History of Psychology
2018, Vol. 21, No. 3, 254–272

1093-4510/18/$12.00 http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/hop0000071

Psychology and Psychoanalysis in Argentina: Politics, French Thought, and the University Connection, 1955–1976

Alejandro A. Dagfal
National Scientific and Technical Research Council, Buenos Aires, Argentina,
and University of Buenos Aires

The hegemonic place acquired by psychoanalysis in the Argentinean psychotherapeutic field is recognized by friend and foe alike. Nevertheless, the historical process leading to this situation is less well known. In this article, I focus on 2 periods crucial to understanding the unusual scope of Freudian ideas and practices in that country. The first one (1955–1966) corresponds to the professionalization of psychology and was marked by projects such as those of Bleger and Pichon-Rivière. Their ideas involved an alliance between psychology and psychoanalysis within a larger synthesis whose philosophical framework was French existential phenomenology. This eclectic "psychoanalytic psychology" found an amazing sounding board in the newly created university psychology programs, in which it was adopted by future psychologists who took psychoanalysis as their primary theoretical and practical reference. The second period (1966 –1976), however, after the reception of French structuralism (mainly via Jacques Lacan and his local interpreters, such as Oscar Masotta), implied an exclusive disjunction: either psychoanalysis or psychology. Psychoanalysis was presented as a return to the Freudian sources. Therefore, it was supposed to replace a psychology that "ignored" unconscious determinism. Thus, paradoxically, Lacanianism, which found its main audience in psychology programs, invited psychologists to relinquish their own professional identity to become psychoanalysts. My hypothesis is that the prominent position that psychoanalysis still holds in Argentina can be best understood by considering the history of its relationship with academic psychology and situating that connection in an intellectual and political context in which French thought has always been crucial.

Keywords: history of psychotherapy, psychoanalysis, university psychology programs, Argentina, French thought

Well-known for its large concentration of "psy" professionals and discourses, Argentina may be the only country in the world with more licensed psychologists than dentists (INDEC, 2005). Over 82,000 psychologists are currently active, which amounts to 206 per 100,000 people, compared with 27 per 100,000 in the United States (Alonso & Klinar, 2015). Furthermore, psychoanalysis (which is not a licensed profession but is regulated as a form of psychotherapy) has acquired such a great scope in academia, in the health care system, and in the common understanding of everyday life, that this situation has drawn the attention of the specialized literature and the international press. For example, in 2012,

Alejandro A. Dagfal, National Scientific and Technical Research Council, Buenos Aires, Argentina, and Psychology School Research Institute, University of Buenos Aires.

This research was supported by the National Scientific and Technical Research Council, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Alejandro A. Dagfal, Instituto de Investigaciones, Facultad de Psicología, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Gral. Juan Lavalle 2353 (C1052AAA), CABA, Argentina. E-mail: adagfal@gmail.com

The New York Times published a long article pointing out that the practice of psychoanalysis was still surging in Argentina, even as it declined "in the United States and in other countries" (Romero, 2012, p. A1). According to the editor of *Le Livre noir de la psychanalyse: vivre, penser et aller mieux sans Freud* [The Black Book of Psychoanalysis: To Live, Think and Feel Better Without Freud], France and Argentina are the two countries in the world in which psychoanalytic ideas and practices remain dominant (Meyer, 2005).

In the early 1940s, after the founding of the Argentine Psychoanalytic Association (APA), the average analyst was a male physician in his 40s, but today, a large majority of psychoanalysts are women in their 30s who hold a psychology degree. Of course, there are psychotherapists with other theoretical orientations, but they are still mostly women and psychologists (since 1985, only physicians and psychologists are legally authorized to carry out any kind of psychotherapy, including psychoanalysis). By 1975, a rather comprehensive sociological study concluded that more than 90% of psychologists who graduated in the late 1960s from the University of Buenos Aires—the most important university in the country—had already gone into clinical practice, even if this choice did not exclude professional activities in other domains (Litvinoff & Gomel, 1975). Although the study did not specify theoretical orientations, historical literature shows that psychoanalysis, in its different versions, was already the theory of choice at the time (Dagfal, 2009a; Klappenbach, 2004; Plotkin, 2001; Vezzetti, 2004). Today, over 78,000 people study psychology in one of the 41 university undergraduate programs (31 are private, 10 are public and free). Eighty percent are women (Alonso & Klinar, 2015). Taking historical trends of the profession into account, a large majority of the students who finally obtain their diploma (around 6,000 in 2014) will certainly become psychotherapists. And on top of that, most of the members of that majority will choose to define themselves as being psychoanalysts. And they will work in some of the bigger cities of the country.[1]

As I will demonstrate in this article, these two facts—the importance of psychology as a profession and the unusual expansion of psychoanalysis in Argentina—have been closely related in the historical shaping of the local psychotherapeutic field. Yet other factors also need to be taken into account in order to place this story in a sociocultural and political context. That is why, among other things, I will show the importance of French thought in an intellectual field in which philosophy and ideology always played a major role. My study of the complex interplay of all those factors between 1955 and 1976 builds on a burgeoning historiographical tradition. Jorge Balán (1991) wrote the first comprehensive history of psychoanalysis in Argentina, focusing on the beginnings of the local "official movement." Ten years later, Mariano Plotkin (2001) widened the view to include the arrival of Lacanianism in Argentina, among other subjects. His *Freud in the Pampas* (Plotkin, 2001) is the only study on the subject available to the English readership. Hugo Vezzetti, the most prolific historian in this field, has explored the reception of psychoanalysis in Argentina *before* its institutionalization (Vezzetti, 1989, 1996), the origins of psychology as a profession (Vezzetti, 2004), the changing relationships of psychoanalysis with the Argentinean Communist Party (Vezzetti, 2016), and a history of madness in Argentina (Ablard, 2008; Vezzetti, 1985). Hugo Klappenbach has also written several articles on these subjects, particularly with respect to the history of psychological training (Klappenbach, 2000, 2004, 2006).

In 2009, I contributed an extensive history of the Argentinean psy professions from 1942 to 1966, crossing the boundaries between psychology, psychiatry, and psychoanalysis. My aim was to account for the "invention" of the Argentine psychologist, in relation

[1] The last professional census was carried out more than 10 years ago. Obviously, it did not include psychoanalysts, but it showed that psychologists were distributed in a highly uneven way. Almost 80% worked either in the city of Buenos Aires or in the cities of the province of Buenos Aires. It can be assumed that psychoanalysts followed the same pattern (INDEC, 2005).

to not only neighboring disciplines but also French thought as a decisive factor in shaping psy practices and discourses (Dagfal, 2009a, 2011). In this article, instead of focusing on the development of psychology as a new profession, I argue, first, that the steady growth of psychoanalysis in Argentina, its extension from the upper classes into the middle classes, its feminization, and its persistence as a theoretical framework and as a prototype for most psychotherapies (well after its decline in most of the Western hemisphere) are all the result of a historical process beginning by the establishment of a "psychoanalytic hegemony" in university psychology programs.[2] Second, I intend to show that understanding the specific characteristics of the expansion of psychoanalysis in Argentina requires considering the subtle roles played by ideology and philosophy in each particular period, in a context generally dominated by French thought.

Brief Historical Background: Psychology, Psychoanalysis, and French Thought

In Argentina, the "alliance" between psychology and psychoanalysis is relatively recent, emerging in the last six decades. In fact, there were no psychology programs before 1955 and no analytic associations until 1942. The domain of psychotherapy, broadly understood, has a much longer history, dating back to the 19th century. However, it only began to expand at the very beginning of the 20th century, understood as a medical discipline. In a period dominated by a positivist perspective, based on a solid faith in science, evolution, and progress, mental illnesses were defined in terms of the natural sciences. Those who practiced psychotherapy were usually physicians trained in philosophy and engaged in politics. Most of them followed the French psychopathological tradition (which implied a solid philosophical training), from Jean-Martin Charcot and Thédule Ribot to Pierre Janet and Joseph Grasset (Dagfal, 2011; Klappenbach, 2013; Piñero, 1903). They considered their approach to psychology and psychotherapy "experimental," but they required no laboratories because they conceived of illnesses as experiments carried out by nature. "Experimental," then, was tantamount to "based on clinical experience and observation" (Carroy & Plas, 1996).

In the 1920s and the 1930s, an "anti-positivist reaction" emerged in the academic field. Thus, psychology approached philosophy at the same time that it moved away from medicine and biology. The ideas of Franz Brentano, Wilhelm Dilthey, Edmund Husserl, and Max Scheler became influential, mainly through the translations of the Spanish philosopher José Ortega y Gasset's group, which also produced the first translations of Freud's works by 1922. These authors were close to neo-Kantianism and phenomenology, advocating consciousness and subjective experience as the foundations for a new science. Instead of observation and experimentation, they proposed comprehension and interpretation as a means of exploring the problem of meaning (Klappenbach, 2006). At the same time, French philosopher Henri Bergson had an enormous impact. He argued that measurement and mathematics could only be applied to mental phenomena by putting aside their most essential trait: that of being quality ("pure duration") and not mere quantity (space; Bergson, 1889).[3] This new intellectual climate in Argentina led to an approach to psychology that emphasized values, freedom, creation, and life itself. It almost brought about the extinction of scientific psychologies until the 1990s.

Psychoanalysis itself was not institutionally organized until the 1940s. In the late 1930s, Ángel Garma (1904–1993), a Spanish psychiatrist, and Celes Cárcamo (1903–1990), an

[2] I do not intend to elaborate on any of those complex facts (such as the feminization of psychology and psychoanalysis), but I do want to show the origin of the historical processes that made them possible.

[3] If in the positivist period Freud had been known mainly through Pierre Janet's critiques (Janet, 1914), after the end of the 1920s he would be linked to Henri Bergson. Thus, for example, Freudian drives were interpreted as a synonym of Bergson's "vital impetus" (Rojas, 1930, 1939).

Argentine psychiatrist, met in Paris. Garma had escaped the Spanish Civil War, after receiving analytic training in Berlin. Cárcamo was in analysis with Paul Schiff while he completed his psychiatric training with Henri Claude in Paris. Around 1937, in a Parisian café, the two of them held their first conversations concerning the possible creation of an analytic association in Buenos Aires. They soon settled in Buenos Aires, and both married French women. In December 1942, they participated in the foundation of the APA, the most important analytic association in Latin America at the time.

A local network of psychoanalysts soon emerged. One of the association's most important members, Enrique Pichon-Rivière (1907–1977), was a psychiatrist born in Switzerland to French parents. He had made acquaintance with Arnaldo Rascovsky (1908–1995), a recognized Argentine pediatrician, who became the other key member of this local group. Finally, Marie Glas de Langer (1910–1987), an Austrian physician escaping from Nazism, and from Franco's regime, joined them. She had received psychiatric training in Vienna. This heterogeneous medical group organized a very powerful analytic institution, even if, in its first decade, it functioned more like a secret brotherhood (Balán, 1991; Plotkin, 2001).

The 1940s were also the years when Peronism began in Argentina: a sociopolitical movement that radically changed the country's governance and institutions, including the universities.[4] Juan Domingo Perón favored developing an applied psychology half way between education and the industrial world that would serve as a framework for the professional organization of the discipline. However, Peronists had no interest in psychoanalysis or psychoanalysts, considering them part of the "luxury consumption" of the privileged classes, who, for their part, belonged to the political opposition (Dagfal, 2012).

In 1947, Perón passed a law explicitly suppressing the autonomy Argentinean universities had enjoyed since the Reform of 1918. Although Peronist lawmakers expelled many professors, the most conservative sectors of the Catholic Church were given directive posts in the ministry of education as well as in several universities, mainly in departments related to philosophy, literature, and the humanities, in which "modern" or atheistic theories were rapidly replaced by an Aristotelian-Thomistic spiritualism (Buchbinder, 2005). In that kind of academic context, psychoanalysis had no place. However, it began to prosper in an intellectual network that included a series of magazines and journals, as well as publishing houses that were interested in the renewal of the social sciences.[5] This heterogeneous network, whose activities were public, constituted a sort of "university in the shadows" (Terán, 1991). Not because it was clandestine or illegal, but because, without knowing it, its most progressive members were preparing to take charge of the post-Peronist university.

Psychoanalysis and Psychology: The Expansion of Psychotherapies (1955–1966)

If Peronism was the backdrop of the 1940s and the early 1950s, its overthrow in 1955 marked the beginning of a new era in Argentina, including for its universities. They recovered their traditional autonomy and initiated a modernization process that included the reform of their study programs and the "normalization" of their faculties. This meant that competitive entrance examinations were installed to revalidate all teaching posts. Most of the intellectuals who had been cast out returned to the university. And this was particularly true in the social sciences and the humanities, in which most of the new

[4] A populist movement founded by Perón (and endorsed by Evita, his second wife), Peronism held three basic principles: social justice, economic independence, and political sovereignty. Perón presented his ideas as a "third position," different from capitalism and communism (Potash, 1980). As a political party, Peronism is still a key actor in contemporary Argentina.

[5] The example of the publishing house Paidós is very eloquent in this respect, as I will show later.

professors were the same intellectuals who had been actively circulating their ideas in journals and publishing houses. All of the sudden, the modernization projects they had begun "in the shadows" could now be continued openly in prestigious academic institutions, such as the University of Buenos Aires, in which the new rector and most of the deans were progressive intellectuals supported by the student movement.

It was the beginning of a period that many have considered the golden age of the Argentine university—a period that started in 1955 and that would come to an end with the coup d'état of 1966. Between those two dates, there were short-lived dictatorships and weak elected governments, while Peronism was totally proscribed. The seven national universities, however, were a sort of a democratic island, in which those who had been marginalized in the former period (militant students, liberal professors) were able to carry out their activities without external intervention (Buchbinder, 2005). Moreover, at a time when the social sciences were flourishing, between 1955 and 1959, six psychology programs were created in national universities, along with sociology and cultural anthropology programs, among others. In 1957, the dean of the Philosophy School of the University of Buenos Aires presented the project in these terms:

> It seems incredible that there were no programs in Psychology and Sociology [at this University], given their contemporary relevance. Their creation was more than necessary, and, elaborating this project, the School Council has just obeyed a sort of public outcry, a friendly request of the environment, proposing this solution to the University Council. (Universidad de Buenos Aires, 1957, p. 147)

Even beyond the universities, psychoanalysis had already become a product of mass consumption, acquiring prestige in a society longing for cultural modernization. Furthermore, Freudian doctrines were now percolating anew among psychiatrists who, renewed by the mental health movement, had expanded their work beyond asylums. By the beginning of the 1960s, the sudden appearance of hundreds of young psychologists dramatically modified the human geography of the "psy disciplines" as well as their power relationships. The intersections between psychoanalysis, psychiatry, and psychology were now varied and multiple, leading to a "clinicization" of the psy disciplines. As a result, psychotherapy was everywhere—all the more so in the university psychology programs, in which psychiatrists taught most of the clinical courses. As professors of psychology, psychiatrists gained much more freedom and recognition than in medicine, in which their specialty had a relatively low status (Ferrara & Peña, 1959).

In this respect, José Bleger is emblematic, as he illustrates the multidisciplinary confluence I have just mentioned. Bleger was an example of the psychiatrists' "exodus" to psychoanalysis in the 1950s and the 1960s,[6] and he was also the most renowned psychoanalyst professor of psychology. Both Marxist and Kleinian,[7] and also the most prominent disciple of Pichon-Rivière, Bleger drew in his teaching upon Daniel Lagache's "behavior general theory," Georges Politzer's "concrete psychology," Jean-Paul Sartre's "existential phenomenology," and Kurt Lewin's "topological and vector psychology,"

[6] At the time, it was very common for psychiatrists to abandon their jobs in the asylums to choose the liberal practice of psychotherapy as a means to improve their social and professional situation. That is how their interest for psychoanalysis can be understood. In 1962, almost 20% of the 800 registered psychiatrists were either psychoanalysts or candidates in the APA (Bermann, 1965). Many of them would also become professors of the clinical subjects in the newly created psychology programs. The most successful, however, would be Pichon-Rivière's disciples (such as José Bleger, Fernando Ulloa, David Liberman, Armando Bauleo, Edgardo Rolla, etc.), identified with "the new psychology."

[7] Melanie Klein (1882–1960) was the first analyst who managed to construct an original system of thought, contesting many Freudian principles, without being forced to leave the psychoanalytic movement. Established in England, she was far more popular in Argentina than in France or in the United States, where Anna Freud, her main rival, was considered a better representative of the Freudian legacy (Dagfal, 2009b)

among many other sources.[8] He forged a new psychosocial approach so strongly influenced by French thought that his second book even earned praise from the circle of Communist psychiatrists in Paris (Béquart, 1961; Bleger, 1958). The first psychologists trained in Argentinean universities, such as María Teresa Calvo (one of the graduates who participated in the beginning of the professional organization), and Alba Kaplan, were Bleger disciples:

> José Bleger was our passion. I was a part of his teaching staff [at the University of Buenos Aires] and did all my training with him. He was such a beloved person! The crowds that came to see him made an impression on the people at the Philosophy School, in Viamonte Street. His courses had to be taught Saturday morning, since the students who also worked for a living had made that request to be able to attend. Loudspeakers had to be placed in the halls! (Calvo, 1995, p. 2)

> The fascinating thing about him is that he was a very competent psychoanalyst, a very skillful one; but he also tried to elaborate a synthesis integrating Marxism. And many of us, at that moment, were activists who followed those ideas. (Kaplan, 1999, as cited in Diamant, 2010, p. 136)

Since 1955, Pichon-Rivière (who had been Bleger's personal analyst) had been shifting away from classical psychoanalysis to an "operational" one, elaborating an analytically oriented social psychology. Following in his footsteps, Bleger conceived of an academic as well as a professional vision for Argentine psychology. From his very first courses in Buenos Aires and Rosario, in 1959, he promoted a "behavioral psychology"—that had very little to do with American behaviorism—calling for an alliance between psychology, psychoanalysis, and dialectic materialism, which he systematized and published four years later as *Psicología de la conducta* [Behavioral Psychology] (Bleger, 1963). This book was reprinted seven times in less than a decade (before the author's death, in 1972, at the age of 49). For a psychology manual, it was an unprecedented success. At the same time, he defined the role of psychologists as prevention and social change agents, in tune with the mental health movement born after World War II:

> The social function of the clinical psychologists should not be focused on therapy, but on public health and, within it, on mental health. The psychologists must actively intervene in all the problems related to mental hygiene and they should not wait until people get sick. . . . I want to promote a change of attitude in psychology students, as well as in the professionals, taking their fundamental interest from the field of illness and therapy to that one of community health. (Bleger, 1966, pp. 27–28)

Bleger's era represented a full efflorescence of psychoanalysis in Argentina on many levels. First, within the universities in the early 1960s, thousands of psychology students (mostly women) discovered and embraced the psychodynamic aspects of Bleger's new psychology. Second, the use of psychoanalysis was now reshaping the clinical orientation of Argentinean health care institutions. The most representative case was the Psychopathology Service at the Lanús Hospital, created in 1956. The director of the Service, Mauricio Goldenberg, was a psychiatrist with a rather traditional training who rapidly became the local head of the mental health movement. Under his leadership, psychoanalysis became a central tenet. His service became the quasi-mythical origin of an interdisciplinary project of reuniting young psychologists, psychiatrists, and psychoanalysts—most of them of a Pichonian or Blegerian orientation (Visacovsky, 2002). Juan David

[8] *Existential phenomenology* is the name of a philosophical movement inspired by Husserlian phenomenology and Heideggerian existentialism. In France, in the 1940s, it even became an intellectual fashion, thanks to authors like Jean-Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir. For Sartre, existentialism was a sort of humanism based on men's responsibilities for their actions. According to him, human beings are nothing but what they decide to be in their fundamental projects. His existential psychoanalysis criticized Freudian unconscious determinism, underlying the value of freedom (Sartre, 1948).

Nasio, one of the first interns at the Psychopathology Service at the Lanús, who is now a renowned psychoanalyst in Paris, talked about that experience:

> We had a great training in Lanús. We were a bit spoiled. For example, from 10 a.m. to 11 a.m., there was Fernando Ulloa [one of Pichon's closest "disciples"], who came to talk to us. From 11 a.m. to 12 a.m., there was José Bleger. And from 2 PM to 4 PM, there could be any of the best representatives of Argentine psychoanalysis. They came to talk to *us*, 12 young interns in white uniforms, who listened to them without even knowing that we were having an exceptional opportunity. (Pernicone, 2000, p. 15)

Furthermore, now there was a new public clamoring for psychoanalysis—for its literature and access to its practice. In this respect, the creation of publishing agencies such as Paidós further extended the reach of "the new psychology." Not only did its two founders (Enrique Butelman and Jaime Bernstein) publish Spanish translations of American psychoanalytic best-sellers like Erich Fromm—they also printed local books such as Bleger's. At the same time, they were also directors of the psychology programs of Buenos Aires and Rosario universities, respectively, where they had recruited Bleger as professor. Hence, they had tremendous power and the means to diffuse their ideas. Prior to this period, they had been a part of the "university in the shadows" (Dagfal, 2009a).

Most of the founders of the psychology university programs longed for a discipline reminiscent of scientific psychology, which, as I have stated, was almost nonexistent since the antipositivist reaction. Nonetheless, they faced considerable resistance. On the one hand, they could not find professors with the scientific training they needed to help disseminate this kind of approach. Thus, in 1959 at the first meeting of directors of new psychology programs, they came to these conclusions:

> There are several psychological specialties that cannot be taught, domains where research cannot be done, since our country lacks trained experts. Because of its extent and its relevance, this is a national problem for the universities. In this situation of *primary need*, we have to consider the following subjects: Experimental Psychology, Industrial Psychology, Professional Guidance. . . . For the first two subjects, the search of professors should be particularly oriented toward Italy, Belgium and France. (Universidad de Buenos Aires, 1959, p. 2)

On the other hand, students' representatives (who had considerable power in the governance of universities) were promoting a different kind of psychology, closer to a form of psychoanalysis aligned with the human sciences, with mental health, French philosophy, and political engagement. Professors who viewed psychology as a natural science had no appeal for them. Psychiatrists with a biological perspective were even more anathema. They also considered psychoanalysts who did not favor interdisciplinary practices elitist, medicalized, or too orthodox. Their medical background put them closer to psychiatrists than to "the new psychology." According to María Teresa Calvo, one of the most engaged students of the 1957 class of Buenos Aires,

> I think it was up to us to give shape to the Psychology Program. We were very active in proposing a syllabus, in inviting professors. They were not invited by the Academic Council, by the dean or by the director. It was us who chose the professors. It was us who introduced psychoanalysis. (Calvo, 1995, p. 2)

This tension between the preferences of students and the professional projects of other groups became more pointed as the first psychologists neared graduation. As had happened in many other countries, psychiatrists in Argentina strongly attacked the training of psychologists in psychotherapy, which was considered by law an exclusively medical activity (and would continue to be so until 1985).[9] In that regard, they agreed with psychoanalysts (nonphysicians

[9] The only exceptions were the provinces of Río Negro and Entre Ríos, which passed specific professional laws in the early seventies that were vetoed during the last dictatorship (Klappenbach, 2000). And even then, this second province required medical supervision for clinical practice.

would not be accepted by the APA until 1983) and with the founders of the psychology programs, who did not want the psychologists to become lay psychoanalysts.

Gregorio Bermann, who had been the president of the First Argentine Psychiatric Conference in 1956, expressed a similar view. Three years later, in the Third Argentine Conference on Psychiatric Assistance, Bermann stated that psychologists, as mere "applied psychology technicians," were not entitled to go into medical psychology.[10] He was then surprised that in the psychology program at Córdoba there was a psychotherapy chair not headed by a physician:

> Astonishing fact; all the more so considering that this subject is completely absent from the Medical School at the same University. . . . There are courses in psychoanalysis being taught this semester, mainly for the students of the Psychology Department. Then, psychology's invasive tendency, aiming at psychotherapy, is notorious. And I have witnessed the disappointment of some students when they found out that they were not entitled to carry out psychotherapy. (Bermann, 1960, p. 176)

The position of the more traditional psychiatrists (the "official representatives," headed by the director of the Neuropsychiatric Hospital of Buenos Aires) was even more severe. They were alarmed "in front of the invasion of actors that are strange to medicine, ready to undermine all its history, its technique and its hardly obtained therapeutic conquests" (Ipar, Sisto, & Dichiara, 1959). Even the first director of the Psychology Department at the University of Buenos Aires, Marcos Victoria, was completely opposed to the possibility of clinical practice by nonphysicians:

> A hasty resolution of the University of La Plata, trying to facilitate the professional exercise of future psychologists, authorizes them to "practice psychotherapy by verbal means." Have the authorities of that University considered that an inexperienced psychologist (bound by no medical oath) may provoke the suicide of an anxious and depressed patient with an inappropriate therapeutic behavior? . . . The lack of responsibility of those lousy psychologists, however, does not stop there. (Victoria, 1965, pp. 21–22)

The students at the University of Buenos Aires strongly opposed his views and did their best to find a substitute for him. Thus, Marcos Victoria was quickly replaced by Enrique Butelman (one of the founders of Paidós) as director of the department and by José Bleger as chair of introduction to psychology. This alliance between students, reformist psychiatrists, and progressive analysts was a natural one. All the more so when the latter were new psychology professors advocating for an autonomous role for psychologists (even in the clinical field), questioning the status quo ante. Conservative psychoanalysts, traditional psychiatrists, and the first psychology professors had all called for a far more limited professional role for psychologists (as psychiatrist aid, test administrator, psychotechnician, counselor, etc.). To them, the psychologist should help the psychiatrist with diagnosis (as did the radiologist) and might, on occasion, work in prevention and counseling, but he (or she) should never direct the treatment. If there were to be interdisciplinary work, the physician must remain in charge of the therapeutic component.

In this context, psychotherapies, in general, and psychoanalysis, in particular, became for this new generation of psychology students a symbol of resistance that gave them a sort of "reactive identity".[11] Despite legal restrictions, these students obtained their

[10] In that conference, one of the main subjects was "professional qualifications for the study and treatment of psychiatric patients" (Ipar, Sisto, & Dichiara, 1959).

[11] A professional identity involves the self-representation of a professional group: The idea that certain professionals have about themselves. Professional identities are not static, as they are usually based upon dynamic accounts, built up with myths and oblivion, exaggerations, and omissions. These stories try to answer some crucial questions, such us who we are, what we are supposed to do, which our skills are, etc. The set of answers given to these questions guides the actions of any professional group, constituting its common sense and organizing the relationships between peers, with other professional groups and with the public. According to Abbott (1988), a "cultural jurisdiction" is established, implying the appropriation and control of a given professional domain.

diplomas and immediately began to open their own private practices while holding down part-time jobs in various institutions. Argentinean society rapidly recognized their legitimacy to practice, which had been hard to win both in the academic and professional fields. More than two decades later, when psychologists obtained the legal right to practice psychotherapy and could finally become members of the APA, these rights had become pro forma. They had already obtained their legitimacy as clinical psychologists and psychotherapists, not to say psychoanalysts, by other means.

Psychoanalysis Versus Psychotherapies: The First Reception of Lacanianism (1966–1976)

The coup d′état of 1966 marked the end of a supposed golden age, during which relative political and economic stability fostered the development of the middle classes and furthered the growth of psychological disciplines. Civil society, in general, did not oppose this political change, hoping instead that the modernization promised by General Juan Carlos Onganía, the new military president, would be realized. There were pockets of resistance, however, and again they were in the national universities, which Onganía rapidly put under the control of executive power. From then on, the radicalization of political life and the progressive degradation of the institutional context would allow less and less room for strictly psychological debates, as more urgent matters seemed to be at stake (Terán, 1991).

Universities could no longer survive as "democratic islands." The limits of a political system that excluded Peronism became all too evident. In the intellectual field, postwar reformist humanism (inspired by existentialism) was strongly criticized. It began to give place to structural approaches close to Althusserian Marxism as well as to revolutionary positions inspired by Guevarism. Once again, the intellectual transformations produced in France—on a cultural level but in the political sphere as well—had an enormous impact in the local scene.[12]

A good illustration of this new situation is a round table organized at the Philosophy School of the University of Buenos Aires by a leftist student group in 1965, a few months before the coup d′état. The subject was Georges Politzer's concrete psychology in its relations to ideology. On one side were Enrique Pichon-Rivière and José Bleger, who had introduced Politzer's early idea that psychoanalysis was a new psychology. Attacking them on the other side was Antonio Caparrós, a Marxist psychiatrist and professor of general psychology, who was backed by León Rozitchner, a Marxist philosopher who had received his doctorate at the Sorbonne, under Jean Wahl. Both of them were later invited to Cuba, where they met Fidel Castro. For Caparrós and Rozitchner, Pichon and Bleger were mere reformers and not revolutionary enough. They preferred to underline Politzer's last years, when he renounced psychoanalysis to embrace Communism and the armed resistance to the Nazis. He was their model, as well as Henri Wallon, the renowned French communist psychologist, whom Caparrós himself had introduced in Argentina:

> While Wallon developed his main practice in the underground Resistance, in his spare time he wrote one of his most productive books: *De l'acte à la pensée* [Paris: Flammarion, 1942]. . . . This proves that the militant activity and the scientific one are not exclusive. But if they came to exclude each other at any given moment, the militant task is that one of men, whereas the scientific task is the activity of the specialists. And one has to choose between being a man and being a specialist; one has to choose between the militant activity, that binds us to the social whole, and the scientific one, that distinguishes us from it; even if the latter involves a contribution to society. (Pichon-Rivière, Bleger, Rozitchner, & Caparrós, 1969, p. 23)

[12] François Dosse has shown in detail how this transit took place in France during the 1950s (Dosse, 1997). Oscar Terán has done the same concerning Argentina, showing how, in a repressive context, intellectual radicalization could lead to armed struggle (Terán, 1991).

After the Cuban revolution (in 1959) and the North African colonies independence (between 1956 and 1962), young Argentineans tended to think that radical social change was also unstoppable in South America. Rosalía Schneider, one of the first graduates, would put it in these terms:

> Many psychologists, besides caring about our new profession, also engaged in political activity. Close to the student movement, we generally had to take sides concerning what was going on. And we did it when we were students, later as teaching aids, and so on. The Cuban Revolution, still fresh, was a beacon, a model to follow. . . . There were people waiting in line to go to Cuba. And many groups assumed the representation of the Cuban Revolution or were waiting for Che to call them in to join the struggle. (Schneider, 2008)

Like Caparrós, the most radicalized of those young professionals thought that every single human action (including intellectual and professional activities) was secondary to the supreme revolutionary goal. Yet they belonged to a different generation and accepted different versions of psychoanalysis, which Caparrós rejected. Because ideological and theoretical references were changing, many other psychologists—including some who were activists—preferred to concentrate on the "revolution of the unconscious" proclaimed by Jacques Lacan.[13] Most of them were for social change but did not favor the armed struggle. Their Marxist perspective was increasingly influenced by the French philosopher Louis Althusser. Through his own "return to Marx," Althusser had made Lacan's "return to Freud" acceptable for the new generation of French Communists and desirable for many intellectuals. He told them that the rejection of psychology and the adoption of psychoanalysis were equally necessary to harmonize Marx's and Freud's revolutions on a scientific basis. Marx had abandoned the *homo oeconomicus*, whereas Freud (as interpreted by Lacan) had left aside the illusions of the *homo psychologicus* (Althusser, 1965; Roudinesco, 1986; Vezzetti, 2016).

The preceding period (1955–1966), marked by the emergence of projects such as those of Bleger and Pichon-Rivière, clearly involved an *alliance* between psychology and psychoanalysis, within a larger synthesis whose philosophical framework was existential phenomenology. In the new period, however, after the second half of the 1960s, the reception of French structuralism[14] implied an *exclusive disjunction*: either psychoanalysis or psychology. Practitioners had to make a choice because, from this new perspective, there was no possible alliance between the two. Many psychologists chose to follow Lacan, and not only changed their theoretical framework but also adopted a new professional model. They identified themselves as psychoanalysts first and foremost, and relinquished their identity as psychologists (González & Dagfal, 2012). In fact, they rejected psychology because it was a part of the synthesis that structuralism intended to refute. In other words, Lacanians did not consider psychoanalysis to be a part of psychology because psychology focused on conscious behavior instead of unconscious

[13] In the 1970s, these differences would become clearer: The most radical militants would tend to join clandestine organizations close to armed groups, whereas those who preferred psychoanalysis would create analytic institutions and work in their offices. This does not mean that other psychotherapeutic models were non-existent in Argentina in a period such as the 1960s and 1970s, in which eclecticism was so common. For example, in the domain of family therapies, there was an important reception of systemic theories that were combined with Kleinian psychoanalysis (Macchioli, 2010). In the psychiatric circles, there was also a widespread implantation of Soviet psychologies (Pavlov, Luria, Leontiev, Vygotsy, etc.). However, their practical impact on the field of psychotherapy was not as visible as the political disputes between the communist psychiatrists and their less engaged colleagues (García, 2013).

[14] In France, structuralism became a worldview that spread in the 1950s and the 1960s, mainly through the works of the anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss, the psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan, and the semiologist Roland Barthes. Opposed to existentialism, they shared the idea that, far from being free, human beings (and human actions) are unconsciously determined by symbolic systems stemming from the very structure of language (Dosse, 1997).

determinism. Even more, Lacanians sought to invalidate all psychologies because they made "the mistake" of valuing consciousness over the unconscious.

To illustrate this transition—from an "existentially-oriented psychoanalytic psychology" to a French structuralism that replaced psychology with psychoanalysis—I will focus on Oscar Masotta, a self-taught young philosopher who, more than anyone else by the mid-1960s, exemplified not only this shift but also the difficult philosophical and political challenges it posed (Masotta, 1969a; Scholten, 2000). In an autobiographical text, written in 1965, Masotta summarized his intellectual trajectory:

> Only today I begin to understand that Marxism is not at all a philosophy of consciousness, and that is why it radically excludes phenomenology. Marxist philosophy must be reencountered and specified in the modern doctrines (or "sciences") of language, structure and unconscious; in the linguistic models and in the unconscious of the Freudians. To the alternative "consciousness or structure" we must answer, I think, by choosing structure. It is not so easy, however, and we must not, at the same time, neglect consciousness, that is to say the foundation of the moral act and historical and political engagement. (Masotta, 1965, pp. 201–202)

Seduced by a new kind of Marxism, different from Bleger's, Masotta began to take interest in Lacan and structuralism without completely renouncing Sartre's and Merleau-Ponty's existentialism. By the end of the 1960s, he was teaching this approach to psychologists who filled his study groups.[15] In the opening issue of one of the first periodical publications created by the new professionals, he showed them the way: "It is Althusser—who reads Marx not without having read Lacan—who suggests us what the task is: reading Freud" (Masotta, 1969b, p. 19). By then, Masotta had already made his choice: He had become a Lacanian. Likewise, many of his followers were ready to abandon the alliance between Kleinian psychoanalysis, French psychology, existential phenomenology, and reformist Marxism. Instead, they began to embrace the teachings of Lacan via Althusser (Acuña, 2009).[16]

A new professional identity emerged: that of the psychologist-psychoanalyst with Lacanian orientation that, although deprived of its former political connotations, is still in force today (even if psychoanalysts tend not to boast about their psychological training). Once more, in this transition, theoretical references had changed, but the privileged intellectual and professional models were located in France. At the same time, in a period of political radicalization, the discourses about "subjective subversion," so dear to the Lacanians, mixed up with discourses about social revolution, as in the Parisian May of 1968 (Roudinesco, 1986). And the borders between "the psychoanalytic camp" and "the revolutionary camp" seemed rather blurry, as some of the actors were the same and shared training places, not to mention political allegiances.

As for "official psychoanalysis," during the 1960s, the self-proclaimed monopoly of the APA was under attack by psychologists practicing "lay psychoanalysis." These lay analysts had obtained a thorough training in Freudian theories at the university and in other private institutions. By the end of 1971, the APA had splintered twice, resulting in the loss of almost a third of its training analysts, in addition to many of its junior members and candidates.

The analysts who split from the APA questioned the organization's hierarchical nature and its alleged neutrality concerning a controversial social situation that was never taken into account. These breakaway analysts moved closer to other psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers working in the mental health movement. These groups gathered in

[15] By that time, study groups had become a safe haven for intellectuals who either were proscribed or just wanted to teach theories that were not included in university syllabus. Thus, Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, Lévi-Strauss, and Lacan were first taught in private environments before becoming well-known authors (Terán, 1991).

[16] Louis Althusser was a communist French philosopher who, in the 1960s, tried to relate Freud and Marx through his particular interpretation of the works of Jacques Lacan (Roudinesco, 1986).

institutions such as the Argentine Federation of Psychiatrists, the Mental Health Workers League, the Research and Training Center, and others. In all those places, an interdisciplinary spirit prevailed, guided by ideals of social change (inspired by different varieties of Marxism). Therapeutic communities began emerging (Carpintero & Vainer, 2005). At the same time, Lacanians adopted new organizational forms. In 1974, the Freudian School of Buenos Aires (the first Lacanian institution outside France) was created, under Masotta's direction (Izaguirre, 2009). One year later, Masotta presented his school in Paris, attacking Pichon-Rivière's disciples at the same time as he introduced himself as the true heir of their master:

> There was in Buenos Aires—he is not dead—a panacea for many demands of knowledge: my dear doctor Enrique Pichon-Rivière. . . . It was he who put in my hands the first numbers of *La Psychanalyse*; it was he who kindly got, from the shelves of the Analytic Association library, dusty journals with Lacanian material; it was he, finally, who invited me to present in his school the results of my readings. (Masotta, 1976, p. 239)

In fact, Masotta was far from sharing Pichon's ideas. However, the old psychiatrist, who had been very interested in surrealism, had "adopted" Masotta as a promising youngster who shared his taste for disruption. In the 1950s, Pichon had even been friends with Lacan. And they had both been expelled from their respective "official" associations.[17] Thus, in Masotta's speech, Pichon was a useful figure for self-legitimization. In the history of local Lacanianism, Masotta used Pichon to place himself as the only inheritor of that unorthodox tradition, closer to the "damn poets" than to renowned professors and members of the APA such as José Bleger. It was the beginning of the institutionalization of a kind of "lay" psychoanalysis that soon competed with Freudian orthodoxy, even though its practice by nonphysicians was still against the law. Masotta was a good example and even a model of this new approach. He taught psychoanalysis, but he had no medical diplomas. And his clinical practice, if he had any at the time, was an enigma until he left for Europe because of political persecution.

The Last Military Dictatorship and Its Aftermath: The Privatization of Psychotherapies (1976–Present)

In 1976, another coup d′état abruptly interrupted this process. If the coup d′état of 1966 marked the end of a humanist and reformist period, the one of 1976 destroyed, in a much more violent manner, any revolutionary illusions. The new military junta, headed by General Videla, soon undertook the extermination of all kinds of political opponents (and not only the armed guerrillas). In less than 2 years, over 10,000 people were kidnapped and executed, with the tacit approval of the U.S. Secretary of State (Campbell, 2003). The future of public universities, once more, was at stake, particularly the departments of humanities and social and human sciences. Some psychology programs closed or their enrollments were suspended. Teaching and research staff members were fired or undertook voluntary resignations, fearing political persecution.

Interestingly, psychotherapy itself was not compromised. All the evidence suggests that those in independent practice had nothing to fear: It was those who worked in the public sphere who became targets of military or paramilitary attacks. What was suspicious was the use of psychoanalysis to produce cultural or political transformation, beyond individual treatment (Dagfal, 2012). Therefore the "privatization" of psy practices that had begun in 1966 became increasingly politically necessary, in the same way that study groups and consultation offices had become a sort of safe haven far from government regulations and

[17] In fact, they were not literally "expelled" but were deprived of the right to train analysts, which was almost the same.

political dangers. For this reason, even if Lacanianism kept expanding *during* the dictatorship, it is not accurate to say it expanded *because of* the dictatorship.

Regardless, many psychotherapists (mainly politically engaged psychoanalysts) were forced into exile, particularly to Brazil, Mexico, Spain, and France, where they were highly appreciated for their training. Some of those who did not leave were abducted and murdered. Even Beatriz Perosio, president of the Argentine Republic Psychologists' Federation and president of the Buenos Aires Psychologists Association, was kidnapped, tortured, and killed in 1978 (Carpintero & Vainer, 2005).[18]

Despite this complex situation, psychoanalysis kept growing.[19] In 1977, the Buenos Aires Psychoanalytic Association (APdeBA) was born, thanks to a "peaceful splitting" that had included around 50 members of the APA. Despite this loss, the APA, which had 372 members in 1975, almost doubled its membership in 1982. As for the Lacanians, in 1979, the school founded by Masotta in 1974 divided into two groups: those who were "loyal" to him, then in exile (gathered in the "Freudian School of Argentina"), and those who chose not to follow him (who stayed in the original institution that Masotta had presented in Paris in 1975). The self-taught philosopher and analyst died in Barcelona the same year of the splitting, after having founded several Lacanian institutions in Spain (Carpintero & Vainer, 2005; Izaguirre, 2009).

That same year, Diana Rabinovich, an Argentine analyst exiled in Venezuela, was already organizing Lacan's seminar in Caracas, which finally took place in 1980. For that event, Rabinovich's partner was Jacques-Alain Miller, Lacan's son-in-law and his appointed successor. In 1981, right after Lacan's death, Miller disembarked in Buenos Aires for the first time, achieving a great deal of success. The APA, for its part, organized a special meeting to celebrate the deceased figure, although Melanie Klein remained most influential. The mother association had 567 members, whereas its offspring, APdeBA, already had 230 members. In addition, there were analytical groups in Mendoza, Córdoba, and Rosario. Even then, a medical degree was required to enroll in those institutions, affiliated with the International Psychoanalytical Association.

After the disaster of the Falkland's War (*Guerra de Malvinas*), in 1982, the following year marked the recovery of democracy in Argentina, which implied a renewal of human sciences in general and of psy disciplines in particular. Subsequent to the normalization of the universities and the reopening of psychology programs, there was a massive enrolment (thousands of students longing to study psychology mainly in Buenos Aires, Rosario, Córdoba, Tucumán, and La Plata). During this period, the reception of Lacanianism reached its peak. Still, it was completely purged of any Marxist tendencies, becoming more of an autonomous worldview, applicable to individual clinical problems. Social reform ambitions, for the most part, were forgotten. As for of the independent practice of psychoanalysis, by the mid-1980s, private offices were full of patients. Most psychoanalysts were women psychologists, who had been practicing without any legal coverage up until that point. In 1983, however, the APA and APdeBA finally opened their doors to the "nonphysicians." At the same time, the practice of psychotherapy by psychologists began to be recognized by provincial professional laws. Eventually, in 1985, psychologists' expertise in psychotherapies gained national recognition in a resolution of the National Ministry of Education (Klappenbach, 2006).

After 1983, the expansion of Lacanianism reached such proportions that it split into tens of institutions. Some followed Jacques-Alain Miller, claiming his late father-in-law's

[18] Even if Perosio was not a psychoanalyst, she was a politically engaged psychologist who carried out institutional work as well as a clinical practice with psychoanalytic orientation.

[19] Some historians have argued that psychoanalysis can only develop under democratic governments. Much discussion about the subject can be found in Damousi and Plotkin (2012).

legitimacy.[20] Others called themselves "South American Lacanians," and tried to form a more federal and autonomous organization. The Lacanians were all very active in training, recruiting new members, publishing, and obtaining posts at the universities. And they found a motivated public. Thus, after 1983, Lacanianism became an important discourse in the seven psychology programs. With some variations (Buenos Aires, Rosario, and La Plata would always be more psychoanalytic than the others), almost every clinical chair across the major universities had a Lacanian orientation. By the 1980s, there was a new hegemony. "The French School" of Lacan had replaced almost completely "the English School" of Melanie Klein.

Lacanianism also became the dominant model in the public health system, particularly in the psychopathology services, in which the new interns were psychologists trained in the universities as well as in analytic institutions. Lacan's *Écrits* [Writings] and seminars, translated into Spanish, became bestsellers, through the circulation of both their official versions and their "pirated" ones.[21] Furthermore, the strong political engagement that had accompanied the reign of Sartre's ideas was replaced by a light progressiveness, which, in general, did not lead to any kind of social practice. Nonetheless, the tremendous expansion of Lacanianism in undergraduate programs resulted in conflicts, all the more so given the fact that Lacanians considered themselves as not belonging to the psychological domain and that they were opposed to any type of psychologization. At the same time, however, they claimed a place in psychologists' training.[22]

After the recovery of democracy in Argentina, the 1990s were a decade of traumatic globalization and economic liberalization, involving a sudden reduction in the government's regulatory roles, the privatization of state-owned companies, and the opening to foreign products. This process ended in 2001 with one of the biggest social and economic crises in Argentine history. As a result, there was a resurgence of nationalistic and antimarket positions that were accompanied by an important development of local industries and a redistribution of income. This "populist era" came to an end in 2015, and the new government proposes a return to globalization and liberalization, along with indebtedness.

In the last two decades, Lacanianism has kept its hegemonic place. However, the situation is slowly changing. First, in the academic field, following regional and international requirements, psychology majors tend to diversify their programs, even if the main subjects stay more or less psychoanalytic (M. E. González, 2015). Nowadays, there is more room for innovative proposals, above all in elective subjects or in private universities (that tend to be more flexible and more in tune with market demands). In addition, most of the universities (some of them in association with analytic institutions) have developed graduate programs with high enrollment, which leaves more space available in undergraduate courses, as the subjects can be redistributed. Second, the health care system has

[20] During the 1980s and the 1990s, Miller would go to Argentina almost every other year, to lecture but mainly to organize his followers. In 1983, he created a local "Freudian Field Commission" that was the seed for the "Third International Conference of the Freudian Field," held in Buenos Aires in 1984. In 1992, the "Lacanian Orientation School" of Argentina was born, along with the "World Psychoanalysis Association" (the Lacanian equivalent of the IPA) that was founded in Buenos Aires the very same day, also including the "School of the Freudian Cause" (France), the "Brazilian School of Psychoanalysis," the "Spanish School of Psychoanalysis," and the "Italian School of Psychoanalysis," among other institutions (Izaguirre, 2009).

[21] Lacan began his weekly seminar in 1953. By the 1970s, a series of stenographer's transcripts and students notes began to circulate, giving place to "pirated versions" that were soon translated into Spanish. In 1972, the "official version" of the seminar was entrusted by Lacan to his son-in-law, Jacques-Alain Miller, who has not yet completed the colossal task of "establishing" in writing more than twenty years of oral teaching (Roudinesco, 1986). In France and Argentina, there has been a lot of legal debate about the pirated seminars as well as controversy about the accuracy of Miller's version.

[22] This contradiction between theory and practice was very similar to the one faced by the psychoanalysts who, between the 1950s and 1985, taught psychoanalysis to students who were not supposed to practice it after graduation, because they were not legally allowed to do so.

changed significantly. Although the public system is still more conservative (Lakoff, 2003), private health care insurance plans are no longer willing to reimburse long treatments whose goals are not clearly established. They demand shorter treatments, based on clear diagnosis and prognosis, following the categories of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (5th ed.; American Psychiatric Association, 2013) or the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems (World Health Organisation, 2016).

In this context, evidence-based psychotherapies have expanded, as they are in the best position to satisfy those demands. At the same time, they are more responsive to the contemporary pragmatic Zeitgeist: People are more willing to treat current symptoms rather than to explore unspecific unconscious conflicts from childhood. Besides, therapies such as cognitive–behavioral therapy are not so distant from psychoanalysis (Rosner, 2012). Along with other "integrative approaches," these new therapies formed their own institutions and associations, and they even penetrated some public universities, such as San Luis and Mar del Plata, but also Córdoba and even Buenos Aires (Fernández-Álvarez, 2008; Korman, Viotti, & Garay, 2015). As a result of this variety and this new competition, psychoanalysts are now less comfortable. Even if they still dominate the field of psychotherapy, they sense that this situation may not last forever. Thus, for the first time in decades, they are obliged to explain the reasons for the efficacy of their treatments, which was almost taken for granted before.

All in all, it would not be an exaggeration to say that in the last 60 years, in Argentina, psychoanalysis has become a non-naturalistic lens for understanding human actions and emotions. The idea that any behavior has a hidden meaning that needs to be interpreted is as common as were ideas of evolution and progress at the beginning of the 20th century. In a way, it would be possible to say that psychoanalysis, like positivism (which also arrived mainly through French authors), provided an all-encompassing framework for understanding human kind that permeated not only psychology but also the social sciences. Within that framework, different forms of psychotherapy could develop.

Final Comments

To shed some light on the complex historical process leading to the hegemony of psychoanalysis in the Argentinean psychotherapeutic field, after a quick introduction and a brief historical background, two crucial periods were examined.

The first one, in the aftermath of Peronism (1955–1966), showed an *alliance* between psychoanalysis and psychology, whose progressive appeal, in a time of social renewal, allowed for the entry of Freudian ideas to the academic field. In this period, psychoanalysis ceased to be the patrimony of a secret little medical brotherhood to become a widespread theoretical reference and a respected practice. This transit, however, would have been impossible to understand without taking into account the creation of the first psychology programs. That was the birthplace of a new psychology, including Kleinian psychoanalysis in a large and popular synthesis with social goals and a French inspiration (from Politzer to Sartre and Lagache).

In the following period (1966–1976), however, the *eclectic synthesis* of a psychoanalytic psychology close to existentialism gave way to an *exclusive disjunction* typical of structuralism: either psychoanalysis or psychology. Paradoxically, many young psychologists, following Jacques Lacan's teachings, who identified themselves as psychoanalysts, chose to forget their original professional identity. In fact, they saw themselves as intellectuals rather than experts. And they did not want to be linked to any form of psychology. For them, their diploma was just a means to have access to the Lacanian kind of practice they were longing for.

To avoid being bound by a typical internal history, the changing relationship between psychoanalysis and psychology was situated in an intellectual and political context. In

different periods, French thought always provided a worldview, from positivism to antipositivism, from existentialism to structuralism. If German and Anglo-Saxon authors and currents were also received, they usually had to pass through that filter. At the same time, as radicalization mounted, different forms of Marxism became influential for many Argentinean "psy professionals" who had to choose between subverting the social order and producing a revolution of the souls.

Finally, during the last military dictatorship—but mainly after the recovery of democracy—Lacanianism underwent a great expansion while gradually losing almost all connection to the political sphere. One could wonder what happened to a theory that from its very beginnings was supposed to meet with resistance (because of its radical nature) and ended up becoming a long-lasting normative discourse. On the way, did it lose the disturbing power of its "unconscious truths"? Was that the price to pay to obtain extended recognition? Will psychoanalysis keep its hegemonic place in a wholly new context? These questions are still open.

References

Abbott, A. (1988). *The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Ablard, J. D. (2008). *Madness in buenos aires: Patients, psychiatrists, and the Argentine state, 1880–1983*. Athens, Ohio: University of Calgary Press.

Acuña, C. (2009). *La recepción del estructuralismo francés en el campo intelectual argentino de los años sesenta* [The reception of French structuralism in the Argentinean intellectual field of the 1960s] (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universidad de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Alonso, M., & Klinar, A. (2015, November). *Los psicólogos en Argentina. Relevamiento cuantitativo 2014* [Psychologists in Argentina: Quantitative survey]. Poster session presented at the VII Congreso de Investigación y Práctica Profesional, Facultad de Psicología, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Althusser, L. (1965). Freud et Lacan [Freud & Lacan]. *La Nouvelle Critique, 161/162,* 88–108.

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Press.

Balán, J. (1991). *Cuéntame tu vida. Una biografía colectiva del psicoanálisis argentino* [Tell me about your life: A collective biography of psychoanalysis in Argentina]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Planeta.

Béquart, P. (1961). Correspondances: P. Béquart à A. Fernández-Zoïla [Letter from P. Béquart to A. Fernández-Zoïla]. In L. Bonnafé (Ed.), *27 opinions sur la psychothérapie* (pp. 249–253). Paris, France: Éditions Sociales.

Bergson, H. (1889). *Essai sur les données immédiates de la conscience* [Essay on the immediate data of consciousness]. Paris, France: Alcan.

Bermann, G. (1960). *Nuestra psiquiatría* [Our psychiatry]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Paidós.

Bermann, G. (1965). *La salud mental y la asistencia psiquiátrica en la Argentina* [Mental health and psychiatric assistance in Argentina]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Paidós.

Bleger, J. (1958). *Psicoanálisis y dialéctica materialista* [Psychoanalysis and dialectic materialism]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Paidós.

Bleger, J. (1963). *Psicología de la conducta* [Behavioral psychology]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Eudeba.

Bleger, J. (1966). *Psicohigiene y psicología institucional* [Psycho-hygiene and institutional psychology]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Paidós.

Buchbinder, P. (2005). *Historia de las Universidades Argentinas* [The history of Argentine universities]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Sudamericana.

Calvo, M. T. (1995). *Interview by M. Cremonte and E. Sincofsky* [Unpublished].

Campbell, D. (2003, December 6). Kissinger approved Argentinian "dirty war". *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/dec/06/argentina.usa

Carpintero, E., & Vainer, A. (2005). *Las huellas de la memoria. 1969–1983* [The traces of memory: 1969–1983] (Vol. *2*). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Topía.

Carroy, J., & Plas, R. (1996). The origins of French experimental psychology: Experiment and experimentalism. *History of the Human Sciences, 9,* 73–84. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/095269519600900105

Dagfal, A. (2009a). *Entre París y Buenos Aires. La invención del psicólogo* [Between Paris and Buenos Aires: The invention of the psychologist]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Paidós.

Dagfal, A. (2009b). Paris-London-Buenos Aires, Argentina: The adventures of Kleinian psychoanalysis between Europe and South America. In J. Damousi & M. Plotkin (Eds.), *Transnational unconscious: Essays in psychoanalysis and transnationalism* (pp. 179–198). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9780230582705_8

Dagfal, A. (2011). *Psychanalyse et psychologie. Paris-Londres-Buenos Aires* [Psychoanalysisis and psychology: Paris-London-Buenos Aires]. Paris, France: Campagne Première.

Dagfal, A. (2012). Psychoanalysis in Argentina under Peronism and Anti-Peronism (1943–1963). In J. Damousi & M. Plotkin (Eds.), *Psychoanalysis and politics: Histories of psychoanalysis under conditions of restricted political freedom* (pp. 135–158). New York, NY: Oxford University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199744664.003.0023

Damousi, J., & Plotkin, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Psychoanalysis and politics: Histories of psychoanalysis under conditions of restricted political freedom*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199744664.001.0001

Diamant, A. (2010). *Testimonios de enseñar y de aprender: Ser psicólogo en la UBA de los 60* [Testimonies about teaching and learning: Being a psychologist in the UBA during the 1960s]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Teseo.

Dosse, F. (1997). *History of structuralism: The rising sign, 1945–1966*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Fernández-Álvarez, H. (2008). Integration in psychotherapy: An approach from Argentina. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration, 18,* 79–86. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1053-0479.18.1.79

Ferrara, F., & Peña, M. (1959). ¿Qué significa la salud mental para los argentinos? [What does mental health mean to the Argentines?]. *Acta Neuropsiquiátrica Argentina, 5,* 361–365.

García, L. (2013). *La recepción de la psicología soviética en la Argentina: Lecturas y apropiaciones en la psicología, psiquiatría y psicoanálisis (1936–1991)* [The reception of Soviet psychology in Argentina: Readings and uses in psychology, psychiatry and psicoanálisis (1936–1991)] (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universidad de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

González, M. E., & Dagfal, A. (2012). El psicólogo como psicoanalista: Problemas de formación y autorización. Entre la universidad y las instituciones [The psychologist as a psychoanalyst: Training and legitimation problems. Between the university and the institutions]. *Intersecciones Psi. Revista Electrónica de la Facultad de Psicología de la UBA, 2,* 12–18. Retrieved from http://intersecciones.psi.uba.ar/revista_ed_n_5.pdf#page=12

González, M. E. (2015). *El psicoanálisis en el siglo XXI en Argentina. Su lugar en las carreras de psicología públicas y privadas* [Psychoanalysis in 21st century Argentina: Its place in the public and private psychology majors] (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universidad de Córdoba, Córdoba, Argentina.

INDEC. (2005). *Censo Nacional Económico 2004–2005* [National Economic Survey 2004–2005]. Retrieved from http://www.indec.mecon.gov.ar/economico2005/cne_08_05.pdf

Ipar, O., Sisto, C., & Dichiara, J. (1959). Encrucijada actual de la psiquiatria [Current crossroads in psychiatry]. In O. Ipar, C. Sisto, & J. Dichiara (Eds.), *Tercera Conferencia Argentina de Asistencia Psiquiátrica* (pp. 13–17). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Ediciones I.T.E.M.

Izaguirre, M. (2009). *Jacques Lacan. El anclaje de su enseñanza en la Argentina* [Jacques Lacan: The implantation of his teaching in Argentina]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Catálogos.

Janet, P. (1914). El psico-análisis. *Archivos de Ciencias de la Educación, 1,* 175–229.

Klappenbach, H. (2000). El título profesional de psicólogo en Argentina: Antecedentes históricos y situación actual [The professional diploma of psychologist in Argentina: History and current situation]. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología, 32,* 419–446.

Klappenbach, H. (2004). Psychology in Argentina. In M. Stevens & D. Wedding (Eds.), *Handbook of international psychology* (pp. 129–150). New York, NY: Brunner-Routledge.

Klappenbach, H. (2006). Periodización de la psicología en Argentina [Periodization of Argentine psychology]. *Revista de Historia de la Psicología, 27,* 109–164.

Klappenbach, H. (2013). French Ideas in the Beginnings of Psychology in Argentina. *Estudos e pesquisas em psicologia, Rio de Janeiro, 13,* 1204–1219.

Korman, G. P., Viotti, N., & Garay, C. J. (2015). The origins and professionalization of cognitive psychotherapy in Argentina. *History of Psychology, 18,* 205–214. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038968

Lakoff, A. (2003). The Lacan ward: Pharmacology and subjectivity in Buenos Aires. *Social Analysis, 47,* 82–101. http://dx.doi.org/10.3167/015597703782352970

Litvinoff, N., & Gomel, S. (1975). *El psicólogo y su profesión* [The psychologist and his profession]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Nueva Visión.

Macchioli, F. (2010). *Los inicios de la terapia familiar en la Argentina. Implantación, configuración y desarrollo de un nuevo campo disciplinar (1960–1979)* [The beginnings of family therapy in Argentina. Implantation, configuration and development of a new disciplinary field (1960–1979)] (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universidad de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Masotta, O. (Ed.). (1965). Roberto Arlt, yo mismo [Roberto Arlt, myself]. *Sexo y traición en Roberto Arlt*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Jorge Álvarez.

Masotta, O. (1969a). *Conciencia y estructura* [Consciousness and structure]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Corregidor.

Masotta, O. (1969b). Leer a Freud [To Read Freud]. *Revista Argentina de Psicología, 1,* 19–25.

Masotta, O. (1976). *Ensayos lacanianos* [Lacanian essays]. Barcelona, Spain: Anagrama.

Meyer, C. (Ed.). (2005). *Le Livre noir de la psychanalyse: Vivre, penser et aller mieux sans Freud* [The black book of psychanalysis: To live, think and feel better without Freud]. Paris, France: Les Arènes.

Pernicone, A. (2000). Reportaje a Juan David Nasio [Interview with Juan David Nasio]. *Fort-da, Revista de Psicoanálisis con niños, 1*. Retrieved from http://www.fort-da.org/reportajes/nasio.htm

Pichon-Rivière, E., Bleger, J., Rozitchner, L., & Caparrós, A. (1969). Ideología y psicología concreta [Ideology and concrete psychology]. *Cuadernos de Psicología Concreta, 1,* 11–41.

Piñero, H. G. (1903). La psychologie expérimentale dans la République Argentine [Experimental psychology in the Argentine Republic]. *Revista de la Sociedad Médica, Buenos Aires, 11,* 403–416.

Plotkin, M. (2001). *Freud in the Pampas: The emergence and development of a psychoanalytic culture in Argentine*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Potash, R. (1980). *The army and politics in Argentina, 1945–62: From Peron to Frondizi*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Rojas, N. (1930). Una visita a Freud [A visit to Freud]. In H. Vezzetti (1989), *Freud en Buenos Aires, 1910–1939* (pp. 173–178). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Editores Puntosur.

Rojas, N. (1939). De Bergson a Freud [From Bergson to Freud]. In H. Vezzetti (1989), *Freud en Buenos Aires, 1910–1939* (pp. 179–190). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Editores Puntosur.

Romero, S. (2012, August 19). Do Argentines need therapy? Pull up a couch. *The New York Times,* p. A1.

Rosner, R. I. (2012). Aaron T. Beck's drawings and the psychoanalytic origin story of cognitive therapy. *History of Psychology, 15,* 1–18. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0023892

Roudinesco, É. (1986). *Histoire de la psychanalyse en France II (1925–1985)* [A history of psychology in France, Vol. 2]. Paris, France: Seuil.

Sartre, J.-P. (1948). *Existentialism and humanism*. London, UK: Methuen.

Schneider, R. (2008, March 25). *Interview by the A. A. Dagfal* [E-mail]. Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Scholten, H. (2000). *Oscar Masotta y la fenomenología* [Oscar Masotta and phenomenology]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Atuel/Anáfora.

Terán, O. (1991). *Nuestros años sesentas* [Our 1960s]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Puntosur.

Universidad de Buenos Aires. (1957, March 14). *Actas del Consejo Superior* [High Council meeting minutes]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Archivos de la UBA.

Universidad de Buenos Aires. (1959, March 8). *Memorandum de la Primera reunión de carreras de psicología* [Report on the First Meeting of Psychology Programs]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Archivos de la UBA.

Vezzetti, H. (1985). *La locura en la Argentina* [Madness in Argentina]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Paidós.

Vezzetti, H. (1989). *Freud en Buenos Aires, 1910–1939* [Freud in Buenos Aires, 1910–1939]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Editores Puntosur.

Vezzetti, H. (1996). *Aventuras de Freud en el País de los Argentinos* [Freud's adventures in the land of the Argentinean]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Paidós.

Vezzetti, H. (2004). Los comienzos de la psicología como disciplina universitaria y profesional: Debates, herencias, proyecciones sobre la sociedad [The beginnings of psychology as an academic and professional discipline: Debates, legacies, projections on society]. In M. Plotkin & F. Neiburg (Eds.), *Intelectuales y expertos. La constitución del conocimiento social en la Argentina* (pp. 293–326). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Paidós.

Vezzetti, H. (2016). *Psiquiatría, psicoanálisis y cultura comunista. Batallas ideológicas en la guerra fría* [Psychiatry, psychoanalysis and communist culture: Ideological battles during the Cold War]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Siglo XXI.

Victoria, M. (Ed). (1965). El psicólogo contra el médico [The psychologist against the physician]. *Psicología para todos* (pp. 21–23). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Losada. (Reprinted from *La Razón*, p. 10, by M. Victoria, 1965, December 20).

Visacovsky, S. (2002). *El Lanús. Memoria y política en la construcción de una tradición psiquiátrica y psicoanalítica argentina* [The Lanús : Memory and politics in the construction of a psychiatric and psychoanalytic tradition in Argentina]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Alianza.

World Health Organisation. (2016). *International statistical classification of diseases and related health problems*. Retrieved from http://apps.who.int/classifications/icd10/browse/2016/en

Received March 30, 2016
Revision received June 4, 2017
Accepted June 9, 2017 ■