

**“FIRST PANAMERICAN PSYCHOANALYTIC CONGRESS” \***

**DR. JOSE REMUS ARAICO \*\***

-----

While I was listening to several of the papers presented during this Congress, the following already quite condensed ideas arose. For example, when I heard of “warm attitudes towards the patient... who has achieved more and better social relations... etc.”, I asked my self: what is the metapsychology of that which we call intuition, honesty, good faith, etc., and should we not engage in the metapsychological dissection of these complex affections, of these attitudes of the ego, or should we rather remain in a sert of synthetic function in these more general levels?.

One can speak in various menders and express concepts through different means regarding that which previously existed in the patients and what remains after the action of this so specialized “medicament” which we administer in our profession.

In the Mexican Psychoanalytical Association we have the rare opportunity and obligation, due to our own formation as psychoanalysts, to attempt the synthesis of two trends which on the surface appear to be antagonistic. Dr. Rascovsky has referred to the history of our integration as a psychoanalyst group. The first Mexican analysts have been trained in these two apparent extremes of the continental analytic thought. The discussions we have listened to during these two days and throughout the two subjects which because they were general seemed a bit unfortunate, are habitual in our Association, therefore, we always attempt the synthesis to which I have referred to as a rare opportunity. However, that which seems unfavorable also enters in to the variables of an experiment.

Some ideas arise from the above, which I present before you as questions.

1.- Are we seeing the consequences of different training’s in different groups of Institutes? Or,

2.- Are there cultural basis which have nurtured us with different primary identifications and quite diverse developments of identities, which are expressed in different manners in spite of equivalent training’s?.

---

\* Comentarios finales del Presidente, Dr. José Remus Araico, al Primer Congreso Panamericano de Psicoanálisis, en México, Marzo 1964.

\*\* Fundador, Vitalicio y Psicoanalista Didáctico de la Asociación Psicoanalítica Mexicana. Profesor Titular de las Facultades de Psicología y de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

3.- To the limits of my conscience and not due to idealization motives or by the sole good neighbor desire, or by the desire of a chairman of a local committee who would like for all his guests at home to agree, I believe that the double contact to which I referred previously allows us to see the following problem:

I believe that deep inside we work in a quite similar manner with our patients, but when we try to express in concepts that which we do and when we enter in to the kingdom of words, a divorce becomes apparent but its importance is not so great because in the end we achieve lasting and important changes in our patients in spite of our conceptions. Thus it would seem that the profound and prolonged experience of having been during our training period first patients and subjects of comprehension and observation, when our internal tensions and conflicts are lowered, qualified us in common beyond what we state in our conceptions which mainly arise from the pre-conscious.

Let us not forget that all of us cultivate a sublime love which we generously use with our patients but which at times we curtail in our scientific exchange with our colleagues. It does not matter how we define it, whether as the liquidation of early divisions in our development, or as the acquisition of professional tact and intuition to be used as working tools. For me, both things are two aspects of the same phenomenon which originated in our training.

Neither should we forget that in that same training we have to train ourselves and also the future analyst to avoid irrational aggression from penetrating in to our work, regardless of how we call it or how we reason it with that high average intelligence quotient which we have as a group.

This high intelligence, which is a fundamental element which can be transformed into a working tool, when coupled to the professional deformity suffered by our ego, can become an undesirable element during discussions and can increase the divorce between concepts, preventing synthesis from the opposition in the dialectic dynamic development which is indispensable in our own discipline.

Perhaps I am not within my rights when, speaking as Chairman, I suggest something personal to the Panamerican Program Subcommittee, that is, a subject for our next Congress, but, in any event, this abuse appears to be inevitable after the ideas I have expressed. It would be useful to discuss, based on clinical material previously selected and distributed quite in advance, those concepts in which it appears we have differences. The distance and objectivity which we could obtain when introducing a common point of discussion so concrete as the fragment of an analysis could be, in my opinion would permit a fruitful synthesis. As a Local Committee, we have worked with a Panamerican Committee and I wish to thank the latter in my name and in that of all my collaborators, for the confidence entrusted in us when delegating all local arrangements, at times quite complex. I am thankful for the presence of Dr. Zetzel, representing the International Psychoanalytical Association, and I admire the effort displayed by all of you in adapting yourselves to this land of volcanoes.

Following the important administrative session, this Congress will come to its end. In the name of the Mexican Psychoanalytical Association and the Organizing Committee, I wish to thank all of you for your attendance and for your enthusiastic collaboration in the work of the Congress, as well as to express my gratitude for your warmth and company a social events; also I would like to ask your benevolence for those organization mistakes which we were unable to foresee or overcome, but perhaps with my personal defect of explaining what happens to us, I would like to add in concluding that the experiment of the First Panamerican Congress has come to its end in its manifest part, and now we have to explore and recognize in the intimacy and loneliness to follow what remains in its latent content.

Thank you very much.

-----

Dr. José Remus Araico  
Paseo del Río # 111, casa 20  
Fortín Chimalistac  
Coyoacán, 04319  
México, D. F.  
Tels. y Fax 56-61-07-67 y 56-61-36-50