused her pain, just as Ruskin did in *Praeferita*.' But her fundamental attitude of appreciation and gratitude to Freud was never diminished as is evident in the preface to *The Psychoanalysis of Children*. In another context she told me: 'Before Freud's death my work was often criticized but in a decent and dignified manner. After he died things became different.' She admired his courage enormously and recalled with delight Freud's last letter on the subject of 'non-medical analysts,' because she also knew how to be scathing and caustic when others put into question the principles she considered as fundamental.

I do not have the impression that Mrs. Klein's view of her Berlin colleagues was always<sup>[7]</sup> as negative as is reported in Hanna Segal's *Klein*. In discussing the difficulties that can come up in the relation with parents of children in analysis, she mentioned that some colleagues in Berlin expressed concern that her work in the beginning in London was to be almost exclusively the analysis of London colleagues' children, saying, 'You know, Melanie, you are almost certain to have difficulties in the British Society with the analysts whose children you treat. Perhaps you should stay on in Berlin'. Mrs. Klein commented to me: 'In fact, there were no difficulties of any importance. If you accept fully and work with the negative transference in the children, have respect for the parents and true sympathy with their having children in difficulty, and don't expect parents to be grateful, as well as taking into account *but not analysing* the parents' transference reactions to you as their child's analyst, things usually go reasonably well. In fact, the difficulties with colleagues began with their reactions to some of the theoretical part of the *Psychoanalysis of Children* and even more so to my paper on the psychogenesis of manic-depressive states. But except for some unpleasantness with Glover, there was a good level of conflict which animated discussion in the mid-Thirties. The Waelders came over from Vienna in 1936, I believe, and Jones and Mrs. Riviere went and talked to the Viennese society. Things got out of hand with too much conflict when our small Society had to take in so many Viennese analysts in such a short time in 1938. Of course, they had their traditions which were different from those of the British Society and were absolutely convinced that they possessed the only true understanding of Freud's work. To my mind, the fruit of Freud's genius cannot be reduced to classical dogma!'

In terms of the future, Mrs. Klein commented one day that she felt that the principal task for analytic research for the coming years was to achieve a better understanding of the diverse mechanisms of splitting (that her own work was only the beginning) as well as of the links between splitting and other primitive defense mechanisms with later defense mechanisms such as repression and displacement. (This comment is published in a brief form in my *Reflexions Critiques sur le livre de Donald Meltzer, 'The Psychoanalytical Process,' Revue française de psychanalyse, Tome XXIV, pp. 168-171 (1970)*).



Once Mrs. Klein said to me: 'Thank God, Dr. Gammill, you didn't interpret envy in that material, because there was nothing connected with it. All this week, I have had several people who have brought material and interpreted envy when there was no evidence for it. You know, *1 don't know if my work will be destroyed by my most fervent followers or my worst enemies!* It has been that way each time I have written an important paper which brought in new concepts. Some have broken off with me because of the new concept; others want to believe that the new concept will deal with and explain everything.' I never saw Mrs. Klein look so distressed and pessimistic as in this outburst of feeling.

Mrs. Klein seemed at times beset with doubts about the writing of *Narrative of a Child Analysis*: whether it was possible to fully convey in written form a sufficiently clear picture of the sessions, whether it should be published for a wider audience or mimeographed for distribution and study by those who were familiar with her technique and theory, and so would have a 'feel' for what would inevitably be missing in a printed account. Doubt curiously disappears in the published form, where she asserts that it is typical of her technique, though this creeps back in certain notes about the unorthodox setting and certain remarks and behaviour which seem to have been influenced by the predetermined short period for the analysis (See Part II of the *Kleinian Development* by Donald Meltzer). It should be mentioned at this point that the French edition of the *Narrative*, though of generally good literary French, contains a large number of serious errors, *contresens*, and omissions of paragraphs and sentences so that it is indispensable that the French reader have at hand the English text. Neither Jean nor Florence Begoin, nor myself, were asked to look over the translation before publication, which we would have been happy to do.

Mrs. Klein also worried over whether she would be successful in conveying to a more general audience a resume of her work in a single lecture, when she was invited to give a lecture at the University of Manchester. It was in speaking of this invitation that Mrs. Klein expressed her regret that psychoanalysis was so little developed in England outside the London area and the need for the British Society to be concerned about this situation. She felt highly honoured by this University invitation, and had always been concerned even in her first paper about the possible applications of psychoanalysis in the rearing of children, and across the whole range of the life experience.

These preoccupations came across especially in the article on 'Weaning,' and in *Love, Hate and Reparation*, presented as lectures and written as a book with Joan Riviere. This book, along with the Manchester University lecture entitled: 'Our Adult World and Its Roots in Infancy,' and the lecture 'The psychoAnalytic Play Technique: Its History and Significance,' are the three cornerstone articles which I recommend to beginning candidates or lay people to get an overall view of Mrs. Klein's work.

The paper on 'The History and the Significance of Psychoanalytic Play Technique' is of capital value to have an overview of the development of her theory in interaction with the clinical experience of psychoanalysis of children. She insisted many times that all her discoveries came from the psychoanalysis of children even if the experience with adults tended to confirm, and add nuances and enrich her fundamental discoveries.



Mrs. Klein was also concerned about the quality of psychoanalytic literature. Once she said: 'What a dreadful waste of our time last night. Z's paper contained absolutely nothing new, though he had to pretend that it did - all 'old hat' dressed up as though something new. 'It could have been made into a useful seminar for candidates if he were less pretentious'. She once complained bitterly about being criticised for not quoting Freud in a paper, insisting that anyone who had read her work seriously would realise her acknowledgement to Freud, Abraham, and others and that it should be taken for granted that serious analysts know Freud's work so that it does not have to be quoted constantly 'otherwise nothing new can be presented and developed in the limits of a Society talk or a journal paper.'

As Dr. Segal emphasizes in her book, Mrs. Klein attended regularly all the Congresses of the International Psychoanalytical Association. I began my supervision in September 1957, following the Paris Congress in late July. Mrs. Klein had found Phyllis Greenacre's contribution to the Round Table extremely interesting with points that could be linked to her own work. She was still angry and disappointed that she had not been given time to discuss this work of Greenacre. Otherwise, she appeared pleased with the congress, feeling for example that the contribution of Pierre Marty brought forth additional interesting evidence about projective identification in psychosomatic disorders, and in addition she was gratified by the hospitality shown to her and Mrs. Bick, especially with the invitation to the Institut Claparede. But there was some nostalgia for the past - the Geneva Congress of 1955 at which she had presented the preliminary paper which was developed into the book *Envy and Gratitude*, but even more so, the Paris Congress of 1938. She had been particularly pleased with her paper, 'Mourning and its Relation to Manic-Depressive States.' The reception of it encouraged her to feel that there would be a wider international acceptance of her work. However, having little sense of politics, at least on the international level, she did not realize that the combined factors of the greatly increased influence of the American Psychoanalytical Association with respect to the I.P.A., and of the immigration of a large number of Viennese analysts to the United States where they were to play a dominant role, would render any significant amount of acceptance of her work in America most unlikely for many decades to come. <sup>[8]</sup>

However, I believe she would be very pleasantly surprised by how seriously her work is now considered in France, due to a considerable degree to the translation of practically her complete works during the 1960s - work to which members of these two Societies have contributed. She would, I think, be very happy to know that this collaboration has happened and would appreciate the quality of the scientific contributions to this meeting (Paris, November 27, 1982) in her honour.

It seems important to me to emphasize Mrs. Klein's broad-mindedness in answering the questions of candidates and her availability and readiness to rethink theoretical problems. However, she emphasized that any provisional theoretical questioning implied the necessity of serious work to come to valuable conclusions. I asked her once if she felt that the lack of gratification of libidinal desires (independently of the aggressive reactions that followed their frustration) should be completely excluded as a possibility of creating anxiety. She remained silent for a considerable time; having in her eyes an extraordinary expression of someone who was looking deeply inside herself. Finally, she said: 'I don't know. After all, anxiety is a complicated problem. Of



## Melanie Klein Trust

course I maintain my opinion concerning aggression and death instinct. However, I have never re-thought the theory of libido in relation to normal projective identification of the life instinct and of the good parts of the self. If for internal or external reasons there is no suitable object available to receive these positive projections, it may be that some sort of terrible collapse occurs in the self which would generate anxiety. Maybe there is a link with Freud's idea of withdrawal of cathexis, with a passive destruction of the external and the internal object, with inevitable repercussions on the state of the ego - anxiety or other disruptions, such as psychosomatic.'

{Note: As to Mrs. Klein's basic attitudes towards psychoanalysis I shall quote Dr. Clifford Scott. He was a student of child and adult analysis in London, 1931-1933. He was Mrs. Klein's first candidate who became a member of the British Society and later President of the Society (1953-1954). He wrote (1975): 'Of course my curiosity about, interest in and understanding of dreams began to increase during my first analysis which began in 1931 with Melanie Klein on the advice of Ernest Jones. The accusation is not infrequently made that associations to dreams were not part of Melanie Klein's work and that she tended to interpret dreams without asking for associations. To me her attitude towards dreams was that an understanding of them, achieved by the dream content including the sequence of association to the dream to current material including day residues, to the transference situation, could lead to an understanding of defences and to the progressively more comprehensive reconstruction of the relation between the progressively developing inner world of infancy and childhood and its double, the external world, which was itself progressively developing as the infant and child developed. I do not remember her neglecting associations, but I do remember her interest in the sequence of dreams, in the complexity of the world of dreams and *her tolerance of what was still puzzling*. When not only associations to the dream and to day residues, but also material from previous dreams is used to build up links with the life history and current developments as well as the sequences of dreams, the whole process of broadening and deepening consciousness and the control of its moods and contents occurs' (my italics).

Some may feel he became a 'member' of the 'Middle Group' (comprising among others W.H. Gillespie, D.W. Winnicott, M. Balint, M. Milner) after the reorganization of the London Institute towards the end of the forties while maintaining their good relationship with Mrs. Klein. He considers otherwise and his only caveat is that he considers the question of the history of aggression and its vicissitudes and its relation to other instincts still open as he does the relation of primary and secondary narcissism and their relation to the onset and development of subject-object relations (Personal Communication).]

It comes to mind in writing this article that Mrs. Klein never mentioned to me anything about Austria, where she was born and grew up, nor of Hungary. I recall chance evocations of Berlin, of Congresses elsewhere in Germany, and mention of vacations in France and Switzerland. On returning from a holiday in 1958, she mentioned having read *Le Temps Retrouvé* of Proust, which she qualified as a 'staggering work of genius.' She sometimes spoke of her commentary on Aeschylus' *Oresteia* on which she was working; and sometimes quotes from English literature would come to mind to illustrate a point. Curiously, I don't think she ever quoted in my hearing anything from German literature. So, for me, Mrs. Klein has always seemed more a person of Western than of Central Europe, though perhaps her holidays in



Melanie Klein Trust

Switzerland in her last years put her geographically at the crossroads of her life experience.

In ending, I wish to render homage to Mrs. Klein as an inspired and inspiring teacher of psychoanalysis. External demands from students and candidates for supervision, my own pleasure in listening to child analytic material, and the need to help foster a new generation of child analysts and child analytic psychotherapists have made it so that for more than two decades I have spent a considerable amount of my time on this work. My debt and gratitude to Mrs. Klein are enormous, for so much of what I have felt I could teach to younger people has come from her teaching, and most especially the spirit of her teaching.



## References

- Grosskurth, P. (1986). *Melanie Klein: Her world and her work*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Jones, E. (1957). *The life and work of Sigmund Freud*. New York: Basic Books. Volume 3.
- Klein, M. (1932). *The psychoanalysis of children*. In *The Writings of Melanie Klein, Volume II*. London: Hogarth (1975).
- Klein, M. (1934). A contribution to the study of the psychogenesis of manic-depressive states. In *The Writings of Melanie Klein, Volume 1*, pp. 262-289. London: Hogarth (1975).
- Klein, M. (1936). Weaning. In *The Writings of Melanie Klein, Volume 1*, (pp. 290-305). London: Hogarth (1975).
- Klein, M. (1940). Mourning and its relation to manic-depressive states. In *The Writings of Melanie Klein, Volume 1*, pp.344-369. London: Hogarth (1975).
- Klein, M. (1946). Notes on some schizoid mechanisms. In *The Writings of Melanie Klein, Volume III*, pp. 1-24. London: Hogarth (1975).
- Klein, M. (1957). Envy and gratitude. In *The Writings of Melanie Klein, Volume II*, pp. 176-235. London: Hogarth (1975).
- Klein, M. (1959). Our adult world and its roots in infancy. In *The Writings of Melanie Klein, Volume 111*, pp. 247-263. London: Hogarth (1975).
- Klein, M. (1961). Narrative of a child analysis. In *The Writings of Melanie Klein, Volume 4*. London: Hogarth (1975).
- Klein, M., and Riviere, J. (1937). Love, guilt and reparation. In *The Writings of Melanie Klein, Volume 1*, pp. 306-343. London: Hogarth (1975).
- Meltzer, D. (1978) *The Kleinian development*. Perthshire: Clunie.
- Scott, W.C.M. (1975). Remembering sleep and dreams. *International Review of psychoanalysis*, 2, p. 257.
- Segal, H. (1979). *Klein*. London: Fontana.
- Klein, M. (1955). The psychoanalytic play technique: Its history and significance. In *The Writings of Melanie Klein, Volume III*, pp. 122-140. London: Hogarth (1975).



## Notes

[1] However, in a letter of 28th September 1982, Miss Betty Joseph wrote, 'I really like your paper on Melanie Klein very much and I would make only one comment on it about its content. I think one should be careful as to the way one describes the position of Melanie Klein on the use of countertransference because I believe she thought that many people used this term to cover an analyst's lack of understanding of his own difficulties, or that they called ordinary analytic intuition countertransference. I think she did not appreciate that use of the term and I always wonder what she would think of its extended utilization in relation to projective identification'.

In this connection, Melanie Klein told me about a young unmarried woman whose difficulty was that the child in analysis often sat on her lap. Finally, this situation became clear in a supervisory session when the young woman said spontaneously: 'Oh! Mrs. Klein he is so adorable that I wish he were my child.'

[2] In the *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* of 1933 (p.149), Alexander writes: 'The following seems to us the inevitable explanation of this process: when the meaning of the game is correctly understood and then conveyed to the child in its own language, the child's anxiety diminishes - because of the fact that the children immediately conceive these interpretations, given to them by a 'kind aunt' in an unemotional tone of voice, to be 'permissions'. With this, an abreaction takes place through play, as Klein also assumes, which then becomes the basis for later sublimations'.

[3] However, in addition to a certain misreading of Mrs. Klein's theory, the use of the word 'Jejune' (p. 151) is particularly tactless in a paragraph where Alexander's views on the superego appear at variance with Freud's later views.

[4] In the supervisory session after my election as Associate Member of the British Psychoanalytic Society, Mrs. Klein said, 'Aren't you happy and honoured to be elected to the Society that Dr. Jones founded?'

[5] In the sense of *demande* in French.

[6] Published in 1986, *Melanie Klein – Her World and her Work*.

[7] Mrs. Klein from time to time with respect to some subject, gave different impressions ('colorations' in French) of certain memories, especially when they were linked to disappointments with people. During the period of mourning for Jones, and all that he represented to psychoanalysis, it seemed to me she tried to be as fair as possible.

[8] Ives Hendrick of Boston (an American analyst who had trained in Berlin) wrote in the first number of the *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* of January 1933, p. 36: 'I believe that Klein's all-inclusive usage of the terms 'oedipus complex' and 'super-ego' accounts largely for some lag in the full appreciation that her work deserves.' The list of editors of the *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* then contained a large number of Berlin-trained analysts. Later, the situation changed and any regret for the 'lag in the full appreciation' largely disappeared.