

**THE TRANSATLANTIC ELEMENT: PSYCHOANALYSIS,  
EXILE, CIRCULATION OF IDEAS AND  
INSTITUTIONALIZATION BETWEEN SPAIN  
AND ARGENTINA**

*Anne-Cécile Druet, Paris, France*

In the last few decades, Argentine professionals have been remarkably prominent in the world of Spanish mental health. When it comes more specifically to psychoanalysis, the proportion is even higher, to the point that the association between a profession – that of an analyst – and a specific group of immigrants – middle-class, well-educated Argentinians – has become widely current in Spain, even amongst the general public.

This process, which began with the massive immigration of Argentine analysts during the Spanish transition to democracy, led to profound changes in the institutionalization and circulation of psychoanalysis in the country. What had been, under Franco's regime, an almost invisible world consisting of a handful of analysts whose main preoccupations were their professional society's institutional life and internal training process started to expand and diversify dramatically. The number of psychoanalytic

---

ANNE-CÉCILE DRUET PhD obtained her doctorate from the University of Paris IV-Sorbonne in 2006 with a dissertation on the history of psychoanalysis in Spain during the transition to democracy. She is currently Professor of Spanish Studies at the University of Paris-Est Marne-la-Vallée, France. She has published various articles on the history and historiography of psychoanalysis in Spain. Her most recent publications include the chapter 'Psychoanalysis in Franco's Spain (1939–1975): Crónica de una "agonía" anunciada' in Joy Damousi and Mariano Ben Plotkin (eds), *Psychoanalysis and Politics. Histories of Psychoanalysis under Conditions of Restricted Political Freedom* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012). Address for correspondence: Université Paris-Est Marne-la-Vallée, 5 bd Descartes - Cité Descartes, 77454 Marne-la-Vallée Cedex 2, France. [anne-c.druet@wanadoo.fr]

*Psychoanalysis and History* 14(2), 2012: 237–251

DOI: 10.3366/pah.2012.0110

© Edinburgh University Press

[www.eupjournals.com/pah](http://www.eupjournals.com/pah)

institutions increased – including Lacanian institutions which had never before existed in the country; people belonging or close to psychoanalytic circles got involved in socio-cultural debates; journals of psychoanalysis were launched, and study groups devoted to Freud's and Lacan's theories multiplied. All these aspects, albeit also rooted in the socio-cultural and political changes that the country was undergoing at the time, were inextricably linked to the active role of Argentine analysts in Spain.

This was not, however, the first time that Argentine and Spanish psychoanalytic histories intersected. On the contrary, these two countries had had repeated points of contact at previous stages of their psychoanalytic past. The first Spanish psychoanalyst, Ángel Garma, was also a founding member and a long-time leading figure of the first Argentine component society of the International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA). During Franco's dictatorship, various Spanish analysts did their training in Buenos Aires, and several Argentine analysts moved to Spain and were instrumental in the institutionalization process there, even before the phenomenon of massive immigration began. The cultural component of the changes that occurred in the Spanish psychoanalytic field during the transition to democracy was not without precedent either. The mutual involvement of the two countries in the other's institutionalization process had in fact been preceded by cultural exchanges, when prominent Spanish intellectuals had participated in the early diffusion of psychoanalytic ideas in Argentina.

This article explores the history of these encounters between the Spanish and the Argentine psychoanalytic worlds. Following the chronology of events, it focuses on the different aspects of this history and shows how the causes, the nature and the consequences of the exchanges evolved.

### *Early Contacts*

In 1911, Spanish philosopher José Ortega y Gasset published in Madrid an article entitled 'Psicoanálisis, ciencia problemática' [Psychoanalysis, a problematic science], in which he introduced Freudian theories to his readers and discussed their scientific value (Ortega y Gasset, 1911a). This article was to become one of the most commented upon episodes in the early reception of psychoanalysis in Spain for a number of reasons, not least of which was the fact that it was thought to be Ortega's only publication devoted entirely to psychoanalysis before his preface to Freud's *Complete Works*. In fact, that same year, Ortega published another article on psychoanalysis, one that seems to have been overlooked by researchers until recently: 'Nueva medicina espiritual' [New spiritual medicine] appeared in Argentina, in the Buenos Aires newspaper *La*

*Prensa* (Ortega y Gasset, 1911b). Even though this latter text was similar to the Spanish publication in terms of its tone and its global assessment of psychoanalysis, there was a significant difference in the way each was received, which in retrospect may appear as typical of two very dissimilar – yet never far from one another – histories of psychoanalysis: while the Spanish publication went unnoticed, the Buenos Aires article aroused so much interest among its Argentine readers that a number of them sent further questions to Ortega, who answered them in a later issue of the same newspaper (Ortega y Gasset, 1911c).

The early appearance of a prominent Spanish figure in the history of psychoanalysis in Argentina is not an isolated event. During the 1920s, many of the Spanish psychiatrists who played a significant role in the introduction of Freudian ideas in Spain were also read in Argentina, especially through their articles published in Ortega's journal, the *Revista de Occidente* (Plotkin, 2003, p. 37). In 1923, one of those psychiatrists, Gonzalo Rodríguez Lafora, travelled to Argentina to lecture on a variety of subjects, one of which was psychoanalysis. At the universities of Buenos Aires and La Plata, Lafora spoke about the theory and practice of psychoanalysis, and also addressed Freudian ideas regarding the role of the unconscious in artistic creation. Since Lafora had expressed his reservations about psychoanalysis on previous occasions – and did so again in Argentina, claiming that the true modern scientific attitude should be that of being a psychoanalyst, but not a Freudian (Rodríguez Lafora, 1923, p. 385) – the fact that he chose to speak about Freudian theories in at least three of his Argentine lectures may seem surprising. This was indeed the first time that Lafora showed such an interest in popularizing psychoanalysis, which led historian Francisco Carles to wonder whether these lectures might have responded to a request from his Argentine hosts (Carles *et al.*, 2000, p. 100). Be that as it may, Lafora's lectures in Argentina drew a large audience and contributed to the early diffusion of psychoanalysis in the country (Plotkin, 2003, pp. 38–9).

What was exported – so to speak – to Argentina during the 1920s was representative of the pattern of the circulation of psychoanalytical theories in Spain. The 1920s was a decade of a very animated debate on psychoanalysis, both within and outside the medical community. Although all kinds of opinions were represented, there was a general tendency to acknowledge the necessity of getting acquainted with Freud's ideas. This had been Ortega's recommendation in 1911, and by the end of the 1920s, with several of Freud's works already available in translation, psychoanalysis was being discussed in multiple medical, socio-cultural, and even political contexts (Glick, 1982, 2003). What did not yet exist in Spain was an interest in orthodox training or institutionalization. This interest arose during the 1930s, and the coincidence between this evolution and the

political events to come was to change for the next decades the transatlantic history of psychoanalysis.

### *The IPA Affiliates in Argentina and Spain*

In a way similar to what happened in other areas of Spanish scientific, intellectual or artistic life during Franco's dictatorship, there was a history of psychoanalysis in exile. While the cases of Miguel Prados in Canada or Francesc Tosquelles in France are certainly well known, the most famous example is that of Ángel Garma, who became one of the key figures of the psychoanalytic movement in Argentina. As if returning the favour, the very same Argentine movement later played a significant role in the creation and development of its Spanish counterpart.

Ángel Garma, born in Bilbao in 1904, completed his psychoanalytic training in Berlin and became a member of the Deutsche Psychoanalytische Gesellschaft, which made him the first Spanish member of the IPA. In 1931, Garma returned to Madrid where he initiated the analyses of a small group of young psychiatrists as he made numerous attempts to convince his colleagues that psychoanalysis should not be practised without an orthodox training. On his agenda was the foundation of a Spanish psychoanalytic association officially recognized by the IPA, but this project was still at a very early stage on the eve of the Civil War. In July 1936, Ángel Garma left Spain where he was never to live again. After spending some time in France, he moved to Argentina where part of his family was living. A few years later, what had been his frustrated objective in Madrid became a reality in Buenos Aires: in 1942, Garma was one of the founding members of the Asociación Psicoanalítica Argentina (APA), the first Argentine component society of the IPA.

At the end of the 1940s, new attempts were made to create an IPA-recognized psychoanalytic association in Spain. This project was born in two small – and initially independent – circles of psychiatrists, one in Barcelona and the other one in Madrid. The Madrid group was led by Jerónimo Molina Núñez, who had been in analysis with Garma before the Civil War. When Molina started considering a psychoanalytic training for himself and his Madrid colleagues, he turned to Garma for advice and orientation. Garma was fully supportive of Molina's project, and he himself and the APA got directly involved in the training of the Madrid group. This marked the beginning of a long-lasting, complex, multi-dimensional and controversial history of collaboration between the Argentine and Spanish IPA-affiliated psychoanalytic circles.

Controversy arose even before the Spanish study group was recognized as such by the IPA. In 1955, many of the people involved in pursuing the institutionalization of psychoanalysis in Spain came into direct contact. The occasion was a conference held in Barcelona, which involved the

participation of members of the Madrid psychoanalytic group as well as that of Argentine analysts from the APA. The Madrid circle's leaders had followed Garma's recommendations and done their training in Berlin (as Garma had done years before), and later in Buenos Aires, either with Garma himself or one of his collaborators in the APA. Meanwhile, the Catalan group was developing independently, and its members were training mostly in France and French-speaking Switzerland. Therefore, although the two psychoanalytic circles that existed in Spain in the 1950s shared the goal of founding the first IPA-recognized society in the country, their training backgrounds were quite different. When the leader of the Catalan circle, Pere Bofill, heard the conference papers presented by the Argentinians and the Madrid group, he strongly disagreed with their interpretations, finding them all too symbolic and lacking in rigour.<sup>1</sup> The identification of such theoretical differences between the Madrid–Argentine circle and his own led Bofill to step up his efforts to create a Spanish IPA society in which his own school was meant to prevail over the other. In his communications with his IPA contacts, he clearly stated that his goal was 'to avoid psychoanalysis getting off to a bad start in Spain', implying that he was trying to prevent the APA from exerting its influence over the Spanish psychoanalytic movement.<sup>2</sup> Bofill's efforts proved successful, and his group became the leading faction within the Spanish psychoanalytic society (officially named Sociedad Luso-española de Psicoanálisis, and later Sociedad Española de Psicoanálisis or SEP). Nonetheless, the ties that existed between the Madrid-based members of the SEP and the APA continued to develop and became one of the reasons why the two historic circles within the SEP never really lost their distinctive identity.<sup>3</sup> The ties between the Madrid group and the APA were especially crucial when it came to the Spaniards' training. Several Spanish analysts had trained in Buenos Aires before the institutionalization process was completed, but that was not all: in 1957, two APA analysts – Jaime Tomás and his wife Pola – moved to Madrid where they remained for the next couple of years (Carles *et al.*, 2000, p. 253). During their stay, Jaime and Pola Tomás conducted a number of training analyses and supervisions, allowing the Spanish candidates to train in their own country.

---

1. Pere Bofill Tauler, Interview with the author, Barcelona, 11 July 2005.

2. Letter written by Bofill to his French IPA contact, M. Bouvet, in 1956, cited by Bermejo Frígola (1993, p. 216).

3. Catalan SEP member M. Pérez Sánchez still mentioned the connection to Argentina as an essential difference when he was asked in an interview about the reasons why the Madrid members split from the SEP in 1973 (Pérez Sánchez cited by Carles *et al.*, 2000, p. 273).

The immigration – albeit temporary – of two Argentine-trained analysts to Madrid marked the beginning of one of the most important chapters in the history of psychoanalytical contacts between Spain and Argentina: the Spanish exile of analysts trained in Argentina. One Spanish psychoanalyst, Garma, had settled in Argentina and had become a key figure of the psychoanalytic movement there; from the beginning of the 1970s, and especially after Franco's death, a large number of Argentine analysts would cross the Atlantic in the opposite direction – some of them actually returning to the country that their parents or they themselves had left years earlier.

When Argentine-trained analysts started to immigrate to Spain, the two historic circles within the SEP disagreed on the conditions under which their newly arrived colleagues could join their society. In 1973, Jaime and Pola Tomás returned to Spain, where they resumed their work with the Madrid-based group of analysts. Their official application to the SEP as training analysts – the status they both enjoyed within the APA – engendered an internal dispute: while the Madrid members were willing to admit Jaime and Pola Tomás as training analysts without further delay, the Catalan members refused to make an exception for them and to expedite the normal admission process.<sup>4</sup> This situation caused an institutional crisis that culminated in the Madrid analysts splitting from the SEP in 1973 (Bermejo Frígola, 1993, pp. 254–61). They created an autonomous IPA study group in Madrid, which in 1981 became the second Spanish component society of the IPA under the name *Asociación Psicoanalítica de Madrid (APM)*.

In Madrid, the applications for admission as training analysts filed by recent arrivals from Argentina were initially welcomed since their presence helped the group meet IPA requirements for obtaining a component society status. As a result of this policy, three out of the eight members of the newly autonomous Madrid study group came from the APA.<sup>5</sup> They illustrated the pattern of double exile that has been mentioned above. Jaime Tomás, for instance, was born in Spain, the son of a Republican who left the country after the beginning of the Civil War and emigrated with his

---

4. The rules of the SEP stipulated that a 'period of adjustment' would be required for all candidates, regardless of their previous status in their society of origin. See *Sociedad Española de Psicoanálisis, Normas para la formación de psicoanalistas*, unpublished, SEP Archive.

5. Jaime and Pola Tomás were two of the six full members of the Madrid group that was initially accepted as a study group by the IPA in 1973, and one of the two associate members, Juan Francisco Rodríguez Pérez, had also been trained in Argentina (Bermejo Frígola, 1993, p. 260). In the following years, Pérez was made a full member, and so were Argentine analysts León and Rebeca Grinberg, also trained in the APA (Muñoz, 1989, pp. 148–9).

family to Paris, Mexico and eventually, Buenos Aires. Juan Francisco Rodríguez, who was Spanish, chose to do his training in a country where psychoanalysis was more developed than in his own and moved to Buenos Aires on Ángel Garma's advice; he later returned to Madrid and joined the APM (Averbach & Teszkiewicz, 2001).

In the 1980s, however, the admission process became an institutional problem in the APM too. Although the Madrid association obtained the IPA component society status in 1981, the total number of APM members was still low (fewer than 30 until 1985),<sup>6</sup> and the number of applications from candidates trained abroad – a vast majority of them in Argentina – kept growing to such an extent that the Argentine-trained analysts soon threatened to outnumber the locals. In such a situation, any new member could make a huge difference in all aspects of institutional life, and this was especially true for training analysts. The Madrid association then did what the SEP had been doing since the beginning: they made the admission process slower and the recognition of status held in foreign IPA societies more difficult. As a result, a significant number of Argentine analysts – some of whom had held prestigious positions within and outside the APA and were prominent figures in the Argentine psychoanalytic movement – sometimes had to wait years before they could join the SEP or the APM with their previous status.<sup>7</sup> This situation led some Argentine IPA members to create their own study groups outside of the Spanish IPA associations and offer an alternative training to young candidates who were more interested in what these analysts had to say than in an orthodox IPA training.

### ***Psychoanalysis and the City: Lacanianism, Culture and Society during the Spanish Transition to Democracy***

From the second half of the 1970s to the early 1980s, two different phenomena interplayed to create the situation that characterized the Spanish psychoanalytic world during the country's transition to democracy: a renewed interest in psychoanalysis among the younger generation – especially, but not only, among young psychiatrists and psychologists – and a massive immigration of Argentine analysts, who offered new and diverse training possibilities as well as a new way to understand the interactions between psychoanalysis, culture and society.

---

6. Roster of the International Psychoanalytical Association, 1973–1985 editions.

7. On this question, see Averbach & Teszkiewicz (2001). These authors emphasize the paradoxical aspects of the situation, especially the fact that one IPA association would not recognize a training done in another IPA association, in spite of both being societies of equal status recognized by the same international organization.

After 1975, the number of Argentine analysts arriving in Spain increased considerably. Although the exact figures are unknown, the phenomenon was significant enough to be referred to as an '*avalancha*' [flood] by the Argentinians themselves (Averbach & Teszkiewicz, 2001). From these years onward, any study group, association or cultural initiative related to psychoanalysis in Madrid or Barcelona was highly likely to include at least one Argentinian (who, as a matter of fact, was also likely to be its main organizer). As for any such group or activity related more specifically to Lacanianism, the probability that its leader or promoter would be someone speaking in the very distinctive Buenos Aires accent was even higher. Psychoanalysis as a profession became so closely associated with the Argentine immigration that even newspapers reflected the phenomenon and tried to explain to the general public the changes that were taking place in the Spanish psychoanalytic universe at the time. Not surprisingly, the better informed those articles, the greater the likelihood that their author was also Argentinian.<sup>8</sup>

Indeed, the changes were many, and their repercussions reached far beyond the mere history of the IPA institutions; virtually all areas of the mental health universe were affected (Averbach & Teszkiewicz, 2001). Of all the consequences that the Argentine exile brought to the Spanish psychoanalytic world, the emergence of a Lacanian movement was probably the one that meant the most dramatic and long-lasting changes. This was not only due to the introduction of a new theoretical orientation in this world, but also to the fact that Argentine analysts tried to recreate in Spain the exchanges between psychoanalysis and the socio-cultural sphere as they existed in Argentina. For the first time since the Civil War, psychoanalysis re-emerged as a legitimate subject for a cultural debate in Spain. Even though the Argentine analysts failed in their attempts – as psychoanalysis never came to play a role in Barcelona's socio-cultural life (let alone that of Madrid) similar to the one it played in Buenos Aires – it became culturally more significant than it had ever been in Spain since the 1930s.

A very important factor that we have to take into consideration if we want to understand the context of the arrival of Argentine analysts in Spain is the history of the IPA-affiliated institutions. From the beginning of the 1970s, an increased interest in psychoanalysis among the new generation led young psychiatrists, psychologists and students to approach the IPA

---

8. See, for example, the articles published in the Barcelona newspaper *La Vanguardia* by N. Catelli ('El psicoanálisis en Barcelona', 17 May 1983, and 'Psicoanálisis. Quién es quién en Barcelona', 24 May 1983) and C. Rodríguez ('Barcelona es el centro mundial del psicoanálisis en lengua castellana', 27 February 1983).



groups, hoping that they would provide the psychoanalytic training that they could not find at Spanish universities. Many of these students or young professionals were involved in the protest movements that were characteristic of the last years of the dictatorship, and their interest in psychoanalysis was also rooted in an opposition to the established order; the Freud that they were seeking was a subversive Freud. When they approached the Spanish IPA groups, they were confronted with a rigid hierarchical structure led by analysts whom they viewed as guardians of the very same paternalistic, bourgeois and conventional system that they had rejected. Additionally, the fact that these circles had been able to work and obtain the approval of the authorities in the political context of Franco's Spain appeared to these young people to demonstrate a propensity for compromise that was difficult to reconcile with their idea of psychoanalysis. As a consequence, for many members of the new generation who were looking for a psychoanalytic training in the Spain of the 1970s, the IPA associations rapidly ceased to be a viable option (Druet, 2008, p. 85; 2006, pp. 146–8 *passim*).

Therefore, by the time the massive exile of Argentine analysts began, there was in Spain, if not a demand, at least a favourable ground for the implantation of a psychoanalytic current of different characteristics. In many respects, Argentine analysts could fulfil those expectations. Even if it was not a general rule, some of them had left their country to escape political persecution, which gave them a political image diametrically opposed to that of the Spanish IPA analysts, whose association and work had been tolerated in Franco's Spain (Druet, 2012). Other important differences included the fact that these Argentine analysts were open to lay analysis (while the IPA circles were regarded as medical societies), and that they were willing to bring psychoanalysis back to the cultural sphere. In particular, one Argentinian embodied this radically different way of understanding psychoanalysis: Oscar Masotta.

On 20 October 1975, one month to the day before Franco's death, Oscar Masotta taught the first class of his seminar on Freud and Lacan in Barcelona. First in Catalonia, and later in other parts of Spain, Masotta's classes became the starting point of what was to become a Lacanian movement in the country. Masotta had introduced Jacques Lacan's theories in Argentina. In 1974, after the foundation of the Escuela Freudiana de Buenos Aires, he left Argentina and settled in London. During his stay there, Masotta came into contact with a number of Spanish psychiatrists and psychologists interested in psychoanalysis. He was also in touch with another Argentinian who lived in Barcelona, Marcelo Ramírez Puig. At his invitation, Masotta started travelling back and forth to Barcelona, where a first study group was set up. While his first Spanish students were mainly people who knew him personally, the seminar was advertised on posters in the streets, and soon other groups were

created.<sup>9</sup> In 1976, Masotta decided to settle in Barcelona; he would live there until his death in 1979.

The students who joined Masotta's study groups came from very different backgrounds. A number of them were Argentinians then living in Spain who had already attended Masotta's seminars in Buenos Aires. As for the Spanish students, they formed a very heterogeneous circle. As a general rule, they were young (a majority of them in their early 20s in 1975, some of them even younger), politically on the left and, of course, interested in psychoanalysis. Other than that, they had little in common. Some of them were psychiatrists and psychologists, but many other artistic or intellectual professions were represented as well. The initial reason why they joined Masotta's group also varied. Some of them had already approached the IPA circles and rejected that option; others had studied abroad, usually in France or Belgium, where psychoanalysis was taught at universities, and were seeking to resume their training in Spain; others were simply readers of Freud and Lacan and interested in learning more about their theories. Many of the members of these study groups never intended to become analysts, but – and this gives a good idea of the historic importance of Masotta's classes – each and every one of those who later played an important role in the Lacanian movement's institutionalization in Barcelona had participated in one of these groups at some point (Druet, 2006, p. 206 *passim*).

Even if, from an institutional point of view, Masotta's influence was greater in Barcelona, his city of residence, than in other Spanish cities such as Madrid, the impact that he had on his students was the same everywhere. Masotta was viewed as a fascinating and charismatic person, with obvious leadership skills, as well as an endearing individual; he was also considered a talented and beloved teacher.<sup>10</sup> Masotta was also a very hard worker. In less than five years, he carried out an impressive number of projects aimed at disseminating Lacan's theories in Spain. Among these projects was the institutionalization of the incipient Lacanian movement

---

9. It seems impossible to determine how many groups and students Masotta actually had in Barcelona. According to all accounts, this and other logistic information were kept by Marcelo Ramírez Puig, who was Masotta's secretary. M. Ramírez died in 1989 and these archives were probably destroyed after his death. As for the first one of these groups, among the students were Alicia Roig (a psychiatrist who had met Masotta in London), the philosopher Eugenio Trías, Alberto Cardín (an anthropologist who was also a well-known figure in the emerging gay culture), and Federico Jiménez Losantos, who after those years went all the way across the political spectrum and became a journalistic icon of the far right.

10. A number of Masotta's students have published their own recollections of these classes and of their teacher. See, for example, Berenguer (1999) and Palomera (1993). For other accounts of Masotta's time in Barcelona, see Druet (2006, pp. 208–9).

that stemmed from his study groups. In February 1977, the Biblioteca Freudiana de Barcelona (BFB) was founded on his initiative; it was the first Lacanian institution in Spain.

The importance of Masotta's figure should not, however, overshadow the rest of the Argentine story in the Spanish psychoanalytic world. A number of Argentine analysts had arrived before him in Spain and created their own circles, and many more would follow. Not all of these exiled analysts were keen to join Masotta's group. Let us not forget that, for the Argentine immigrants, the exile did not mean the beginning of the story. Some of them already knew each other, if only by reputation, from before arriving in Spain, and they all shared a past in the Argentine analytic world. Masotta was not as universally popular within this world as he was among his young Spanish students. In addition to the dissensions that had somehow been imported from Buenos Aires, the exile created new, and sometimes more personal, reasons for some people to keep their distance from him. Given his prominent role within the incipient Lacanian movement, Masotta was in a position to help other Argentinians start a new professional life in Spain. Some of the obstacles that they would have had to face in other countries did not exist there (such as having to learn a new language or being denied the right to practise medicine or psychology), but many Argentinians, some of whom had left Argentina in a hurry, fearing for their life or that of their relatives, arrived in Spain with no immediate possibility of work. Many of them, who sometimes faced truly tragic situations, expected something from Masotta. The kind of help that he was most likely to provide was related to patients: given his position, Masotta received a lot of requests for analysis, and most of the time he referred them to fellow Argentinians. This created a very complex situation. On top of this issue, there were the differences – or just the personal dislike – that in some cases already existed in Buenos Aires; as a result, the Argentine analytic world in exile did not live in perfect harmony, and some Argentine analysts kept their distance from Masotta's movement. They founded their own groups, organizing their own activities and training other Spanish students. These groups co-existed with other independent circles, making the new psychoanalytic universe in Spain a fragmented and diverse one. This characteristic would become even more pronounced after Masotta's death, with the split of his own group and the creation of new ones by Argentinians who arrived in Spain at the beginning of the 1980s.

These new groups not only brought changes to the structure of the psychoanalytic world; they also changed the interactions between this world and the Spanish – in fact mainly Catalan – socio-cultural sphere. As we have seen, during the dictatorship psychoanalysis had had a very reduced social and cultural visibility in Spain. Psychoanalysts themselves were not public figures and they very rarely lectured or published works

outside the psychiatric and psychological sphere. The IPA circles did not create a psychoanalytic journal until 1984, and their members were not known for participating in social or cultural debates (Druet, 2012). As for what the general public knew about psychoanalysis, it probably was not much; as late as 1984, a journalist could still deem it necessary to explain to his readers what a psychoanalytic cure actually was.<sup>11</sup>

When they arrived in Spain, some Argentine analysts tried to recreate the social and cultural debate that surrounded psychoanalytic issues in Buenos Aires.<sup>12</sup> Although these attempts were unsuccessful, they still had a huge impact on the place psychoanalysis occupied in urban cultural life, once again especially in Barcelona. Masotta himself worked very hard to establish ties with the city's social and cultural life by organizing a number of activities in some of Barcelona's cultural institutions, lecturing for very diverse audiences, and publishing as many works as he could in as many places as he could, including cultural journals. Spanish intellectuals who were close to him – such as Spanish philosopher Eugenio Trías – participated in some of these activities. A few years later, in Madrid, other Argentine analysts like Jorge Alemán or Gustavo Dessal would also be instrumental in the process of bringing psychoanalysis back to the Spanish cultural world.<sup>13</sup> In 1981, two journals of psychoanalysis were created: *Sínthoma* in Barcelona and *Serie Psicoanalítica* in Madrid appeared almost contemporaneously. It was the first time ever that a journal of psychoanalysis available to the public was published in Spain, and in both cases these journals were created and directed by Argentinians.<sup>14</sup>

The first significant crisis within the Spanish Lacanian world occurred after Masotta's death. This world, already fragmented, became what was then known as a '*nebulosa*': a collocation of unclear and changing groups, some of them short-lived, with variable memberships. Masotta's leadership, which was not questioned within his own group, had allowed for a stable situation within the Biblioteca Freudiana. When Masotta died, this stability disappeared. None of his close Argentine collaborators appeared as a legitimate successor, and no one could reclaim his legacy.<sup>15</sup>

---

11. *El Periódico*, 27 May 1984, p. 24.

12. Jorge Alemán (1995) has given an account of his arrival in Madrid in which he described the psychoanalytic desert that he found there, compared to what he was used to in Buenos Aires.

13. Alemán (1995) recalls his conversations with A. García Calvo and Leopoldo M. Panero. See also Dessal (1981).

14. Germán García and Jorge Jinkis for *Sínthoma*, and Jorge Alemán and Sergio Larriera for *Serie Psicoanalítica*.

15. Masotta was careful not to establish an official hierarchy between his closest collaborators, who were in charge of the training activities inside the BFB, and not to

In Barcelona, a significant number of members resigned from the BFB, individually or in waves, and distanced themselves from its new leader, Germán García, who had recently arrived from Buenos Aires.

This crisis also led some to question the way things worked within the Argentine–Spanish Lacanian world. This world, by the time of Masotta’s death, was broadly divided in two different groups: one predominantly young and Spanish (the students), and one almost exclusively Argentinian (the analysts). As a general rule, the members of the first group did not yet have a clinical practice, and they were or had been in analysis with the members of the second group. Among this group of the Argentine analysts (at least those who were closest to Masotta and in charge of the training activities), no one had trained with Lacan or any of his closest disciples. They were readers of Lacan, but mostly came from Kleinian analyses. Their young Spanish students did not initially question this situation. On the contrary, while their first years of training took place while Lacan was still alive, working and teaching his seminar in Paris, just a few hours away from Barcelona, the vast majority of them did not go to Paris even once during those years.<sup>16</sup> Things changed, however, after Masotta’s death, and the contacts between Spain and Paris became more and more frequent. Many of the Spanish Lacanians then undertook a second analysis, this time with analysts coming from Lacan’s inner circle, and followed the seminars that these analysts taught in Spain and in Paris.

With this movement towards Paris, towards the place where the doubly transatlantic journey of Lacanian theories had started, a chapter of the history of psychoanalysis between Spain and Argentina was coming to an end. The ‘Argentine time’ was over and the ‘French time’ began. The school led by Jacques-Alain Miller became very influential in Barcelona, Madrid and other cities where there were smaller Lacanian circles. After a transitional period, the Argentine analysts who had been the leaders or the historic members of the first Lacanian circles in Spain joined the new

---

make the BFB an Argentine institution in Spain. For these reasons, Masotta appointed the young Catalan psychologist Joan Salinas as director (on paper) of the BFB. Salinas was 26 years old at the time.

16. There were exceptions, such as that of Carmen Gallano, who was to become one of the most prominent Spanish Lacanian analysts. She decided to leave Barcelona while Masotta was still alive and continue her training in Paris (see Palomera *et al.*, 1982, pp. 128–9). She would later be openly critical of some of the Argentine analysts’ training, calling some of their analyses ‘dubious’ (Gallano & Salinas, 2001, p. 13). After Masotta’s death, criticism also came from outside psychoanalytic circles. One of the most famous incidents occurred on the occasion of Lacan’s death, when the famous and highly popular psychiatrist Carlos Castilla del Pino published an article in which he claimed that Lacanianism had been ‘sold’ in Spain by ‘pragmatic’ people moved by greed. These people were not named directly but could only be the ‘Argentiniens of Spain’ who were mentioned earlier in the text (Castilla del Pino, 1981, p. 30).

institutional structures and activities promoted by Miller. As a result, the Spanish Lacanian movement lost some of the specificities that it had inherited from its Argentine roots, such as the study groups. With the passing of time, some Argentine analysts returned to Argentina, while others stayed in Spain and shared roles and responsibilities with those who were once their young Spanish students, now no longer young nor students, and sometimes prominent figures of the international Lacanian movement themselves. Meanwhile, the Spanish IPA societies continued to develop and, since the separation between the Madrid and Barcelona groups in the 1970s, both of them have enjoyed institutional stability. The Lacanian movement and the IPA movement started to write and publish their own history, each one making very clear that they had nothing to do with the other. And, yet, their histories, however different they may be, share a common characteristic: their Argentine element.

### References

- Alemán, J. (1995) Argentinos en Madrid. *Analítica del Litoral* 5: 37–47.
- Averbach, M. & Teszkiewicz, L. (2001) Psicoanalistas argentinos en la salud mental española. Available from: <http://www.monografias.com/trabajos911/capitulo-libro-psiquiatria/capitulo-libro-psiquiatria.shtml>; accessed 14 October 2011.
- Berenguer, E. (1999) Masotta: su agalma. In: Izaguirre, M. (ed.), *Oscar Masotta. El revés de la trama*, pp. 153–61. Buenos Aires: Atuel/Anáfora.
- Bermejo Frígola, V. (1993) La institucionalización del psicoanálisis en España en el marco de la API. Ph.D. dissertation, Universidad de Valencia, Spain.
- Carles, F., Muñoz, I., Llor, C. & Marset, P. (2000) *Psicoanálisis en España 1893–1968*. Madrid: Asociación Española de Neuropsiquiatría.
- Castilla del Pino, C. (1981) Jacques Lacan. *El País*, 16 September 1981, p. 30.
- Dessal, G. (1981) Psicoanalistas: un esfuerzo más para ser científicos. Respuesta a Gustavo Bueno. *Serie Psicoanalítica* 2–3: 227–46.
- Druet, A.-C. (2006) La psychanalyse dans l'Espagne postfranquiste. Ph.D. dissertation, Université Paris IV–Sorbonne, France.
- Druet, A.-C. (2008) Le lacanisme en Espagne: histoire d'un 'détour' argentin. *Mélanges de la Casa de Velázquez* 38(2): 81–95.
- Druet, A.-C. (2012) Psychoanalysis in Franco's Spain (1939–1975): Crónica de una 'agonía' anunciada. In: Damousi, J. and Plotkin, M.B. (eds), *Psychoanalysis and Politics: Histories of Psychoanalysis Under Conditions of Restricted Political Freedom*, pp. 57–78. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Gallano, C. & Salinas, J. (2001) El movimiento lacaniano en España. In: *Actas I. Historia del psicoanálisis en España. Repercusiones clínicas*, pp. 12–24. Madrid: Asociación Española de Psicoanálisis del Campo Lacaniano.
- Glick, T. (1982) The naked science: Psychoanalysis in Spain, 1914–1948. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 24: 533–71.
- Glick, T. (2003) Sexual reform, psychoanalysis and the politics of divorce in Spain in the 1920s and 1930s. *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 12(1): 68–97.
- Muñoz, M.L. (1989) Contribución a la historia del movimiento psicoanalítico en España: formación de la Asociación psicoanalítica de Madrid. *Revista de Psicoanálisis de Madrid*, special number, May–Nov: 121–52.
- Ortega y Gasset, J. (1911a) Psicoanálisis: ciencia problemática. In: Ortega y Gasset, J. *Ideas y creencias*, pp. 89–121. Madrid: Revista de Occidente en Alianza Editorial, 2005.

- Ortega y Gasset, J. (1911b) Nueva medicina espiritual. In: Ortega y Gasset, J. *Obras completas*, vol. 1, pp. 473–81. Madrid: Taurus, 2004.
- Ortega y Gasset, J. (1911c) La interpretación de los sueños. Una consulta. In: Ortega y Gasset, J. *Obras completas*, vol. 1, pp. 519–20. Madrid: Taurus, 2004.
- Palomera, V. (1993) Un tarro de miel. *Freudiana* 8: 118–20.
- Palomera, V., Roldán, A. & Segura, M. (1982) Una española en París. *Tyché* 1: 125–31.
- Plotkin, M.B. (2003) *Freud en las Pampas*. Buenos Aires: Sudamericana.
- Rodríguez Lafora, G. (1923) La teoría y los métodos del psicoanálisis. *Revista de Criminología, Psiquiatría y Medicina Legal* 10(58): 385–408.

#### ABSTRACT

From the early diffusion of Freud's ideas to the development and institutionalization of the Lacanian movement, the Argentine and Spanish psychoanalytic histories have had repeated points of contact. In fact, almost all stages of the Spanish analytical sphere have been shaped by the presence of an 'Argentine element'. This article aims to explore the history of these encounters between the Spanish and Argentine psychoanalytic worlds. Following the chronology of events, it focuses on the different aspects of this history and shows how the causes, the nature and the consequences of the exchanges evolved.

*Key words:* Spain, Argentina, Lacanianism, Oscar Masotta, exile, circulation of ideas, transnational history, institutional history