

The Journal of The Japan Psychoanalytic Society

June 2022

VOL. 4

Special Issue on the “Ajase Complex”



THE JAPAN
PSYCHOANALYTIC
SOCIETY



日本精神分析協会

The Journal of The Japan Psychoanalytic Society

Founded in 2019 by Osamu Kitayama.

The Japan Psychoanalytic Society

4 Yotsuya 3- Chome, Shinjyuku-Ku, Tokyo 160-0004, JAPAN

E-mail address: tokyo@jpas.jp

Fax: +81 33 3263 8693

Homepage: www.jpas.jp/ja/

Editorial Board

Kenichiro OKANO, Soh AGATSUMA, Yasuhiro KOGA, Kunihiro MATSUKI

Visiting Editorial Board Members

Jan ABRAM (UK), Harriet BASSECHES (USA), Tomas PLAENKERS (Germany), Vic SEDLAK (UK), Rudi VERMOTE (Belgium), Inge WISE (UK)

Associate Board Members

Takayuki KINUGASA, Hiroyuki MYOKI, Toyoaki OGAWA, Akiyoshi OKADA

The Journal of The Japan Psychoanalytic Society vol. 4.

Special Issue on the “Ajase Complex”

Contents

Foreword	Kunihiro MATSUKI	2
Theories on the Ajase Complex		
A history of psychoanalysis in Japan	Keigo OKONOGI	3
Two kinds of guilt feelings: The Ajase complex	Heisaku KOSAWA	18
Ajase complex and its implication	Keigo OKONOGI	26
The therapeutic method of Kosawa Heisaku: ‘Religion’ and ‘the psy disciplines’	Christopher HARDING	42
Freud’s correspondence with colleagues in Japan	Edited and Annotated by Osamu KITAYAMA	59
Encounter and prenatal rancour	Aki TAKANO	82
A “common model” for the formation of guilt in childhood —A comparative study of Oedipus and Ajase complex	Kenichiro OKANO	93
The mother image in the Ajase complex and its Buddhist background	Fumiaki IWATA	107
Past volumes		119
Postscript	Kenichiro OKANO	123

Foreword

Since being inaugurated Chairman of the Editorial Committee, Dr. Ken-ichiro Okano has explored new potential directions for the English-language Journal of the JPS. An important challenge he took up was to make the Journal a free access edition, available to anyone in the world to read.

As part of the project to put this into practice, Dr. Okano planned a special feature on the Ajase Complex for this Volume 4. He has taken on the challenge of releasing, to the rest of the world, a psychoanalytic notion unique to Japan that has been termed the Ajase Complex.

It is my hope that this ambitious challenge taken on by Dr. Okano, who will soon be fulfilling his duties as Chairman of the Editorial Committee will soon end, will be a major success.

Let me give you a brief overview of the Ajase Complex, and describe how it grew and developed in Japan.

It was psychiatrist Heisaku Kosawa who integrated the IPA's Tokyo and Sendai Chapters in 1955 and established the current Japan Psychoanalytic Society. On February 11, 1932, Kosawa visited Freud at his home in Vienna. He brought with him a painting by Hiroshi Yoshida, titled "Lake Yamanaka," which he gave to Freud. It depicted the majestic Mt. Fuji, reflected in a lake. Ever since, the picture has hung in Freud's room. Later, during his stay in Vienna, Kosawa completed a paper entitled "Two Kinds of Guilt Feelings," and delivered it to Freud, who at that time had just undergone cancer surgery. The paper "Two Kinds of Guilt Feelings" focuses on mother-child relationships, with a child's hatred/aggression towards his mother as its main theme. Kosawa took note of negative emotions as well as aggression/destructiveness in the context of mother-child relationships, at around the same time as did Melanie Klein.

This paper presents the Ajase Complex, which is based on the story of Kunika Ajātashatru in the Buddhist scriptures. The name Ajātashatru was pronounced in China as 'Ajase,' and paraphrased and written with Chinese characters 未生怨, or *misho-on*, a term that includes the notion of 'prenatal rancor,' or grudges/aggression that a fetus harbors towards its mother.

It is unclear what Freud, who was given this paper by Kosawa, thought of it. Subsequently, in 1954, Kosawa contributed the Japanese-language edition of this paper to the first volume of the *Japanese Journal of Psychoanalysis*.

Later, during the 1990s, Keigo Okonogi, a student of Kosawa who was a leading psychoanalyst in Japan at the time, shed light on the Ajase Complex and attempted to give the unique concept a psychoanalytic re-evaluation. This came to attract interest among people both inside and outside the world of psychoanalysis.

The special feature on this occasion includes an English translation of Kosawa's

original paper, as well as various discussions that appeared in *Japanese Contributions to Psychoanalysis*, a printed publication that can be said to be the predecessor of this Journal. These have been re-posted in this electronic Journal to make them once again available to readers throughout the world.

Psychoanalysis has a history of nearly 90 years in Japan as a clinical method. During this time, our country's psychoanalysts have actively studied theories and techniques from Europe and the US, but at the same time have consistently attempted to create a psychoanalytic approach that is rooted in our own country's traditions, culture, and language. The theory of the Ajase Complex that has resulted from their efforts is a major achievement. I look forward to hearing candid opinions about this concept from all of you, the readers of this Journal.

April 2022

Kunihiro Matsuki

President, Japan Psychoanalytic Society

References

- Kitayama O 2011: Freud and the Japanese—Correspondence between Freud and the Japanese, and resistance to psychoanalysis by the Japanese. Iwasaki Gakujutsu Shuppansha.
Nishi M 2019: The origin of psychoanalysis in Japan. Misuzu Shobo.

Theories on the Ajase Complex

A history of psychoanalysis in Japan

Keigo Okonogi

I. A Historical Overview

The history of psychoanalysis in Japan may be roughly divided into two periods: 1) the period before World War II; and 2) the period from the end of World War II to the present.

1. The period before World War II

(1) The introduction of Freud to Japan (the 1910s)

The first Japanese document on psychoanalysis, an article by Kaison Ohtsuki entitled “The Psychology of Forgetfulness,” appeared in psychological research in 1912. The same year, Kyuichi Kimura published “How to Detect the Secrets of the Mind and to Discover Repression,” which introduced psychoanalysis as a scientific method of exploring people’s thoughts.

Psychologists and educators introduced Freudian psychoanalysis in a variety of forms over the next ten years. The most notable effort was *A Lecture on Psychology*, written in 1914 by psychologist Yoichi Ueno. While in the United States, Ueno had become acquainted with Freudian psychoanalysis through a lecture by Professor Stanley Hall of Clark University. On returning to Japan, he wrote *A Lecture on Psychology*, which included Japan’s first systematic outline of psychoanalysis. It contained such chapters as: “The Origin of Psychoanalysis,” “Psychoanalytic Therapy,” “The Interpretation of Dreams,” “Infantile Sexuality,” “The Psychoanalysis of Mythology and Art,” “Forgetfulness and Verbal Slips,” “Wit,” “Psychoanalysis and Education,” etc.

(2) The publication of Freud’s collected works in Japanese (1929–1933)

From 1929 to 1933, two collections of Freud’s works appeared in Japanese translation. Both were the work of a group headed by literary figures Kenji Ohtsuki and Yaekichi Yabe.

On a visit to London in 1930, Yabe, a psychologist, met president of the IPA Ernest Jones. Yabe subsequently established the Tokyo branch of the IPA. Ohtsuki, a writer, later

Initially published in the Japanese Contribution. Vol.1 (2004) pp.9–33.

Keigo Okonogi

(1930–2003) former Training and Supervising Analyst at JPS.

succeeded Yabe as president. The Association, however, promoted psychoanalytic theory to the general public only, as a system of thought, without inviting the participation of psychiatrists. It thus never developed as an association of clinical psychoanalytic psychotherapists, and was finally disbanded after the Second World War.

(3) Kiyoyasu Marui and Tohoku School (the 1920s to 1930s)

In the domain of Japanese psychiatry and medicine, Freudian psychoanalysis was originally dismissed as a misguided theory of pansexualism. Kiyoyasu Marui became the first Japanese psychiatrist to study psychoanalysis as a theoretical system of psychopathology.

Marui went to the United States in 1919 to study with Adolf Meyer at Johns Hopkins University. Witnessing the influence of psychoanalysis on American psychiatry, he hoped to introduce psychoanalysis to the Japanese psychiatric community. After returning to Japan, he began teaching at the University of Tohoku in Sendai (in northeastern Japan). Psychoanalysis became the focus of his medical school lectures on psychiatry. Beginning in 1925, he also taught psychoanalytic theory to practicing psychiatrists. Marui furthermore published psychiatric textbooks with a special emphasis on psychoanalysis. Psychiatrists who studied under Marui became Japan's first generation of psychoanalytically-oriented psychiatrists, known collectively as the Tohoku School.

The Tohoku School flourished from the late 1920s to 1940. However, this school of psychiatrists led by Marui did not fully comprehend the techniques of psychoanalytic therapy. Rather, they understood psychoanalysis simply as a theory of psychopathology. On the basis of this understanding, members of the Tohoku School presented papers focusing on a psychoanalytical understanding of neurosis in Japan at meetings of the Japanese Association of Neurology and Psychiatry. They also published the *Journal of Psychoanalytic Psychopathology*. However, the mainstream psychiatric circle in Japan at the time was characterized by a German Kraepelinian trend. Marui's small isolated group was continuously subject to harsh criticism. In 1933, nonetheless, Marui visited Freud in Vienna and received approval for establishing a Sendai Branch of the IPA.

(4) Heisaku Kosawa, "the father of Japanese psychoanalysis" (the 1930s)

Heisaku Kosawa, a student of the Tohoku School, began to question Marui, who taught only theory without understanding Freudian psychoanalytic therapy (which Kosawa himself had been studying directly from the works of Freud). In order to learn psychoanalytic methods first hand, Kosawa left Japan to study at the Vienna Psychoanalytic Institute from 1932 to 1933.¹ He received training analysis from Richard Sterba, and individual supervision on psychotherapy from Paul Federn.

While in Vienna, furthermore, Kosawa visited Freud at his home at Bergasse 19 and interviewed him directly. He presented Freud with a paper explaining his theory of the

1. It was in the latter half of the 1980s that Dr. Arnold Cooper told me of Dr. Sterba. According to Dr. Cooper, Dr. Sterba fondly remembered the days when he had performed psychoanalysis on Kosawa in Vienna, and wished to relate this experience to psychoanalysts in Japan. Dr. Sterba was at that time living in Detroit, where he had moved from Vienna. I strongly wished to record an interview with Dr. Sterba, since I felt such a document would be invaluable to the history of psychoanalysis in Japan. I began to make arrangements for a meeting. However, to my great disappointment, Dr. Sterba passed away before our plan was realized.

Ajase complex, which he contrasted with the Western oedipal complex. (Kosawa's theory will be discussed more thoroughly in Part II.) Unfortunately, however, Freud does not appear to have evinced great interest in Kosawa's thesis.

After returning to Japan in 1933, Heisaku Kosawa, now at odds with Kiyoyasu Marui, opened a private clinic in Tokyo. Here he began practicing psychoanalytic therapy as it was known in Europe and the United States.

With the outbreak of World War II in 1939, Japan became an ally of Nazi Germany—which regarded psychoanalysis as a dangerous, Jewish system of thought. Heisaku Kosawa came under constant surveillance from the special police. Nevertheless, he continued to conduct a private practice throughout the war.

2. The period after World War II

(1) The second-generation psychiatrists and the Kosawa School (the 1950s to 1960s)

The end of World War II brought an influx of learning and culture from the United States, which greatly influenced all aspects of Japanese society including the field of psychiatry. It created a generation of young psychiatrists who sought to study the model of American dynamic psychiatry. They chose to receive training analysis and individual supervision from Heisaku Kosawa.

This group of psychiatrists who studied under Heisaku Kosawa became the second generation of Japanese psychoanalysts, known as the Kosawa School. Some leading members included: Takeo Doi, from the University of Tokyo; Makoto Takeda and myself from Keio University; and Shigeharu Maeda and Masahisa Nishizono, from Kyushu University. These young psychiatrists from the Kosawa School became members of the Japan Branch of the IPA.

After the death of Kiyoyasu Marui in 1953, Heisaku Kosawa had succeeded Marui as director of the IPA Sendai Branch. Through exchanges with Anna Freud and Heintz Hartmann, Kosawa later changed the name of the Sendai Branch to the Japan Branch. He then established its headquarters in Tokyo, a move approved by the IPA.

The Japan Branch of the IPA is known internationally as the Japan Psychoanalytic Society. Members of the Society have completed studies in training analysis based on rigorous international standards, as well as psychoanalysis through individual supervision. Psychiatrists who received training analysis from Heisaku Kosawa between 1950 and 1960 represent its core members.

At approximately the same time, from the end of the 1940s to the early 1950s, a study group for psychoanalysis was established by Heisaku Kosawa and professors of psychiatry from various universities. With this group as its center, the Japan Psychoanalytical Association was established in 1955.

As far as its focus is concerned, the Japan Psychoanalytical Association should more correctly be called the Association for Dynamic Psychiatry. It was established by psychiatrists and psychologists with a psychoanalytical orientation. Although it includes “psychoanalysis” in its name, the Association has no specific eligibility requirements or standards for membership.

Membership for the Japan Psychoanalytical Association has grown steadily over the years. It is currently a major scientific organization with 1,500 members, roughly 70 to

80 percent of whom are dynamic psychiatrists. A number of clinical psychologists also participate.

The founding members of the Japan Psychoanalytical Association, like those of the Japan Psychoanalytic Society, received psychoanalytic training from Heisaku Kosawa. Psychiatrists who have studied psychoanalytic psychotherapy and dynamic psychiatry in the United States and Europe have also become members. The Association does not limit itself to any specific school of psychoanalysis; some members adhere to Freudian ego psychology; others advocate British object relations theory or the Kleinian school. In this sense, various schools cooperate to run the Association. Members who have joined after studying psychoanalytic psychotherapy abroad include: Akihisa Kondo, who worked with Karen Horney; Kenji Sakamoto, who studied under Clara Thompson; and Ikuro Miyoshi, who received training from Metard Boss of Switzerland.

(2) The third-generation psychiatrists (the 1960s to 1970s)

In 1969, following the death of Heisaku Kosawa, Michio Yamamura succeeded to the presidency of the Japan Psychoanalytic Society and the Japan Psychoanalytical Association. The period 1960–1970 also witnessed the return of several Japanese psychiatrists from clinical training abroad. Kiyoshi Ogura, for example, returned to Japan after undergoing complete clinical training at the Menninger Hospital. Third-generation psychiatrists, who had completed training with second-generation psychiatrists such as Nishizono and myself, returned from shorter sojourns in England and the United States. Among these returning third-generation psychiatrists was Tetsuya Iwasaki, who, after studying at the Menninger Psychiatric School, presented Otto Kernberg's theory on borderline personality organization and its treatment. He also translated the works of Hanna Segal, and introduced the Kleinian school of thought to Japan. During the same period, Joji Kandabashi, Sadanobu Ushijima and others received training from John Padel in London. They introduced the object relations theory of Winnicott to the Japanese clinical scene.

Boosted by the participation of these third-generation psychiatrists, psychoanalysis gradually gained importance in Japan, and became a major influence in the field of clinical psychiatry. However, as mentioned before, Japanese psychiatry has traditionally possessed a German—more specifically a Kraepelinian and biological—orientation. This long-established tradition within Japanese psychiatry resulted in a variety of conflicts with emerging psychoanalytic dynamic psychiatry. It was under these circumstances that clinicians with a psychoanalytic orientation in psychiatry, clinical psychology, and psychosomatic medicine gradually began demonstrating their leadership through the vehicle of the Japan Psychoanalytical Association.

During the period 1960 to 1970, many important psychoanalytic works were translated into Japanese, in a movement towards internationalization organized by the Japan Psychoanalytic Society under the leadership of myself. The third Japanese translation of Freud's collected works appeared. In addition, most of the leading works on ego psychology by Wilhelm Reich, Heinz Hartmann, Ernst Kris, Anna Freud, and Erik Erikson were translated into Japanese.

The most original research in Japanese psychoanalysis at this time was that of Takeo

Doi. As will be discussed later, his theory of *amae* eventually received recognition not only in Japan, but also in the international psychoanalytic community.

In terms of clinical practice, it was during the period 1960 to 1970 that the diagnosis and psychotherapy of borderline cases, as well as classic psychoanalytic therapy, began to attract keen attention. Reflecting contemporary trends in Europe and the United States, psychoanalytic psychotherapists in Japan began actively performing psychotherapy for schizophrenic patients. Soon, psychiatric family study, particularly that of the schizophrenic family, became a theme of major importance. From approximately 1970, however, Japanese psychiatry came under the influence of the worldwide anti-psychiatric movement; as a result, numerous disputes occurred among various psychiatric societies and universities.

(3) The fourth-generation psychiatrists, and increasing international exchange (the late 1970s to 1980s)

As disputes among universities and academic societies abated, a new wave of psychiatrists—who might be called the fourth generation—joined the established psychiatric community. This fourth generation, like the third, returned to Japan after studying psychoanalytic psychotherapy and dynamic psychiatry in Britain and the United States. Kuninao Minagawa, for example, received five years of training in psychotherapy at Michigan University from the Nagera group, focusing on the treatment of children and adolescents. Rikihachiro Kano returned to Japan after receiving training in psychoanalytic psychotherapy and dynamic psychiatry for three years at the Menninger Hospital in Topeka, Kansas. Osamu Kitayama received training in psychotherapy with a psychoanalytic orientation at the Department of Psychotherapy of London's Mousley Hospital.

During the 1980s, Japanese translations appeared for most of the essential works of object relations and Kleinian theorists: Melanie Klein, Michael Balint, Douglas Fairbairn, D. W. Winnicott, and Hanna Segal. The translation of Bion's work is still under way, although Leon Grinberg and Elizabeth Bianchedi's study, "*An Introduction to the Work of Bion*," has appeared in Japanese.

From 1980 onwards, a growing number of psychoanalysts from overseas, particularly from the United States, began to visit Japan. Leading American psychoanalysts such as Cornell University's Otto Kernberg and Arnold Cooper conducted the first international seminar in Tokyo, on borderline cases and narcissism. Numerous psychoanalysts from other countries followed, resulting in a dramatic increase in the number of seminars and lectures held in Japan. Leading IPA analysts—including former IPA presidents Robert Wallerstein, Serge Lebovici, and Joseph Sandler, among others—came to Japan on various occasions to give lectures and organize seminars. Ramon Ganzarain visited Japan for the congress meeting of the International Association of Group Psychotherapy, Serge Lebovici, Robert Emde and Joy Osofsky for the IACAPAP, and Efrain Bleiberg for the Menninger Workshop Tokyo.

Following the IPA Congress in Hamburg in 1983, the Japan Psychoanalytic Society has implemented English-Japanese simultaneous interpretation at subsequent IPA Congresses in Madrid (1985), Montreal (1987), etc. The number of Japanese members taking part in the IPA Congress increases each year, and full-scale international exchanges

with the IPA have been organized.

During the late 1980s, I became interested in reviving Kosawa's theory of the Ajase complex, seeking to integrate it with my own clinical experience and subsequent psychoanalytic research. Presented at a variety of international conferences, this new interpretation of Kosawa's theory has received widespread attention. Doi's concept of *amae*, presented at the IPA Congress in Montreal as well as the Amsterdam Congress (1993), has also attracted attention for its universal applicability. Osamu Kitayama has made original presentations at several IPA congresses, including the Psychoanalytic Congress in Rome (1989), the IPA Congress in Buenos Aires (1991), and the Amsterdam Congress. His studies are beginning to draw worldwide interest as well.

II. Studies by Japanese Psychoanalysts

As studies by leading Japanese psychoanalysts frequently cited in overseas literature, I would like to introduce (1) Takeo Doi's theory of *amae*; (2) the Ajase complex theory, developed by Kosawa and later expanded by myself and (3) Osamu Kitayama's "The Prohibition of Don't Look" and "Studies on Mourning." In terms of chronology, I should rightly begin with Kosawa's Ajase complex. However, in order to include my own, subsequent research on the Ajase theory, I will follow the order in which the studies drew international notice, and begin by discussing Doi's concept of *amae*.

1. The theory of *amae*: Takeo Doi

The first paper by Doi introducing the concept of *amae* appeared in an American speech journal (the 1956 Spring issue of *Western Speech*), under the title, "Japanese Language as an Expression of Japanese Psychology." The relevant passage from this paper appears below.

"*Amaeru* [*amae* is its noun form] can be translated as 'to depend and presume upon another's love.' This word has the same root as *amai*; an adjective which corresponds to 'sweet.' Thus, *amaeru* has a distinct feeling of sweetness, and is generally used to express a child's attitude toward an adult, especially his parents. I can think of no English word equivalent to *amaeru* except for 'spoil,' which, however, is a transitive verb and definitely has a bad connotation; whereas the Japanese *amaeru* does not necessarily have a bad connotation, although we say we should not let a youngster *amaeru* too much. I think most Japanese adults have an ear memory of the taste of sweet dependency as a child and, consciously or unconsciously, carry a lifelong nostalgia for it (p.92)."

Thus, although *amaeru* has its primary locus in childhood, it may also apply to an interpersonal relationship between adults, if that relationship contains the same desire for dependency and belonging experienced by a child. Doi argued that the visibility or conscious recognition of *amae* might itself be a distinguishing factor of Japanese culture.

Doi furthermore discovered that an unfulfilled desire for *amae* lies behind *toraware* (a state of obsession in which a patient adheres to one idea to the exclusion of all others),

often seen among patients of Morita *shinkeishitsu* or “nervousness”—the type of neurosis most prevalent among the Japanese. Doi later concluded that the psychodynamics of *amae* plays a central role in a variety of other psychiatric disorders as well.

Eventually, Doi came to assert that *amae* was not a psychology unique to the Japanese, but rather a universal psychology, appearing in other cultures as well. The psychology of keeping pets, for example, may be understood in terms of *amae*. Doi thus maintains that although the word *amae* originates in the Japanese language, the concept of *amae* possesses universal applicability and represents an important tool for psychoanalytic investigation.

In order to position his theory within the broader context of international psychoanalysis, Doi has compared *amae* with several existing psychoanalytic concepts. He writes:

“It has been my belief at the same time that this concept has a universal applicability in as much as the patient’s transference can be interpreted in terms of *amae*. In other words, the concept of *amae* can lend itself to psychoanalytic formulation and may even complement the existing theories of psychoanalysts.”

I would like to continue with another quotation from Doi:

“*Amae* agrees with object-relations theory and makes it more amenable to introspection precisely because *amae* and its vocabulary refer to inner experience. For instance, passive object love or primary love as defined by Michael Balint can be equated with *amae* in its pure form and as such, his concept becomes something quite tangible. In fact, Balint deplors the inadequacy of the word ‘love’ to catch its essence in nascency, and states as follows: ‘All European languages are so poor that they cannot distinguish between the two kinds of object-love, active and passive.’ (1965, p. 56) It is then remarkable that the Japanese language has this word *amae*, enabling the infantile origin of love to be accessible to consciousness. Incidentally, I began to correspond with Balint in 1962 and he confirmed that, after reading some of my papers, his ideas and mine were developing in the same direction. I also had the good fortune to discuss the matter with him personally when I went to London in 1964. I was furthermore delighted that he honored me later by citing my work in his last book, *The Basic Fault*.

In this connection, I would like to say a few words about the concept of attachment, which was introduced by John Bowlby into psychoanalysis from ethology, since it obviously covers the same area as *amae*. As is known, Bowlby sharply distinguishes attachment from dependence, saying that a child does not become attached to his mother because he has to depend on her. So he prefers attachment to dependence as a term, as the former can be more precise than the latter in describing behavior. He also mentions the negative value implications of the word dependence as another reason for avoiding it. Even so, it seems to me that he overlooks the fact that attachment involves a dependence of its own, as one necessarily becomes dependent on the object as far as one is attached to it. In this regard, *amae* definitely has an advantage over attachment precisely because it implies a psychological dependence in the sense mentioned above and unlike attachment refers to the feeling experienced rather than to behavior.

All in all, one can say, paradoxical as it may sound, that the concept of *amae* makes it possible to discuss what is not verbalized in ordinary communication, hence is something that remains totally unnoticed if you are speaking European languages.

Next, I would like to explain how the concept of *amae* can be related to narcissism, identification and ambivalence. *Amae* is object-relational from the beginning, therefore it does not quite agree with the concept of primary narcissism. However, it fits in very well with secondary narcissism, in fact it is particularly well-suited to describe whatever state of mind may be called narcissistic. Namely, of the two kinds of *amae*, primitive and convoluted, that I mentioned before, the convoluted *amae*, which is childish, willful and demanding, is surely narcissistic. As a matter of fact, if you suspect someone of being narcissistic, you may be sure that this person has a problem with *amae*. In the same vein, a new concept of self object defined by Kohut as ‘those archaic objects cathected with narcissistic libido’ (1971, p. 3) will be much easier to comprehend in the light of *amae* psychology, since ‘the narcissistic libido’ is none other than convoluted *amae*. Also, Balint’s observation that ‘in the final phase of the treatment, patients begin to give expression to long forgotten, infantile, instinctual wishes, and to demand their gratification from their environment’ (1965, p. 181) makes perfect sense, because the primitive *amae* will manifest itself only after narcissistic defenses are worked through by analysis.”

Doi’s *amae* theory has prompted numerous debates and discussions. I myself, for instance, have discussed adult perceptions of *amae* behavior in children. The concept of *amae* as represented by Doi is an intrapsychic emotional state experienced by adults, and it is also a mode of interpersonal relationship. It should be noted firstly, however, that Japanese rarely use the word *amae* subjectively, for example, in the sense, “I want to *amaeru*.” Rather, the word refers to someone else: “He or she is *amaeru*-ing,” “is overly *amaeru*-ing,” or “is resorting to *amae*.” It is essentially a word used by an adult to refer to a child, or by an older or senior person to refer to a junior, describing the latter’s emotions, or mode of interpersonal relationship.

Secondly, some adults experience negative feelings toward *amae*. They may want to prohibit or punish it in others, or they may feel ashamed and guilty of their own desire to *amaeru*. In certain cases, the mind may work to ignore or negate feelings of *amae*. In psychoanalytic terms, the conflict with the superego towards *amae*, or the defense of the ego against *amae*, generates a variety of emotions. Part or all of this mental process is then projected onto another person.

Finally, within the context of the parent-child relationship in Japan, the word *amae* frequently carries a sense of reproach: “Stop *amaeru*-ing,” “See, you’re *amaeru*-ing again,” “I’ve had enough of your *amaeru*-ing,” or “You’re an *amaeru*-ing child.”

2. The Ajase complex: Kosawa and Okonogi

(1) The story of Ajase and his mother: Heisaku Kosawa’s version

The Ajase complex is an original theory developed by Heisaku Kosawa, and subsequently expanded by myself. Whereas Freud based his Oedipus complex on a Greek tragedy, Kosawa developed his theory of the Ajase complex from stories found in Buddhist

scripture. The story of Ajase centers on the Buddhist concept of reincarnation.

Well known to the Buddhist world, Ajase's story appears with many variations in the scriptures of ancient India. These scriptures entered Japan by way of China and Korea from approximately 700 to 1000 AD. Kosawa modeled his theory on the version of Ajase's story appearing in the *Kanmuryojukyo*, a Buddhist scripture centering on the salvation of the mother. In this instance, the woman saved by the Buddha is Ajase's mother, Idaike.

Wife of King Binbashara, the ruler of an ancient Indian kingdom, Idaike feared that as her beauty faded she was losing her husband's love. She consulted a soothsayer, who told her a sage living in the forest would die in three years' time, to be reborn as her son. However, Idaike was too anxious to wait three years, and desperate to have a child, she killed the sage. As he was dying, the sage cursed Idaike, telling her that, reincarnated as her son, he would one day kill the King. Idaike became pregnant at this moment. The unborn Ajase had thus already been murdered by his mother's egotism. Moreover, fearing the wrath of the sage reincarnated in her womb, Idaike attempted to kill her son by giving birth to him from the summit of a high tower. Ajase survived; however, having broken his little finger as a result of his fall, he was nicknamed "the prince with the broken finger."

Ajase passed a happy childhood. However, on reaching adolescence, he learned from Daibadatta, the enemy of Buddha, that his mother had attempted to kill him by giving birth from the top of a high tower; he had only to look at his broken little finger for proof. The Sanskrit word *Ajatasatru* means both "broken finger" and "prenatal rancor" (a term to be discussed below). Disillusioned with the mother he had idealized, Ajase attempted to kill her. He was subsequently overcome by guilt, however, and developed a severe skin disease, characterized by festering sores so offensive in odor that no one dared approach him—except for his mother, Idaike. Despite his mother's devoted care, Ajase did not readily recover; he even attempted several times to kill her. Seeking relief, Idaike went to the Buddha and told him of her sufferings. The Buddha's teachings healed her inner conflict, and she returned to continue to care for Ajase. Eventually, the Prince was cured to become a widely respected ruler. This is the version of the Ajase story Kosawa wrote in the 1950s, based on the *Kanmuryojukyo*.

(2) Themes of the Ajase complex

My own research has identified two fundamental aspects of the Ajase story as presented by Kosawa. I will also present, as a third point, Kosawa's own examination of guilt in the Ajase complex.

(a) The mother's conflict between the wish for a child and infanticidal wishes

Queen Idaike wished to have a child in order to protect her status as queen and maintain her husband's love—she took the extreme action of killing the sage to achieve her desires. However, believing that the birth of the reincarnated sage would bring disastrous results, Idaike began to fear the child in her womb. She then attempted to kill her child by giving birth to him from the top of a high tower.

The story of Ajase illustrates two conflicting emotions on the part of the mother. On the one hand, she wishes to have a child in order to protect herself, and to achieve her

own desires. On the other hand, projecting persecutory imagery and hatred onto her baby, she becomes fearful of the child's birth and attempts to kill him.

According to Serge Lebovici, such conflict depicts the mother's ambivalence concerning her *bébé imaginaire*. The egocentric conflict of the mother—her wishes both to have a child and to eliminate her baby—arouses persecutory anxiety through projection onto the child she carries. This unconscious maternal conflict appears clearly in the Ajase story.

(b) The child's prenatal rancor and matricidal wishes

Ajase experienced rage towards his origins from the moment of conception. As a reincarnation of the murdered sage, that is, he desired to kill his mother even before his birth. In Buddhism, this anger experienced towards birth itself is termed *mishooon*, or prenatal rancor.

Kosawa compared the Oedipus complex and the Ajase complex as follows: "Freud's Oedipus complex originates in a conflict involving the libido, with the son's love for his mother and hatred for his father. The Ajase complex, on the other hand, concerns the more fundamental question of birth or origins." Kosawa further contended that whereas incestuous desire and patricide formed the core of the Oedipus complex, the Ajase complex centered on the themes of matricide and prenatal resentment.

(c) Two types of guilt, and the mother's forgiveness

The paper Kosawa originally submitted to Freud concerning the Ajase complex bore the title, "Two Types of Guilt." ("The Ajase Complex" was rather its subtitle.) In this paper, Kosawa asserted the following. When a child makes a mistake or does something wrong, he or she first experiences guilt as a fear of punishment. However, human beings have another sense of guilt, which is of a higher dimension than mere fear of punishment. This second type of guilt is experienced when the child who fears punishment is forgiven his or her wrong doing.

In terms of the Buddhist legend, Ajase suffered feelings of guilt when confronted by a minister with his desire to kill his mother. Shocked at his own contemplated matricide, he began to shake, and became deathly ill. Idaike, however, forgave her son and nursed him devotedly. Under his mother's care, Ajase experienced a more profound sense of guilt, one of heartfelt remorse.

Kosawa termed this guilt resulting from forgiveness *zangeshin* or "repentance." He emphasized the need to differentiate between repentance and the guilt related to punishment. This "repentance"-type guilt compares with Klein's depressive/reparative guilt. The Ajase story may thus be viewed as depicting the transition from a punitive to a reparative type of guilt. (Kosawa may in fact have read Klein's *The Psycho-Analysis of Children* before writing his thesis.)

Ramon Ganzarain, an American psychoanalyst who studied the Ajase complex, has delineated several defense mechanisms in its treatment of guilt: denial, confusion, etc.

(3) Subsequent discussions of the Ajase complex

The most important discussions will be introduced below.

(a) The mother's distress over losing paternal support

I once received the following remarks from Professor Theodore Lidz concerning the Ajase story. In his view, children should be raised by both parents; the conflict of the Ajase story originates in the father's declining an active role and leaving the child's fate in the hands of the mother. Ajase's difficulties, in other words, began with the mother's tragedy of losing her husband's—Or, in a broader sense, a man's—support.

I believe this is a very important interpretation. One of the important themes of the Ajase complex is that, although children grow up in a triadic world of father, mother, and the child, a mother such as Idaïke carries the burden of raising her child by herself. The world of the Ajase complex is therefore a dyadic world.

Lidz's interpretation is also relevant in light of the socio-historical background of the Ajase legend in Japan. Early Japanese Buddhism was highly influenced by Chinese philosophy. (As mentioned above, Buddhism arrived from India via China and Korea). An essentially Japanese, popular Buddhism began to develop during the Kamakura era (1183–1333)—through the efforts of such priests as Shinran and Nichiren. One of the issues in popular Japanese Buddhism was the possibility of women's entry into the Buddhist paradise. Behind this issue lay the problem of guilt over infanticide, particularly abortion, since Japanese women have traditionally been assigned responsibility for disposing of unwanted children. The depiction of Idaïke's salvation in the *Kanmuryojukyo* played an important role in assuaging mothers' guilt over infanticide.

(b) On the origins of the text of the Ajase complex

The Ajase story also appears in the *Nehangyo* quoted in the teachings of Shinran, the *Kyogyoshinsho*, with an emphasis on the father-Son relationship and patricide as in the Oedipus complex. Kosawa, however, influenced by the *Kanmuryojukyo*, wrote his story as a uniquely mother-child story.

It is interesting to compare this textual history with recent Western studies of Freud's Oedipus complex. For example, attention has recently been focused on Freud's omission of certain aspects of the Oedipal story, particularly the conflict occurring between Laius and Jocasta before Oedipus' birth. Freud omitted this portion of the Oedipus myth and focused only on the conflict between the adolescent Oedipus and his parents, naming this the Oedipus complex. If Freud had included the incidents surrounding Oedipus' birth, his story might have possessed a greater thematic similarity with the Ajase complex. From a cross-cultural perspective, one might suggest that Freud was influenced by the Judeo-Christian tradition, whereas Kosawa was heavily influenced by the oft-cited "maternal" aspect of the Japanese culture.

(c) The Ajase complex of Sigmund Freud

Balmaly and Kruhl (1979) have proposed that one reason behind Freud's radical switch from the psychic trauma theory to the endogenic drive theory lay in defense mechanisms organized against the acknowledgement of his father's failures. They argue that, while married to his second wife, Rebecca, Freud's father had a relationship with a 20-year-old woman who became pregnant. This child was Sigmund Freud. After Rebecca's flight and subsequent suicide, Jacob married Amalia, Freud's mother.

If this hypothesis is correct, Freud would have experienced extreme conflict concerning his existence as his parents' "imaginary baby."

Does the avoidance of origins and of the "*bébé imaginaire*" in Freud's Oedipal story represent a repression of the Ajase complex? Joan Raphael-Leff, a psychoanalyst based in London, has compared Ajase's mother Idaike in the Ajase story with Oedipus' mother Jocasta in the Oedipus myth. In her paper, Raphael-Leff contends that, like Idaike, Jocasta, too, displays maternal ambivalence, expressing both the desire to have a child and infanticidal wishes. Further study of the Oedipus myth in light of the Ajase complex might prove to be highly significant.

In sum, the origins of both Oedipus and Freud, as well as Freud's Ajase complex, have recently become the subject of study in the West. The theory of the Ajase complex is thus not only applicable to Japanese mothers and children, it is a universal theme.

3. The study of on, the Japanese concept of debt or indebtedness, and of the "Don't look" prohibition: Osamu Kitayama²

As Osamu Kitayama states in "Metaphorization—making terms," the analyst's receptiveness to ambiguity is generally thought to be an essential part of his or her psychoanalytical practice. The interpretation of multiple meanings can effectively create a "bridging function" between personal metaphorical meaning and shared literal meaning. It appears that this ambiguous metaphor fails to function in the treatment of schizophrenics, who experience metaphor in literal terms. Some, however, can utilize metaphors, indicating positive signs (i.e., a non-psychotic part, an anal retentive tendency, creativity, ambiguity tolerance, etc.)

Kitayama's paper concerns the transitional process from literal experience to metaphorical understanding in schizophrenic patients. In this process, the therapist's role of translating the patient's expressions, which are experienced literally, into metaphorical "here and now" events is essential. Among relevant technical issues, the appearance and usage of the "in-metaphor" and compound metaphor may play an important role in interweaving the words and meanings of the two persons in therapy.

Kitayama (1993) next analyzed several ambiguous metaphorical expressions in the Japanese language: for instance, the Japanese word "*on*," which expresses obligation, debt, guilt, and love or kindness. Whereas the English concept of guilt is associated with punishment, *on* implies repayment or "requital." It is interesting to note that concepts such as *oime*, *giri*, and *kari*, which also seem important to Japanese ways of thinking, share with *on* the core meaning of debt or indebtedness.

Intrigued by the importance of debt to Japanese motivational concepts, Kitayama (1985) investigated Japanese myths and folk tales, particularly tales of marriage between humans and non-humans, in order to relate them to his clinical experience. In one tale, the snake-wife, responding to the hero's demand, forfeits her milk-producing eyeballs. The most typical and popular legend is "A Crane's Repayment of Her Debt (*On*)."² Below is an outline of the tale.

2. The following summary of his work was contributed by Kitayama.

- 1) The hero rescues an injured crane, which, in the guise of a beautiful woman, then visits his home and offers herself in marriage.
- 2) The young woman is a talented weaver as well as a devoted wife. However, she prohibits the hero from watching her at work, since, in her original form as a crane, she is weaving cloth from her own feathers.
- 3) Unable to resist temptation, the hero ignores the prohibition of “Don’t look”—only to see the young woman in her animal form.
- 4) He becomes frightened; the crane-woman feels hurt and ashamed. The two separate in the end.

The prohibition of “Don't look” is a taboo which, in a two-body relationship, should be broken over time, in contrast to the oedipal incest taboo, the taboo to be kept. Kitayama concluded that the tragic development of the above tale shows a sudden transition, in Kleinian terms, from the paranoid-schizoid position to the depressive position.

Kitayama (1991) further argued that from the viewpoint of “environmental failure,” “false charge” or “forced guilt” may occur when the infant is suddenly confronted with its causal relation to the fragile environment, and that maternal prohibition should be withdrawn gradually as the infant develops the capacity to tolerate causality. As an infant's feeling of indebtedness stems from the relative tension between his or her own destructiveness and the mother's survival, it is thus possible to speak of “forced” or “false guilt,” generated in infants with masochistic caretakers.

Finally, Kitayama (1993) proposed the value of “indebtedness” as a psychological concept to bridge external charge and internal debt. When analyzing transference and repeated acting-out in the form of masochistic or suicidal behavior, we may discover a conscious or unconscious pathological accumulation of debt.

III. The Present State of the Japan Psychoanalytic Society

To restate briefly, on succeeding to the presidency of the IPA Sendai Branch in 1955, Kosawa changed its name to the IPA Japan Branch and relocated its headquarters to Tokyo. This IPA Japan Branch later came to be called the Japan Psychoanalytic Society. The Society is currently directed by psychiatrists who received training analysis from Heisaku Kosawa, Japan's first generation of psychoanalysts.

Michio Yamamura succeeded Kosawa as president of the Society, to be followed by Takeo Doi, and current president Masahisa Nishizono. I myself have served as secretary for many years. Sadanobu Ushijima is the current treasurer, and Tetsuya Iwasaki the current chairman of the Education and Training Committee.

During the transition period between Kosawa's death and the start of training conducted by the first-generation psychoanalysts, training analysis was not actively performed in Japan. The present membership for the Japan Psychoanalytic Society therefore remains quite small, with 18 active members and 13 associate members.

Eighty percent of the Society members live in the Tokyo area, with the remaining 20 percent in distant Fukuoka (in southern Japan) and vicinity. Although the Japan Psychoanalytic Society has not yet established a psychoanalytic institute integrating these

two areas, it hopes to do so by 1994. Members, however, have not yet agreed whether to establish one psychoanalytic institute covering all of Japan, or two psychoanalytic institutes—one in Tokyo and the other in Fukuoka.

The Society intends to establish, by 1994, new regulations in line with the education and training criteria set forth by the IPA. It also plans to increase the number of training analysts, and to implement training analyses in accordance with international standards.

IV. Conclusion

The psychoanalytic theory transmitted from the Vienna Psychoanalytic Institute via Kosawa forms the mainstream of psychoanalysis in Japan. From the 1950s to the 1970s, this dominant trend received its greatest influence from the dynamic psychiatry of the United States.

Presently, there is a mounting interest in Japan for Kohutian self psychology as well as object relations theory, particularly the work of Melanie Klein, D. W. Winnicott, and W. Bion. Establishing the clinical applications of these theories has become a major challenge for numerous Japanese clinicians. The application of psychoanalysis to the fields of adolescent and infant psychiatry is also a focus of interest, and has been the topic of international meetings conducted in Japan. There is finally a growing trend to conduct psychoanalysis independent of either dynamic psychiatry or psychoanalytic therapy.

The number of patients receiving psychoanalytic psychotherapy has increased dramatically in the Japanese cities of Tokyo, Osaka, Fukuoka, Kobe and Hiroshima. There has also been a sharp rise in the number of private psychotherapeutic clinics operating in Tokyo, including five or six psychoanalytic psychotherapy clinics. These trends indicate potential for the future growth of psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic psychotherapy in Japan.

Japanese psychiatrists' and psychologists' study of psychoanalytic thought generated an encounter between Western and Japanese culture. Indigenous Japanese patterns of thought merged with the imported theory of psychoanalysis, paving the way for such theories as those of *amae*, the Ajase complex and the "Don't look" prohibition. These theories aid in understanding the mentality not only of Japanese, but also of people from other cultures; they furthermore promise to contribute greatly to psychoanalytic understanding itself. I sincerely hope that Japanese psychoanalysis will continue to make significant theoretical contributions to the international community.

References

- Balmory M 1988: *L'homme aux statues*. Editions Grasset et Fasquelle, 1979. Translation by Hiroshi Iwasaki, Tetsugaku Shobo.
- Doi T 1962: *Amae*: A key concept for understanding Japanese personality structure. In R. J. Smith & R. K. Beardsley (Eds.), *Japanese culture: Its development and characteristics*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Doi T 1963: Some thoughts on helplessness and the desire to be loved. *Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes*, 26.

- Doi T 1964: Psychoanalytic therapy and Western man: A Japanese view. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 1.
- Doi T 1973a: *The anatomy of dependence* (J. Bester, Trans.). Tokyo: Kodansha.
- Doi T 1973b: Psychotherapy as “hide and seek.” *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*, 37.
- Doi T 1992: On the concept of amae. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 13.
- Ganzarain R 1988: Various guilts within the Ajase complex. (Translation by Okonogi, K.) *Japanese Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 32 (2): 93–102.
- Kitayama O 1985: Pre-Oedipal “taboo” in Japanese folk tragedies. *Int. Rev. Psychoanal*, 12: 173–186.
- Kitayama O 1987: Metaphorization—making terms. *Int. J. Psychoanal*, 68: 499–509.
- Kitayama O 1991: The wounded caretaker and guilt. *Int. Rev. Psycho-Anal*, 18: 229–240.
- Kitayama O 1993: On digesting ambiguous indebtedness. Presented at the 38th IPA Congress in Amsterdam.
- Kohut H 1971: *The Analysis of the Self*. New York: Int. Univ. Press.
- Kohut H 1977: *The restoration of the self*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Kosawa H 1932: Final Kosawa version of the Ajase story, 1953, in the translator’s afterword, “Japanese version of Neue Folge der Verlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse, 1932.”
- Kosawa H 1954: Two kinds of guilt, 1934. *Japanese Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 1 (1).
- Krühl M 1979: *Freund sein Vater*, C. H. Beck’sche Verlag, Münden. Translation by Setsuo Mizuno, Shisakusha, 1987.
- Lebovici S 1988: Fantasmatic interaction and intergenerational transmission. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 9 (1).
- Okonogi K 1971: Dr. Heisaku Kosawa as a great pioneer of Japanese psychoanalysis. *Japanese Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 15 (6).
- Okonogi K 1978: The Ajase complex of the Japanese (1). *Japan Echo*, 5(4): 88–105.
- Okonogi K 1979: The Ajase complex of the Japanese (1). *Japan Echo*, 6(1): 104–118.
- Okonogi K 1991: Le complex d’Ajase. *Devnir*, 4: 71–102.
- Okonogi K 1992: Amae as seen in diverse interpersonal relations. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 13 (1), Spring.
- Pollock GH: Oedipus: The myth, the development stage, the universal theme, the conflict and complex in (*).
- *Pollock GH & Ross JM 1988: *The Oedipus papers*. Int. University Press.
- Raphael-Leff J 1989: Freud, son of Jocasta. Invited paper presented to the International Conference on Prenatal and Perinatal Psychology, Amherst, Mass., August. (Unpublished)
- Raphael-Leff J 1992: Mother of Ajase and Jocasta, 1992. Invited paper presented to The Tokyo Meeting of Infant Psychiatry, Tokyo.
- Ross JM 1985: Oedipus revisited: Laius and the “Laius Complex” in(*).
- Stern DN 1985: *The interpersonal world of the infant: A view from psychoanalysis and developmental psychology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Stolorow RD, Brandchaft B, & Atwood GE 1987: *Psychoanalytic treatment: An intersubjective approach*. Hillsdale, NJ, Analytic Press.
- Takemoto Y 1986: Amae as metalanguage: A critique of Doi’s theory of amae. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis*, 14.
- Yamamura M 1975: Reviewing the 25 years of the Japan Psychoanalytical Association. *Japanese Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 24 (4): 215–219.

Theories on the Ajase Complex

Two kinds of guilt feelings: The Ajase complex

Heisaku Kosawa

In discussing religion, Freud first wrote about a scene which he envisaged the “totem meal,” a ritual similar to the bear festival of the Ainu in Japan.

“The clan is celebrating the ceremonial occasion by the cruel slaughter of its totem animal and is devouring it raw—blood, flesh and bones. The clansmen are there, dressed in the likeness of the totem and imitating it in sound and movement as though they are seeking to stress their identity with it. Each man is conscious that he is performing an act forbidden to the individual and justifiable only through the participation of the whole clan; nor may anyone absent himself from the killing and the meal. When the deed is done, the slaughtered animal is lamented and bewailed.” (1913, pp. 140)

Freud further added the following.

“Psycho-analysis has revealed that the totem animal is in reality a substitute for the father (Vaterersatz); and this tallies with the contradictory fact that, though the killing of the animal is as a rule forbidden, yet its killing is a festive occasion—with the fact that it is killed and yet mourned.” (pp. 141)

He then returned to his thoughts on cannibalism by comparing (a) Darwin’s hypothesis on the “Primal Horde” (*Urhorde*) that “there is a violent and jealous father who keeps all the females for himself and drives away his sons as they grow up,” and (b) a union of males (*Männerverbände*) that is the most primitive kind of organization that we actually come across (an organization that consists of bands of males; these bands are composed of members with equal rights and are subject to restrictions of the totemic system, including inheritance through the mother).

Initially published in the Japanese Contribution. Vol.2 (2007) pp.3–11.

Heisaku Kosawa

(1897–1968) Graduated from Tohoku University, and studied at the Vienna Psychoanalytic Institute from 1932 to 1933. Began a private practice in psychoanalysis in 1933. Established JPS in 1955 and became its first President, and later, Honorary President. [The paper was originally featured in “Konryo”(1931) and subsequently re-featured in the Japanese Journal of Psycho-Analysis.]

"One day the brothers who had been driven out came together, killed and devoured their father and so made an end of the patriarchal horde. United, they had the courage to do and succeeded in doing what would have been impossible for them individually. (Some cultural advance, perhaps, command over some new weapon, had given them a sense of superior strength.) Cannibal savages as they were, it goes without saying that they devoured their victim as well as killing him. The violent primal father had doubtless been the feared and envied model of each one of the company of brothers: and in the act of devouring him they accomplished their identification with him, and each one of them acquired a portion of his strength. The totem meal, which is perhaps mankind's earliest festival, would thus be a repetition and a commemoration of this memorable and criminal deed, which was the beginning of so many things—of social organization, of moral restrictions and of religion." (pp. 141–2)

Freud wrote further as follows.

"They hated their father, who presented such a formidable obstacle to their craving for power and their sexual desires; but they loved and admired him too. After they had got rid of him, had satisfied their hatred and had put into effect their wish to identify themselves with him, the affection which had all this time been pushed under was bound to make itself felt. It did so in the form of remorse. A sense of guilt made its appearance, which in this instance coincided with the remorse felt by the whole group. The dead father became stronger than the living one had been—for events took the course we so often see them follow in human affairs to this day. What had up to then been prevented by his actual existence was thenceforward prohibited by the sons themselves, in accordance with the psychological procedure so familiar to us in psycho-analysis under the name 'deferred obedience.' They revoked their deed by forbidding the killing of the totem, the substitute for their father; and they renounced its fruits by resigning their claim to the women who had now been set free." (pp. 143)

Thus, created the fundamental taboos of totemism out of the sense of guilt of the son (1. Never kill a totem, and 2. Never use for sexual purposes females who belong to the totem), and for this very reason they had to correspond with the two repressed wishes of the Oedipus complex.

Thus, totem religion emerged from a child's sense of guilt, as an attempt to allay this emotion and to reconcile with the deceased father, in compliance with 'deferred obedience.' All subsequent religions, although they differ depending on the conditions of the culture of the period when such religion had been contrived and the means that were used, were attempts to solve the same problem.

Furthermore, Freud touched on the subject of the origination of the concept of God and on Christian theories, and stated,

"There was one factor in the state of affairs produced by the elimination of the

father which was bound in the course of time to cause an enormous increase in the longing felt for him. Each single one of the brothers who had banded together for the purpose of killing their father was inspired by a wish to become like him and had given expression to it by incorporating parts of their father's surrogate in the totem meal. But, in the consequence of the pressure exercised upon each participant by the fraternal clan as a whole, that wish could not be fulfilled. For the future no one could or might ever again attain the father's supreme power, even though that was what all of them had striven for. Thus after a long lapse of time their bitterness against their father, which had driven them to their deed, grew less, and their longing for him increased; and it became possible for an ideal to emerge which embodied the unlimited power of the primal father against whom they had once fought as well as their readiness to submit to him. As a result of decisive cultural changes, the original democratic quality that had prevailed among all the individual clansmen became untenable; and there developed at the same time an inclination, based on veneration felt for particular human individuals, to revive the ancient paternal ideal by creating gods."(pp. 148)

"There can be no doubt that in the Christian myth the original sin was one against God the Father. If, however, Christ redeemed mankind from the burden of original sin by the sacrifice of his own life, we are driven to conclude that the sin was a murder. The law of talion, which is so deeply rooted in human feelings, lays it down that a murder can only be expiated by the sacrifice of another life: self-sacrifice points back to blood-guilt. And if this sacrifice of a life brought about atonement with God the Father, the crime to be expiated can only have been the murder of the father."(pp. 154)

"In the Christian doctrine, therefore, men were acknowledging in the most undisguised manner the guilty primaeval deed, since they found the fullest atonement for it in the sacrifice of this one son. Atonement with the father was all the more complete since the sacrifice was accompanied by a total renunciation of the women on whose account the rebellion against the father was started. But at that point the inexorable psychological law of ambivalence stepped in. The very deed in which the son offered the greatest possible atonement to the father brought him at the same time to the attainment of his wishes against the father. He himself became God, beside, or more correctly, in place of, the father. A son-religion displaced the father-religion."(pp. 154)

If I were to summarize Freud's discussion, I would have to conclude that religion is an attempt to allay the emotion of wanting to kill one's father, and to reconcile with the father with 'deferred obedience,' and therefore is a mental state that is manifested from a child's sense of guilt.

But is only this situation representative of all the religions that exist in this world? Is religion that has emerged out of a child's sense of guilt the only and universal religion? I am compelled to say that there are other types of religion. What had emerged out of a child's sense of guilt is "religious desire or demand without spiritual enlightenment" and not a perfect, well-established religious state of mind. If so, what is a religious state of

mind? I would like to say that it represents a situation whereby a child develops a sense of guilt for the first time after his murderous tendencies are “melted down and dissolved” by the parent’s self-sacrifice.

I would like, furthermore, to illustrate this once again, using an ordinary parable. There was a certain child. He was a very obedient child. Suppose that one day, he accidentally (in the truest sense of the word) dropped a plate and broke it. In so doing, a feeling of remorse, of having done a bad thing, welled up in his heart. When he was brought in front of his parents, he must have been trembling with fear. He apologized again and again, from the bottom of his heart, that he had done a bad deed and was sorry. But the stubborn old man continued to reproach the child. The obedient child could no longer stand it, and shouted, “I’ve apologized this much but still you do not forgive me. Why? I’m a human being, and human beings make mistakes. All right, do as you please, I do not care any more.” The child’s attitude must have been, as viewed by his parents, that of the most hideous rebel. However, the other parent (mother) said to him, “It is clear that what you did was bad. It is true that people make mistakes, but the bad you did was truly bad. Still, people are people, and a plate is something to be broken. You cannot help that, no matter how hard you try. So, always remember this admonishment and continue working.” Hearing this, the obedient child burst out in tears. “Oh Mother, how generous you are for saying such things to me, who have done such a bad thing. I apologize from the bottom of my heart that I have done wrong. Please forgive me; I will never repeat the same mistake, ever again.”

Readers—I am sure you have learned that, in this simple parable, a child developed a sense of guilt, but that this sense of guilt was made to change by the parent, to give rise to a different sense of guilt in the child’s mind. Earlier, I stated that there are two religions; what I meant by that is a religion that came about by the differences in two mental states such as these. So the religion shown earlier, if seen from one angle, is a “religious desire or demand,” and may not be something that should be referred to as religious state of mind. I intend to call the child’s first awareness of guilt, “a sense of guilt,” and the latter awareness of guilt, “repentance.”

Then, where is such a religion? I believe it is the origin of the Shinshu sect of Buddhism, began by Saint Shinran in Japan, which is the place of Mahayana Buddhism; it is the *Samannaphalasutta* (“unconditional and absolute faith that welled inside a person, like a plant that sprouted despite having no roots”) of Prince Ajase who lived in India during the days of the Buddha.

Prince Ajase, young and ambitious, won a series of victories in a war with neighboring countries. At the instigation of Daibadatta (a cousin of the Buddha), he confined his father King Bimbisara in prison, feeling an ever-mounting wish to exact vengeance. Ajase first reached the prison gate and asked the gatekeeper whether or not his father was still alive. The gatekeeper told him the exact circumstances, that his mother, Queen Idaike, was secretly supplying food to Bimbisara. Immediately upon hearing this, Ajase was enraged. “My mother is a villain. This is because she is the companion of my father, who is a villain.” He also shouted, “The priests are villains; they use a variety of black magic in an attempt to prolong the evil King’s life.” Cursing and shouting, Ajase all at once stretched his left arm to grab his mother’s hair, picked up a sword with his right

hand, placed it on her chest, and was about to run it through her heart. His mother, astonished, clasped her hands in prayer, bent her body, lowered her head, flung herself on her child's arm, drenched in perspiration, and fainted in agony. A Minister by the name of Gakko ("moonlight") and a physician, Jivaka, rushed to stop Ajase and admonished him by saying, "The Ministers know that, since long ago, there have been many evil kings. Many princes have killed their fathers to seize the throne. However, they have never, ever heard of a person committing the atrocious act of injuring his own mother. If you, the Prince, commit this act, it is a shameful act unworthy of *Kshatriyas* or the nobility. It is a heinous act that we the Ministers and your followers cannot bear to hear. This is an act of the *Shundras* who belong to the lowest caste." Hearing these words, Ajase held back and decided not to strike his mother down with his sword. However, he immediately told the attendant to confine her to an inner chamber in the palace and refused to let her go out, even by a step. Later, Prince Ajase became the king, and, purely out of a wish to fulfill all his desires and pleasures unimpeded, killed his father and assumed the throne. As the years passed, however, he began to harbor a strong feeling of remorse. The notion pained his heart, and these feelings of guilt led him to break out in a severe skin illness (virulent sores) which covered his body with foul-smelling pustules so offensive that no one dared approach him. King Ajase himself admitted that this was clearly a retribution for his bad deed, and that he would fall into the pits of hell at any moment. Indeed, he was at the height of distress, despair and suffering. His mind and body were in such disarray that all the pain and suffering of the present and future loomed over him, all at once, as if a huge mountain had collapsed on him. It was at such a period that six followers—scholars who studied the Indian philosophy of the six schools—came to meet Ajase. Each stated his views in an attempt to console the King, but failed to provide him with peace of mind.

One day, the Minister Jivaka came to meet Ajase and tried to comfort him. At that instant, a voice was heard, coming out of thin air, telling King Ajase, "The Buddha will sooner or later enter nirvana. So go to the Buddha immediately and ask for his redemption. Nobody but the Buddha can save you. I am advising you this because I feel pity for you." On hearing this, Ajase was terrified, his body trembled, and, visibly shaking like a Japanese banana tree, asked the sky, "Who are you who says those things from above the clouds? I cannot see you; I can only hear your voice." The voice replied, "I am your father, King Bimbisara. You are to follow the words of Minister Jivaka; you should not do what your six ministers tell you to do." Hearing his father's kind words, King Ajase became so distressed that he lost consciousness and fainted.

Ajase finally reached the place of the Buddha. The Buddha did not preach anything. However, having killed his innocent father, Ajase was convinced in his mind that he would definitely go to hell, so he doubted that even the Buddha could save him. The Buddha focused on breaking down Ajase's resistance and tried to arouse religious belief in him.

"As long as the Buddha, who oversees the past, present and the future, provided—despite knowing that King Ajase would kill his father for the sake of the throne—the father-king with the causality that he must ascend to the throne in response to the offerings that the father-king had given to the Buddha in the past, then, even if the King had killed his father-king, the King's killing of his father cannot be blamed only on the King himself. If

the King falls into the pits of hell, other gods must also fall with him. If the gods are not reprimanded for their sins, there is no way that Ajase would be solely reprimanded for his sins. Thus, the Buddha must save Ajase from going to hell. How can the Buddha, who receives the wishes of other people for the repose of the souls of the deceased, ever see Ajase go to hell without doing anything about it?" It was as if King Ajase's tightly-closed chest of darkness was suddenly thrown open; he felt as if he had been walking along a narrow, winding road and suddenly saw himself out in a wide, open beach.

"Dear Buddha, when I look around me, I see that, from the seeds of that horrible tree called iran, the same iran always grows. However, the beautiful and fragrant chinaberry tree never grows from the seed of an iran. But isn't it strange? Right now, I see that a chinaberry has grown out of an iran seed. The iran is me. The chinaberry is the devotion I just obtained now. If so, then this devotion may be referred to as *Samannaphalasutta*, or 'unconditional and absolute faith.'"

So, the education of virtue that the compassionate Buddha had given to Ajase has left the confines of logic and reason, filling him with sympathy and thankfulness. And thus, dried-up trees began to blossom, and beans began to sprout. The teachings of redemption provided to such extreme feelings of guilt helped induce this tremendous feeling of repentance in Ajase.

At this point, I wish to briefly describe the differences between the desires of Oedipus and the desires of Ajase.

At the core of Oedipus' desire was the love for his mother, and Oedipus killed his father to make her his. In other words, the murder of his father enabled him to marry his mother. In Ajase's case, however, the killing of his father, a king, did not originate in the former's lust for his mother. Queen Idaike was about to see her youthful years go by, and since she had no child with her husband, the king, she worried that the love of her husband would vanish along with her beauty. Ajase's murder was based on this lamentable agony of his mother.

Idaike consulted a soothsayer, who told her to kill a hermit living in the forest, who was destined to die in three years' time. The hermit was reincarnated in her womb and she became pregnant. She gradually began seeing things the soothsayer had said, such as wanting to suck the blood from her husband's right leg. This brought her tremendous agony, both physically and mentally. It was inevitable that Ajase, who was born this way, would harbor a feeling of hatred toward his parents. Ajase was a hot-blooded youth of unparalleled valor, and other people regarded him as the happiest prince on Earth. However, no matter how hard he tried, he was unable to dispel the mysterious dark clouds that hovered over him day and night. Then, the time came. The ambition of Daibadatta, regarded as the revolutionary of the Buddhist community, finally revealed the true nature of his dark shadow. And so, instigated by Daibadatta, Ajase ended up murdering his father.

According to recent teachings of psychoanalysis, the most primitive form of sadism is oral sadism. Crunching, or crushing with the teeth, is the most primitive form of tyranny; it is an appalling crime. Why? It is because it is about crunching the mother, who is the ultimate source of life.

Ajase's tyranny was the most horrifying, primitive tyranny imaginable, of attempting

to harm his own mother.

In fact, according to psychoanalysis, in addition to those who wish to kill their father because they love their mother, some psychopaths wish to kill their mother because they love her. The former is known as the Oedipus complex; I am inclined to name the latter the Ajase complex. Oedipus killed his father; Ajase even tried to kill his mother as well. Even if a father is killed, the ultimate source of life remains. Then, what if a mother is killed? Is the fundamental question on life an answer made towards the ultimate source of life?

Furthermore, I would like to end this manuscript by briefly discussing whether or not neurotics and psychopaths are actually able to acquire a religious state of mind.

A certain analysand began saying the following, moments before ending treatment: "I have always regarded religion in an uncritical fashion. I used the famous proposition made by Marx which I found in a book I had read three or four years ago—that religion is the opium of the masses—to argue uncritically that religion is a reflection of the dissatisfaction of the members of the subordinate class, that was either created in the form of an image, or was a hypothetical thing such as heaven. But lately, I don't know exactly why, but I have become very aware of the need to re-educate myself in a critical manner concerning religion."

Since early on, this analysand was raised by his grandparents as their foster child. He experienced all imaginable forms of sexual trauma. On reaching school age, he returned to his hometown to live with his parents. Up to that point, he had lived in a completely different world. His father was a person of high standing in a provincial town. He was also an educator. As a result, the analyst's life created an extremely strange personality in him, whether he liked it or not.

His neurosis originates from his upbringing. His personality was thoroughly murderous and sexual. He was both Oedipus and Ajase. However, his world of the unconscious became his re-experience, and, as he began to recognize this, his disease melted away, like snow under the sun. At the same time, his personality became non-murderous and changed to a religious character of its own accord.

Although this may appear tedious, I would like to show how his murderous tendencies are manifested. "On the day of my younger brother's funeral, I was worried if other people would suspect my feelings or my attitudes to be those of some happy occasion. Of course, I was influenced by the mood around me, and objectively showed, at least on the surface, that I was overcome with grief. At the funeral, I was sitting at a dining table at the very far end, being served post-funeral dishes. But I got excited, quickly taking a peek at every single dish that was served at the table by removing the plate cover; I remember people sitting near me laugh at me."

You may say that this is the silly, thoughtless behavior of a 15-year-old. That is, of course, true. However, if the mourning during those sad events, and rejoicing in joyful events, are manifestations of natural, humane sensitivities, not much influenced by education or any other acquired formalisms that had been added on later in life, then the fact cannot be denied that the analysand was showing abnormal reactions toward the death of his brother.

"The place where we used to live was totally devastated by the so-called Great Kanto

Earthquake that struck in 1923. We worked with our father and younger brothers to build a small house. We made everything ourselves, from the foundation stones to walls—we wove one sheet of bamboo after another. We made tremendous efforts to erect a tiny house with a 6-mat room. Even though I was a child, I was already a fourth grader in middle school, and physically, I was almost a grown man. Ordinarily, in a case like this, it is perfectly natural to think that, since we made such heroic efforts to build a house, the parents should live in it. But then, after we learned that the children could not live in that house...I remember sulking considerably at my mother. I even hoped that another earthquake would strike and smash the house we just built.”

His sexual life was also something that matched these tendencies. “One evening, when I was in the third or fourth grade of middle school, my father was late coming home because of some business. My mother put the younger children to sleep and went to the parents’ bedroom. In those days, I was living alone in an annex. I got tired of studying, so I left the annex to drink some tea, and, since nobody was around (I guess I should explain to other people that I just wanted to check in on my mother and younger brother, who was sleeping soundly), I went close to my mother and spied on her, overcome with a desire that can never be forgiven.”

“With descriptions that made his book a world masterpiece, Emile Zola described how ‘Nana,’ the heroine, peeks through a keyhole and watches her parents engage in sexual intercourse, and becomes an extremely lewd woman as a result. As for me, in a house that my family had rented when I was in sixth grade of elementary school, I used to sleep in the living room. At one time, unfortunately, we had house guests, so I spread a mattress in my parents’ bedroom and slept there. There, I had the same experience that Nana had. And it was not through a tiny keyhole...”

This account provides a glimpse of what is at the fundamental root of his personality. When studies on what are referred to in psychoanalysis as oral or anal stages came to be analyzed in more depth, and many more things became known from various angles, this analysis used to say to me, “Even during this summer vacation, my mother told me how happy she was, seeing me take much better care of my father than before, but I don’t know if she was simply praising me, or making ironic remarks about how I used to behave. In any event, she told me something of the sort two or three times.”

During the early and middle stages of my interview with him, he used to bite his nails while talking. However, he stopped doing it, and it appeared as if everything was resolved from the heart.

His personality changed completely. His perceptions of life also changed dramatically. The way he viewed life changed completely, as if silver had changed to gold. This psychology is the most harmonious state that human beings have managed to attain, to this date, even when seen from contemporary cutting-edge scientific and psychoanalytical perspectives. Lastly, therefore, I wish to pose the question to thinking people: “What does religion mean for ordinary people?”

(Source: The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, “Totem and Taboo and Other Works,” Volume XIII [1913–1914], translated from the German under the General Editorship of James Strachey. The Hogarth Press, 1955.)

Theories on the Ajase Complex

Ajase complex and its implication

Keigo Okonogi

[I] Introduction

It is well known by now by most clinicians and scholars around the world about the psychoanalytic concept of Oedipus complex that was proposed by Sigmund Freud in 1897 basing on Greek mythological story from the West. However, it is rather rare for the scholars to be aware of the Ajase complex which has been suggested by Japanese psychoanalyst Heisaku Kosawa in 1932 based on the Hindu mythological story of the prince of Ajase. These two complexes, one derived from the West and another from the East, both address the deep-seated emotional complex relating to parent-child relationship, but with greatly different focus for the nature of conflict and resolution. They provide concepts complementary to wholistic understanding of parent-child bond. Thus, it is pertinent to this chapter in this book to elaborate the story and the nature of complex for theoretical comprehension of human nature with more broad bases.

One of the pioneer Japanese psychoanalysts, Heisaku Kosawa, in 1932, left Japan to study at the Psychoanalytic Institute of Vienna. After an interview with Sigmund Freud, he underwent training analysis with Richard Sterba under the supervision of Paul Federn. Kosawa returned to Tokyo in 1933, and took his first step as a psychoanalytic therapist by opening a private practice, as was customary in the West. He pursued this work from the 1930s until his death in 1968. During this period, Kosawa continued to assimilate Western knowledge from international psychoanalytic journals, and applied his learning to the treatment of Japanese patients and his clinical experience with them. Kosawa's work led him to develop his own method of psychoanalytic treatment and his own theories, of which the Ajase complex is a representative example (Kosawa, 1953).

Kosawa early on gave close attention to the mother-child bond of early childhood, and was extremely attracted to the ideas of Melanie Klein about infants' oral sadistic phantasy to their mothers (1932). He accorded particular importance to the hate and resentment experienced by the child towards the mother, as well as to the child's oral sadism. In addition, he was strongly influenced by the methods of his former supervisor Federn in the psychotherapeutic treatment of schizophrenia, and noted the maternal function of the therapist. Kosawa gradually found it necessary to treat not only classic neuroses, but also what are now termed borderline cases. Owing to the specific nature of his Japanese

patients and the treatment of these borderline cases, the question of transference and counter-transference with regard to preoedipal object relations became an important theme in Kosawa's theory.

The text concerning the *Ajase* complex which Kosawa presented to Freud in 1932 derives from the story of the Indian prince *Ajatasatru* as related in the *Nirvana Sutra* (introduced to Japan between 700 and 1000 AD.) and *The Teaching, the Practice, the Confidence, and the Realization of Shinran*, a celebrated Japanese priest of the Kamakura period (1185–1333) (Shinran, 1966). Nonetheless, during the twenty years of clinical practice which followed his return to Japan, Kosawa referred principally to the Buddhist classic entitled *The Sutra of the Contemplation of Infantile Life* to elaborate his own original version of the *Ajase* story (1954). It is this story which forms the basis of the *Ajase* complex.

The *Sutra of the Contemplation of Infinite Life* is rare among Buddhist texts in that its theme is the salvation of the mother. The central character saved by the Buddha is *Ajase's* mother *Idaike* (The names of characters, places, etc., in the legend will be referred to by their Japanese equivalents). The following constitutes the essentials of Kosawa's version of the *Ajase* story.

The Story of *Ajase*

Queen *Idaike* was the wife of the king of *Bimbashara*, ruler of *Oshajo*. Worried that the love of her husband was fading along with her beauty, she came to ardently desire the birth of a child. The soothsayer she consulted told her a hermit living in the forest would die in three years' time, to be reincarnated in her womb. *Idaike*, however, was too anxious to wait three years. Obsessed by her desire for a child, she killed the hermit—who cursed her as he died: "I will be reincarnated as the son of the king, but one day this son will kill him!" *Idaike* became pregnant at this moment with the future *Ajase*. The Prince had thus already been killed once, owing to his mother's egoism. After becoming pregnant, however, *Idaike* grew to fear the resentment of the child in her womb (the hermit's curse) and gave birth from the top of a high tower, so as to drop her baby to the ground below. The infant broke his little finger, but survived. Young *Ajase* was therefore nicknamed "the prince with the broken finger."

Ajase subsequently passed a normal, happy childhood. However, on reaching adolescence, the enemy of the Buddha, *Daibadatta*, revealed that his mother had attempted to kill him by giving birth from a summit of a tower. He added that if the Prince had need of proof, he need only look at his broken finger. It was in this way that *Ajase* discovered the story surrounding his birth. Disillusioned with the mother he idealized, *Ajase* was overcome with rage, and attempted to kill *Idaike*. However, the Prince's subsequent feelings of guilt led him to develop a severe illness (*ruchu*), which covered his body with foul-smelling sores. When no one else dared approach, it was none other than Queen *Idaike* who devoted herself to his care. Finally realizing that these ministrations had no effect, however, and confronted with the unhappy fact that her beloved son had attempted to kill her, *Idaike* confided her problems to the Buddha and asked for his counsel. The instruction she received led *Idaike* to resolve her emotional conflicts, and to devote

herself to the care of her son. *Ajase* recovered from his illness to become an enlightened sovereign.

[III] The Fundamental Themes of The *Ajase* Complex

The *Ajase* complex, as understood through Kosawa's reading of the Buddhist legend, involves three themes which can be identified as follows:

(A) The Mothers Desires Both to Have a Child and to Kill Her Child

Idaike wished for a child, to protect her status as queen and to retain the love of her husband. Her desire pushed her to the extreme act of killing the hermit. However, believing that the hermit would return to life and occasion unhappiness, *Idaike* came to fear her child and considered abortion—then finally attempted to kill *Ajase* by giving birth from the summit of a tower. This story depicts the psychological state of a mother who, on the one hand, wishes for a child to protect her position or to satisfy her own desires. On the other hand, however, she does not want to give birth, and projects feelings of persecution and hate onto her baby to the point that she fears delivery or even imagines ridding herself of her child.

Borrowing the concept of Serge Lebovici (1988), we could say that this story describes the conflicts of the mother in relation to her “imaginary baby.” The mother's self-centered conflict—between an egotistical desire to exercise the right of life and death over her child, and paranoid fears of the imaginary baby onto whom she has projected her own egoism—has always been part of maternal psychology. In contemporary society, however, as the myth of maternal love is disbanded, mothers' conflicts have come into the open. The author will later note his experience of these issues in the Japanese clinic.

(B) Prenatal Rancor and the Child's Desire to Kill the Mother

From the moment of *Ajase*'s conception, he experienced a fundamental rancor towards his origins: the resentment of the hermit killed by *Idaike*. We could say, in other words, that he was animated by the desire to kill his mother from before birth. In the Buddhist language of the *sutra*, resentment directed at one's origin is termed *mishoon* or “prenatal rancor.” Kosawa compared the Oedipus complex and the *Ajase* complex as follows. “Freud's Oedipus complex has its origins in the conflict surrounding erotic desire, where the son loves his mother and feels rivalry toward his father. By contrast, the *Ajase* complex involves the more fundamental issue of one's birth, or of how one came into existence.” He believed that the originality of the *Ajase* complex lay in its themes of matricide and prenatal rancor, in contrast to the Oedipus complex, which emphasizes incestuous desire and patricide.

If Freud considered the Oedipus complex as a primal phantasy (*Urphantasie*), the author believes that the *Ajase* complex also possesses a universal character. It is a psychic state that focuses notably on questions linked to one's origins: the identity of one's parents and the circumstances surrounding one's birth. At the same time, the author would note that there are also socio-historical factors peculiar to Japan which motivated Kosawa to present his thesis on the *Ajase* complex to Freud. Notably, there exists in Japan

a contrast between the outward idealization of the mother, and a socio-historic reality in which the mother was often forced to kill or “thin out” her children. The Japanese term of *mabiki* refers to the thinning of a rice field, and indicates the killing of children as a community practice, particularly during famines, as was common until the Edo Period (1603–1868).

Later, the author will give clinical examples illustrating how children manifest prenatal rancor towards their parents, and resentment and murderous desire towards their mother. This theme, incidentally, appears most often in the case of adolescents.

(C) Two Types of Guilt

The text concerning the *Ajase* complex which Kosawa presented to Freud was entitled, “Two Types of Guilt.” A context for this theme can be found in Kleinian (1945, 1946) discussions of the comparison between paranoid and depressive guilt, or the movement for a punitive type of guilt to a reparative type. These two types of guilt, and the defense mechanisms employed against them, are important structural elements of the *Ajase* complex.

[III] The *Ajase* Complex Considered from a Clinical Viewpoint

In this article, the author would like to examine the two fundamental themes of the *Ajase* complex noted above—the conflicts of the mother surrounding maternity, and the “prenatal rancor” of the child—in light of clinical cases the author has treated as psychotherapist. Concerning the former, I will present the case of a mother with symptoms of maternal rejection; and concerning the rancor of the child, two clinical cases of adolescents.

(A) The Conflicts of the Mother Surrounding Maternity

Based on clinical experience, the author has noticed that more and more mothers exhibiting symptoms of maternal rejection have begun to undergo psychotherapeutic treatment in Tokyo. One of the factors contributing to this phenomenon has been the disappearance of these mothers’ traditional support system. If previously a woman’s own mother, or her mother-in-law, aided her in pregnancy and with childcare, this structure of family support has been lost with the phenomenon of nuclearization. The growing number of women in the work force, furthermore, has meant an increase in their responsibilities. In this type of new family, no system dictates who should aid the mother with the difficulties of pregnancy, delivery, and childraising. Furthermore, in Japan, there is as yet no custom of men emotionally supporting their wives.

In these circumstances, mothers’ anxiety concerning pregnancy and delivery, and accompanying symptoms of maternal rejection, have come into evidence. Another factor underlying this phenomenon may be thought to be societal recognition of women’s self-assertion. Both society and the family environment now permit mothers who have experienced hostility or rejection toward their children to express openly their feelings.

There have always existed mothers who experienced a rejection of maternity. In the past, however, this rejection could be rationalized as corporal punishment or discipline.

Today, by contrast, respect for children's rights, and the general recognition that mothers may not feel affection for their children, have resulted in an increasing number of patients in Japan who complain of maternal rejection syndrome.

Case 1—The *Ajase* complex as seen in Mitsuko and her mother, who both exhibit maternal rejection syndrome

Mitsuko is a thirty-one-year-old housewife, who has been married for five years. Since her son was one year old, and her daughter three, she began to complain of insomnia and migraines, and harbored thoughts of killing her daughter. One day, in front of her children, she cut up her daughter's favorite doll with a pair of scissors. Mitsuko agreed to see a doctor after this event, on the advice of her husband. In this way, her individual psychotherapy began. As Mitsuko's mother also expressed the wish for a consultation in view of the psychic changes that had occurred in her daughter, I became her therapist.

Gradually, during consultations with her therapist, Mitsuko realized that she was hypocritical with her daughter. She also felt that her daughter was coming more and more to resemble herself at the hated time of her own childhood. In fact, her daughter incarnated all the aspects of her own personality Mitsuko detested. On seeing her daughter, Mitsuko would be seized by the impulse to banish this other self. She would scream, "Get out!" or "Go over there and leave me alone!" and criticized every aspect of her daughter she disliked. As she showered her daughter with reproaches, however, Mitsuko would be haunted by the apprehension that she was coming to resemble her own mother, whose anxious nature she found extremely oppressive.

Until she began treatment, Mitsuko was largely unaware of the negative feelings she held towards her mother. Rather, Mitsuko considered her mother to be a fragile creature, in need of protection from a cruel father and grandmother. Mitsuko's mother had passed the thirty-five years of her marriage waiting on her husband and two mothers-in-law (her husband's biological mother, and the mother's sister, by whom Mitsuko's father had been adopted while in college). Mitsuko's father, furthermore, very attentive to both older women, would not partisan the wife subject to their control. He was an extremely self-centered man, and showed no interest in the management of the household or his children. On arriving home, he would take up a book; when on vacation, he would go off by himself to the mountains.

Mitsuko's first pregnancy ended in a miscarriage, for which her mother-in-law reproached her as though it stemmed from some physical deficiency on Mitsuko's part. After this event, Mitsuko began to see her own mother as having sacrificed her own life, in spite of fragile health, to serve her husband and two mothers-in-law—and began to be profoundly irritated by this masochistic attitude. Mitsuko directed all her conscious feelings of anger towards her grand-mothers and father; towards her mother, she felt sympathy, and advised her on numerous occasions to divorce.

Thus, Mitsuko began by feeling herself in sympathy with her mother. She could not escape the idea that her mother was in danger of dying from some illness or of committing suicide, and that in order to save her mother, she must bring about her divorce. However, as her therapy progressed, Mitsuko became aware that behind these worries and

anxieties on behalf of her mother lay feelings of deep resentment and animosity.

Once, Mitsuko mentioned that her mother suffered from stomach problems, and had undergone medical examination. At the time of our therapy, it was determined that Mitsuko's mother was suffering from benign polyps, rather than an actual disease. Although her mother accepted this diagnosis, Mitsuko expressed to her analyst the conviction that her mother was suffering from a serious illness, perhaps cancer, and became distraught at the idea of her mother dying. She gradually recognized that behind her anxiety lay a hidden desire for her mother's death. If only her mother died, her own psychic burden would be lightened, and she would experience relief.

On reflection, Mitsuko realized that she had always been treated with more coldness and severity than her younger brother. Although she had endured her mother's strict discipline—telling herself that, as the oldest daughter, she must be obedient—she lived with the fear that her mother would die or leave her family. Behind her fears of abandonment lay an idea that Mitsuko's mother had transmitted to her daughter in non-verbal form: "If only it weren't for you, I'd be living happily with my little boy."

The moment at which Mitsuko began to experience unpleasant feelings for her daughter, and to treat her cruelly, coincided with the birth of her son. Mitsuko herself had a younger brother. With the birth of this son, her mother's position in the family had stabilized, as a daughter-in-law who had given birth to a precious heir. Mitsuko was thus in certain aspects burdened with the uncertainty experienced by her mother at the beginning of her own marriage.

Mitsuko realized this state of affairs, she began to verbalize a "prenatal rancor" of which she had not been conscious. "If my mother was happy, why did she force herself to have me? It would have been better for her if I'd never been born."

Mitsuko's mother had kept a secret concerning the birth of her daughter. According to what was recounted to me in therapy, she had married into a family of illustrious politicians. Her husband considered himself the center of the world, and accorded no importance to family life or his wife. As her father and mother-in-law were extremely severe as well, she soon bitterly regretted her marriage. At the time, however, incompatibility was not recognized as grounds for divorce.

One day, she learned by chance from a family employee that several members of her husband's family had suffered from mental illness, or committed suicide. One of her husband's grandmothers, for instance, had been psychologically disturbed. On thus discovering that her husband's family had a history of mental illness, she fled back to her own parents. Mitsuko's mother subsequently decided to divorce at once, fearing that a child conceived with her husband would be at risk of psychological abnormality. However, she was at this time already pregnant with Mitsuko.

Mitsuko's mother was torn between returning to her husband's family, and bringing her pregnancy to term, or having an abortion, and proceeding with divorce. As she hesitated, she lost the opportunity and her child was born. Mitsuko's mother feared constantly that her daughter would show signs of abnormality. Each time she fought with her husband, or was bullied by her in-laws, she would feel resentment towards Mitsuko, thinking, "I wouldn't be in this house if it weren't for her."

Mitsuko became an anxious child, from her earliest years continuously anxious and

lacking in self-confidence. However, with the birth of the second child, a son, this socially prominent family was delighted with the appearance of a male heir. The atmosphere of the family, and the manner in which they treated their daughter-in-law, suddenly improved—so much that she began to have the genuine impression that the child represented a blessing, and to rejoice in the enviable privilege of belonging to this celebrated family. The stronger this emotion became, the more Mitsuko appeared a nuisance, and she began unconsciously to discriminate between Mitsuko and her little brother.

Mitsuko was unaware that, after she was conceived, her mother had agonized over whether or not to give birth to her. However, on becoming another, Mitsuko reproduced unconsciously with her own child the conflict her mother had previously experienced in relation to herself.

Ajase's mother *Idaike*, like the mother of Mitsuko, had desired a child to preserve her social status. After becoming pregnant, however, she had thoughts of killing her child, frightened by the hermit's curse and fearing that a misfortune would occur if the baby were born. For Mitsuko's mother, also, a child was necessary for a secure position in her husband's family; however, at the same time, she wondered if her baby would be affected by a mental illness. The conflict experienced by Mitsuko's mother toward her daughter reveals psychological characteristics in common with *Idaike's* conflict regarding *Ajase*.

Ajase became conscious of prenatal resentment towards his mother, and experienced a desire to kill her, after learning as an adolescent of the events surrounding his conception and birth. Similarly, before beginning therapy with myself, Mitsuko's mother had spoken to no one of the conflict experienced while she was pregnant with Mitsuko, and had repressed her feelings up until the time she underwent therapy, considering it to be her secret alone. Over the course of her therapy, she gradually recalled, and became able to verbalize, the suffering she had experienced at the time, concerning her choice between pregnancy and divorce.

In this sense, one can say that her mother's conflicts concerning the issue of whether or not to give birth had been transmitted to Mitsuko in an unconscious, nonverbal form. Mitsuko unconsciously passed on the rejection she had experienced as a child to her own daughter.

In psychiatric terms, Mitsuko's mother had neurotic ideas of a hypochondriacal type. One of these manifested itself in the previously mentioned symptom, a feeling of permanent heaviness in the stomach. Mitsuko's mother confided to me that this sensation had persisted for thirty years. During the course of our therapy, she underwent her eleventh exam by gastroscope. Finally, after her treating physician diagnosed a case of stomach polyps, she had them removed by endoscopy.

After having undergone this minor surgical procedure, Mitsuko's mother confided to me that, for thirty years, she had suffered from discomfort in her stomach, which had begun with the birth of Mitsuko. This discomfort having finally disappeared, she also felt released from an emotional sense of ill-being that had endured for thirty years. It gradually became clear that this sensation of discomfort signified for Mitsuko's mother, the daughter she had wanted to abort but could not.

From this moment, Mitsuko's mother rejuvenated in a surprising manner, displaying at times the expressions or attitudes of a young girl. It was just at this time that Mitsuko

believed her mother to be suffering from cancer and was seized by temporary panic. This situation which appeared in the course of therapy reproduced what had taken place previously, when Mitsuko was still in her mother's womb and her mother wondered whether or not she should have an abortion. For Mitsuko, her mother's stomach cancer was the child (Mitsuko herself) in her mother's womb. In addition, this fetus had the power to kill her mother. It is here that the aspects of Mitsuko's case most clearly linked to "prenatal rancor" become evident.

In this way, the mother's conflicts as they appear in the Ajase complex were vividly reproduced during the treatment of Mitsuko and her mother.

(B) Changes in the State of Women in Japan and the Transmission of Conflicts from One Generation to Another

In a family with feudal values such as her husband's, Mitsuko's mother had no choice but to accept the traditional role of a daughter-in-law. Her principal role was therefore to serve her husband's adopted mother; however, she experienced deep frustration at being unable to experience love in the context of a happy marital relation with her husband.

Mitsuko, who did not want to become like her mother, chose to make a "modern" marriage of love. However, after marriage and the birth of their first child, her husband devoted himself to his company rather than his family, and no longer took notice of his wife. On the surface, there had been a transition from a feudal-type family to one of a democratic, nuclear type. However, in light of Mitsuko's failure to find happiness in a family life centered on the couple, her mother's frustration had only repeated itself in an identical form. Furthermore, Mitsuko projected her frustration onto her daughter and became psychologically aggressive towards her, exactly as her own mother had done with herself.

Although at first glance the mother and daughter existed in culturally different family environments, at a deeper, psychological level, the mother's conflicts had been passed on to her daughter unconsciously, through a process of intergenerational transmission. This unconscious repetition and transmission between generations, I would emphasize, occurs in the deepest strata of the mother-child bond, transcending historical change.

(C) The Child's Prenatal Rancor

The second aspect of the *Ajase* complex involves the experience of the child, and centers on the issue of prenatal rancor. Prenatal rancor is the resentment experienced by the child on learning of the mother's conflict concerning his or her birth.

In the story of *Ajase*, prenatal rancor is represented through the metaphor of reincarnation. As a reincarnation of the hermit murdered by *Idaike*, *Ajase* was born with the resentment of a child already killed by his mother. Psychoanalytically speaking, *Idaike*'s conflict between the desire to have a child, and the desire to kill her child, was unconsciously transmitted to her son. On reaching adolescence, he attempted in turn to kill his mother.

In the logic of prenatal rancor, a child must recognize the sexual union between the parents that resulted in his or her own birth. Seen in the context of traditional psychoanalysis, which stresses the child's need to accept that the mother is a sexual object for the

father, *mishoon* involves the question of the primal scene.

Prenatal rancor furthermore involves a questioning and an investigation of one's origins: "Who were my parents?" "How was I brought into the world?" To answer the question of identity, one must know the circumstances of one's birth. It was in adolescence, when curiosity as to his personal history led *Ajase* to discover *Idaike*'s conflict concerning his birth, that the Prince was overcome with prenatal rancor.

Moreover, while children are conceived between a mother and father, the responsibilities of pregnancy, delivery, and child rearing (or alternately of abortion) are often imposed on the mother alone. The story of *Ajase* also illustrates the mother's suffering when the father offers no support with the emotional burdens of giving birth to and raising a child. The child's empathy for the mother's suffering, and anger towards the father, are other elements involved in the theme of prenatal rancor.

In clinical practice, those who manifest most vividly the prenatal rancor aspect of the *Ajase* complex are adolescent boys and girls. *Ajase* himself attempted to kill his mother on reaching adolescence. In this connection, the author would like to present the concrete example of the second clinical case.

Case 2—Akira, who exhibits violent behavior at home and refuses to attend school, asked question: "Why did you have me?"

Akira is a fourteen-year-old boy in the second year of middle school. His mother is what is known as a "kept woman" (a concubine). His father has visited Akira and his mother for nearly fifteen years. Akira came under treatment because of school refusal and violent behavior at home. From the onset of adolescence, he suffered from his legal status as an illegitimate child and turned his anger on his father. Akira blamed his father for not having recognized Akira and his mother, and accused him of irresponsibility.

At this point in time, Akira's mother complained vociferously to her son that his father was a "sneak" who had deceived her, and that he did not carry out his promises. They were in their current predicament for this reason. Spurred on in such a way, Akira began to create disturbances when his father arrived, lashing out at him and behaving violently.

During the course of events, however, Akira's anger gradually turned on his mother, as he asked himself why she had given birth to him under the circumstances. When his father was not present, he began to criticize his mother for having given birth to a child when she could not marry. Furthermore, though Akira's mother fiercely abused his father when he was absent, when his father arrived to spend the night, the two seemed to be on very good terms. The sight of such intimacy between his parents was intolerable to Akira, and only increased his anger. He would fly into a particular rage on feeling that his mother and father were, as man and woman, engaged in what he called "flirting." He would become violent towards his mother, screaming "Drop dead!" or "You're always complaining, but when Dad comes, you turn into a doormat and wag your tail, you're glued to him. You make me sick!" It reached the point where he threatened to strangle his mother.

As a result of these incidents, Akira stopped attending school, although he had previously been an excellent, dedicated student. He shut himself in his room, saying that he hated himself and wanted to die.

I thus began joint therapy with Akira, his mother, and his father. Our sessions began with Akira expressing all sorts of doubts and frustrations concerning his parents, and proceeded as, in my presence, Akira's parents took turns responding to their son and recalling the past. Finally, Akira turned to the circumstances surrounding his birth, asking why his parents had had a child when they could not marry. Akira was haunted by the belief that his mother's pregnancy had been motivated by a desire to create a bond with her lover, an idea he eventually came to express. This aspect of the case revealed a very close resemblance to the story of *Ajase*.

Akira's mother admitted to her son that such had been the case. She had been in love with his father, though unable to marry him, and—wanting to affirm her love and strengthen the bond between them—had decided to bring her child to term rather than undergo an abortion. In response, Akira accused his mother of irresponsibility, and demanded why she had brought him into the world; however, his tone eventually changed. That his parents (although they had certainly considered it) were unable to carry out an abortion meant in effect that they had been unable to kill him. Akira gradually realized that behind his desire to know why he had been born lay a wish to discover why his parents had not aborted him. It became clear to him that they had not wanted to do so, and for that reason he now existed.

Furthermore, Akira's father explained that he had not intended to deceive Akira's mother—it was with the intention of marrying that the two had agreed to keep their child. If he had been a “sneak,” he would surely have persuaded Akira's mother to accept the inevitability of an abortion. Sincerely believing at the time that he would be able to divorce and remarry, Akira's father had wanted to have the child as a pledge of their love. In present-day Japan, however, if a man falls in love with another woman, he cannot divorce without the permission of his legal wife. Akira's father is still thinking of divorce; however, according to him, his wife and children remain opposed. (He spends approximately half the week with Akira and his mother, in actuality, and the situation is to some degree acknowledged by his legal family.) As he listened to his mother and father, Akira began to realize that, in comparison to families united only by formal law, real love existed between his parents, and between his parents and himself.

Akira's violent behavior came to an end over the course of these experiences, and the family's home life returned to order. He furthermore returned to school, where, having been gifted at the outset, he was swiftly able to readjust. Two years later, he entered high school with no difficulty. Akira is pleasantly leading an emotionally healthy life.

Considered from the point of view of Akira's psychological process, on entering adolescence and beginning individuation, the identification with his mother began to dissolve. This experience of separation led him to search for his origins, and to question whether his mother had become pregnant in order to strengthen her ties with his father. Furthermore, when she was alone with her son, Akira's mother behaved as though she lived for him alone, and abused Akira's father as a villain. When her lover arrived, however, she would do an about face and show herself as a woman, attaching herself to his side and behaving seductively. This double aspect of his mother was extremely difficult for the adolescent Akira to tolerate.

Among the reasons for which Akira's anger took the conscious form of prenatal rancor

were the difficulties he and his mother experienced living on their own, and his anguish as an adolescent on becoming conscious of social disapproval of his family situation. However, a short period of interventional therapy sufficed to restore the unity of the family, and Akira's good relations with his parents.

In adolescence, many children feel deep anxiety over the circumstances of their birth, and confront the problem of their origins by searching for their true parents. These issues involve prenatal rancor. In searching to discover how they were born, how they came into existence, these children exhibit a fundamental resentment towards the roots of their identity: "Why was I born this way?" "Why did I have to come into the world under these circumstances?" This prenatal rancor is one of the fundamental themes of the *Ajase* complex.

[IV] Problems Concerning the Feeling of Guilt in the *Ajase* Complex

In the context of Buddhism, *Ajase* is most often presented as a scoundrel who attempted to put an end to his mother. Nevertheless, he became an enlightened sovereign after being saved by the Buddha. A clear contrast can be seen with the treatment of crime and punishment in the story of Oedipus. Oedipus, feeling himself to be guilty, condemns himself to a life of blindness and exile. He lives, in other words, with the burden of his crime. By contrast, *Ajase* is eventually cared for and saved by the mother he attempted to kill. Through the character of the mother, the story seeks to put in evidence the vast compassion of the Buddha, a compassion which leads to the pardoning of *Ajase*'s crime.

According to Kosawa, *Ajase*'s feeling of guilt undergo a change over the course of the story. His guilt first appears as a fear of retaliation for wrongdoing. In the author's opinion, this resembles the "punitive" or "persecutory" guilt described by the school of Melanie Klein (1946). After attempting to kill his mother, however, *Ajase* is frightened at the possibility of punishment and falls gravely ill. His mother, however, not only pardons her son, but also takes charge of nursing him. *Ajase* then experiences a second type of guilt: not fear of punishment, but rather remorse towards his mother. This second type of guilt is close to what Klein terms "reparative" guilt. It is no longer clear at this date to what extent Kosawa was influenced by Melanie Klein, but the author would like to note that Kosawa's argument dates from 1932.

The theme of a sinner saved by the Buddha, as it appears in the *Ajase* legend, is very familiar to Japanese. This dynamism represents the other side of human relations described by Takeo Doi's (1973) concept of *amae*, and is important for understanding personal relations in Japan. One party forgives, the other feels remorse, with a resulting experience of mutual pardon. This world of mutual pardon is clearly illustrated by the *Ajase* story. The centrality of sutras such as the Kan muryo ju kyo (The Sutra of Contemplation of Infantile Life) to the popular tradition, moreover, lies in this point.

However, the psychoanalyst Ramon Ganzarain (1988) has noted several defense mechanisms as regards the treatment of guilt in the *Ajase* complex. The first defense mechanism he cites is the "sharing" of guilt—by sharing guilt with another, one is discharged of responsibility. For instance, when the Buddha saves *Ajase*, he does so through the argument that he himself, by making *Ajase*'s father king, initiated the string

of unfortunate events that occurred between *Ajase* and his parents. The teaching that no one person bears guilt alone, as all people are sinners, offers a salvation that erases the problem of guilt. This process is evident in any religion. In Buddhism, however, it is specifically linked to the idea of self-renunciation, to the concept that the limiting of guilt or sin to an individual is illusion; people's crimes arrive rather from various karmic relations.

The second mechanism of defense is denial by rationalization or reasoning. From the psychological point of view of *Ajase*, the Prince is told a number of secrets concerning his origins that justify his attempted murder of his mother; a pattern which also justifies his anger towards her. In terms of a psychoanalytic interpretation, it is important to understand that *Ajase*'s inherent desire to kill his mother was rationalized and acted out by his learning the secret of his birth.

The third mechanism is confusion. The Buddhist world of salvation in the *Ajase* story, from the point of view of a Westerner such as Ganzarain, represents a state that should rather be termed "confusion." In this situation, no one is really guilty, and no one knows who should be blamed; everyone is saved by mutual identification. Elements such as individuality, subjectivity, and the boundaries of self, are erased.

Ganzarain's identification of various psychic defense mechanisms against guilt brings into sharp focus the difference between the author's own Buddhist interpretation of the story, and that of a Christian such as Ganzarain. Clearly, as a Buddhist, the author has the tendency to affirm and idealize to some extent the idea of salvation as it appears in the story of *Ajase*, and to identify with it. Ganzarain's attitude, however, which considers this form of salvation to be itself a defense mechanism against guilt, is more truly psychoanalytic. Although the author agrees with him intellectually, the author cannot disengage himself easily emotionally. The author received a type of culture shock from this confrontation, which led the author to make many new discoveries.

Mutual pardon itself can thus be seen as a defense mechanism against guilt, and the acting out of anger and resentment towards one's parents on learning of one's origins, a mechanism to justify inherent aggression against one's parents. This view is clearly important to the treatment of adolescents. In this light, it becomes necessary to pursue discussion of "two types of guilt" in the *Ajase* story from the point of view of defense mechanisms as well as that of socio-cultural context.

[V] The Difficulties of the Mother Who Has Lost Her Husband's Support

Kosawa's version of the *Ajase* story focused on the conflicts between mother and child, particularly the suffering of the mother connected with the issue of infanticide. When the author spoke to the well-known American family psychiatrist Theodore Lidz (1989) about the *Ajase* story, he suggested the following interpretation.

The tragedy of the *Ajase* story arises from the fact that—although the parents have together created, and should together raise, a child—the father does not assume his role and leaves the child's fate in the hands of the mother alone. In other words, Lidz suggested that the point of departure for the *Ajase* complex was the tragedy of the mother, as a wife or a woman, having lost the support of her husband or male partner. The author

believes this is a very important interpretation. Lately, the author has thought of Lidz's insight as one of the important themes of the *Ajase* complex. Despite the existence of an Oedipal, triangular world of mother, father, and child, the mother is haunted by the idea that she must take responsibility for the child in an exclusively dyadic relation. It is the conflict between mother and child in such a relationship—where a split appears between the idealized mother who wields all—powerful love and control and the frightening mother who wields the right of death—that the author believes Kosawa attempted to describe with the *Ajase* complex.

If one approaches the problem from a cultural angle, The Sutra of the Contemplation of Infantile Life became central to Japanese Buddhism approximately nine hundred years ago. To give a brief historical overview, Buddhism, which originated in India, came to Japan in the sixth century by way of China and Korea. It was not, however, until the Kamakura period (1185–1333) that there appeared a type of Buddhism that could properly be called Japanese. Its founders, who included Nichiren (1222–1282) and Shinran (1173–1262), sought to establish a popular Buddhism removed from the Chinese philosophy which had characterized it up to that time. A topic of great importance in this popularization was the enlightenment of women, in particular the salvation of mothers. Behind this topic lay the issue of infanticide, practiced in the form of “selection,” or of abortion. The Sutra of the Contemplation of Infantile Life played an important part in assuaging the guilt of mothers who had killed or aborted their infants.

During the Edo Period (1603–1868), the population of Japan remained stable at between 30 and 35 million. This era was punctuated with many periods of famine, during which children were often killed by abortion or “selection.” Furthermore, in Japan, there has been the historical tradition that this responsibility falls solely on the mother. For this reason, the salvation of mothers who had killed or aborted their children became a central topic for Japanese Buddhism.

There exist in Japanese shamanism certain rites by which the deceased takes possession of a medium (*miko*) and returns to meet with the living. Among these rites, one of the most important is a memorial service for “selected” or aborted children (called *mizuko* or “water children” in Japanese), in which the child meets and pardons the mother through the intercession of a medium.

The author has thus far spoken of the *Ajase* complex in the context of the “maternal” society of Japan, where the phrase “fatherless family” has become common, and where the father continues to work outside the home while the raising of children falls to the mother. However, it might also give insight into circumstances in the West, which has recently seen the progress of feminism, and a growing number of single mothers (particularly in the Scandinavian countries).

[VI] On the Sources of the *Ajase* Complex

Japanese Buddhist scholars have variously criticized Kosawa's use of Buddhist legend in his theory of the *Ajase* complex. They argue that whereas the *Ajase* story as it appears in The Nirvana Sutra and Shinran's text focuses (like the Oedipus complex) on father and son and the theme of patricide, Kosawa transformed the legend into a story of mother and

child. While these criticisms are not entirely unjustified, it seems to the author that one could, like Kosawa, arrive at a different interpretation of the *Ajase* legend by emphasizing the mother-child story of The Sutra of the Contemplation of Infantile Life.

In terms of constructing a psychoanalytic argument, various factors lay behind Kosawa's decision to emphasize the dyadic world of mother and child. First, he wanted to define the boundary of his theme: prenatal rancor and the question of origins, as opposed to the themes of the Oedipus complex. Secondly, he wanted to emphasize the essential resentment towards (and particularly the desire to kill) the mother harbored by every human being. Thirdly, he wanted to highlight the anger and resentment of the child confronted with the fact that his or her mother was first of all a woman, and that his or her own origins lie in the sexual relation between the parents as man and woman. Finally, Kosawa wanted to underline the tragedy of mothers who had lost the support of their husbands. In other words, he wished to show the conflicts mothers experience in relation to their children when no help is available from their own mothers or family with pregnancy and childraising.

In addition, it is not unusual for psychoanalysts, when using a story from the classics as a metaphor for their own insights, to select and expand on those parts consistent with their own ideas, while ignoring or omitting others. In the case of the Oedipus complex, for instance, attention has recently been turned to the parts of the Oedipus legend which precede those selected by Freud, and which describe the events leading up to the birth of Oedipus to Laius and Jocasta.

As punishment for various instances of misconduct, a curse was placed on Laius: should he produce a son, the child would bring about misfortune. Laius thus determined never to have a child. However, he became drunk one evening and had sexual relations with his wife. The child born of this union was Oedipus. As an oracle had predicted that Oedipus would kill his father, he was thrown into the river directly after birth.

Freud omitted this initial half of the legend, and designated the "Oedipus complex" only those conflicts experienced by the son towards his parents. If Freud had taken up the story in its entirety, several themes in common with the story of *Ajase* would have become evident. In Otto Rank's The Myth of the Birth of the Hero (1909), there appear many tales and legends resembling that of Oedipus; however, all recount the story of the parents as it relates to the hero's birth.

It is this aspect of the *Ajase* legend, linked to the circumstances preceding the Prince's birth, that Kosawa extracted from the Buddhist texts to make his principal subject. This transformation allowed him to express his own psychoanalytic insights in the form of a metaphor. Kosawa's version of the legend, which replaced a father-child story with one centering on mother and child, reflected his perception of Japanese family relations, whereas it is possible to discern in Freud's theory of the Oedipus complex the impact of a Judeo-Christian heritage.

[VII] Final Remarks

It is interesting to examine the opinions recently offered by Marie Balmory (1988) and Marianne Krull (1988) concerning how, as he was in the process of formulating his

theory of the Oedipus complex, Freud moved from a theory of psychic trauma to one of interior drives. They argue that Freud's discovery of the errors of his father (with regard to Sigmund's own birth), and defenses against this knowledge, played a role in the above mentioned transition.

According to these two authors, Jacob Freud (Sigmund Freud's father) was already married to a woman named Rebecca before marrying Freud's mother Amarie. While living with Rebecca, he became intimate with Amarie, at the time a young woman of twenty, who subsequently became pregnant. If Rebecca disappeared, or committed suicide, as a result, we can easily imagine that Sigmund might have associated himself with somber images in his parents' psychic world as their "imaginary baby."

If Freud had retraced the events surrounding his birth in an attempt to find his own roots, he might have read the Oedipus story as that of someone searching for his identity. However, must not there have been some repression or split in Freud's psyche as concerned this theme? A reexamination of the Oedipus complex from the point of view of the *Ajase* theory might prove extremely significant.

References

- Balmory M 1979: *L'Homme aux Statues*. Editions Grasset et Fasquelle. Translation by Hiroshi Iwasaki, Tetsugaku Shobo, 1988.
- Doi T 1973: *The Anatomy of Dependence*. Tokyo: Kodansha International, Ltd.
- Ganzarain R 1988: Various Guilts within the Ajase Complex (Translation by Okonogi, K.). *Japanese Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 32 (2): 93–102.
- Grinberg L 1964: Two Kinds of Guilt—Their Relations with Normal and Pathological Aspects of Mourning. *Int. J. Psychoanal.*, 45.
- Grinberg L 1978: The "Razor's Edge" in Depression and Mourning. *The Goals of Psychoanalysis*. London: Karnac Books, 1990.
- Grinberg L 1992: *Guilt and Depression*. London: Karnac Books.
- Klein M 1939: A Contribution to the Psychogenesis of Manic-Depressive States. *Contributions to Psycho-Analysis, 1921–1945*. London: The Hogarth Press, 1948.
- Klein M 1940: Mourning and Its Relation to Manic-Depressive States. *Contributions to Psycho-Analysis, 1921–1945*. The Hogarth Press.
- Klein M 1952: Notes on Some Schizoid Mechanisms. *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.* 27: 99–110; republished (1952) in *Melanie Klein, Paula Heimann, Susan Isaacs and John Riviere, Developments in Psycho-Analysis*. The Hogarth Press, pp. 292–320.
- Klein M 1960: A Note on Depression in the Schizophrenic. *Envy and Gratitude & Other Works*. The Hogarth Press, 1975.
- Kosawa H 1934: Two Kinds of Guilt. *Japanese Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 1, 1954.
- Kosawa H 1953: Final Version of the Ajase Story, in the translator's afterword, "Japanese version of Neue Folge der Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse, 1932."
- Krühl M 1979: *Freund sein Vater*, C. H. Beckesche Verlag, Münden. Translation by Setsuo Mizuno, Shisakusha. 1987.
- Lebovici S 1988: Fantasmatic Interaction and Intergenerational Transmission. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 9 (1).
- Okonogi K 1978: The Ajase Complex of the Japanese (1). *Japan Echo*, 5 (4): 88–105.
- Okonogi K 1979: The Ajase Complex of the Japanese (1). *Japan Echo*, 6 (1): 104–118.

- Okonogi K 1991: Le Complex d'Ajase. *Devnir*, 4, pp. 71–102.
- Pollock George H Oedipus: The Myth, the Development Stage, the Universal Theme, the Conflict and Complex in 19 below.
- Pollock George H, Ross JM 1988: *The Oedipus Papers*. International University Press.
- Rank O 1909: *The Myth of the Birth of the Hero*. New York: Robert Brunner, 1951.
- Raphael-Leff J 1989: Freud, S on of Jocasta. Invited paper presented to the International Conference on Prenatal and Perinatal Psychology. Amherst, Mass., August (unpublished).
- Raphael-Leff J 1992: Mother of Ajase and Jocasta. Invited paper presented to The Tokyo Meeting of Infant Psychiatry, Tokyo.
- Ross, John Munder. Oedipus Revisited: Laius and the “Laius Complex” in 19 above.
- Shinran 1966: Kyo gyo shin sho, Ryukoku Translation Series, vol. V. Kyoto: Ryukoku University, 1966.
- Suzuki DT 1973: The Kyo gyo shin sho: The Collection of Passages Expounding the True Teaching, Living, Faith and Realizing of the Pure Land. Kyoto: Shinshu Otani-ha.
- The Sutra of Contemplation on the Buddha of Immeasurable Life. Kyoto: Ryukoku University Translation Center (1984).

Theories on the Ajase Complex

The therapeutic method of Kosawa Heisaku: 'Religion' and 'the psy disciplines'¹

Christopher Harding

While many psychoanalysts from Freud's generation up until the late twentieth century were generally critical towards—or at the very least ambivalent about—religion, in recent years influential voices in psychoanalysis, psychiatry, and psychology have been calling for a revision of such attitudes. A raft of new publications has appeared on the relationship between religion, on the one hand, and the 'psy disciplines'² and mental health on the other, alongside initiatives by clinicians both internationally and in individual countries such as Japan and the UK aimed at understanding and harnessing the healing potential of religious practices and outlooks.³ Clearly there are dangers alongside advantages in bringing religion and mental health into closer contact, hence there have been calls for caution and for the current popularity of therapies and practices that are derived from religious traditions—'mindfulness' being the most high-profile example—not to be allowed to obscure the philosophical and methodological incompatibilities that may exist between the worlds of religion and the psy disciplines.⁴

From a historical point of view, one of the major questions raised by this trend towards a renewed dialogue between religion and the psy disciplines, is whether what are supposedly being brought into closer contact here ever existed apart from one another in the first place, in any clearly definable way. Might it be, instead, that our current understanding of them as separate is at least in part the result of processes akin to what Thomas Gieryn called 'boundary work': intellectual and institutional efforts, often ideologically motivated, at artificially carving out domains of responsibility and expertise over time, at the expense of rival disciplines or ideas? One thinks in particular of the modern marginalization of religion as something irredeemably anti-rational, epitomized by cognitive beliefs about the world that are manifestly false, reducible to human psychological need, and superseded in any conceivable practical benefits by modern humanist psychotherapies and communitarianism.⁵

The psychodynamic tradition, from Freud and Jung onwards, has of course been greatly interested in religion, both because of the tradition's characteristic view of mental health and illness not as clearly dichotomous states but as a continuum that encompasses

Initially published in the Japanese Contribution. Vol.4 (2014) pp.151–168.

Dr CHRISTOPHER HARDING, DPhil (Oxon) FRHistS

Cultural historian in India and Japan, Lecturer in Asian History at University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom.

(and so warrants analytic attention towards) all of human experience, and because behavioural characteristics understood to be connected to a religious upbringing and outlook, from guilt to scrupulousness, have been a feature of so many seminal analyses and theories. Both Freud and Jung approached religion in the modernist, functional mood of their time—in terms of what it *does*, for or against the interests of an individual or a society, whether in the Freudian sense of helping to bolster civilized society (a role for which Freud hoped religion would one day no longer be required⁶) or in the Jungian vein of providing support in an individual's process of individuation.⁷ This 'rationalization'—in the Weberian sense—of religion was a form of boundary work, firmly delineating the proper purviews of religion and the psy disciplines and contrasting them to one another. The former was now domesticated by the latter as a socio-cultural and a psychological phenomenon. This boundary work was more successful in Freud's psychology—though it has been criticized⁸—than in Jung's. Freud's response to the French poet and mystic Romain Rolland, who accused him of missing the rootedness of religion in an individual's profound ('oceanic') experience—his or her 'feeling for the 'eternal''⁹—is instructive. Rolland had been willing, even eager, for religious experience to be subjected to scientific, particularly psychological, scrutiny, because the future he hoped for was one in which science and religion came together to cut through illusion and self-deception of all kinds (including immature forms of religiosity), and honestly to pursue truth and justice.¹⁰ And yet Freud met Rolland's challenge by making Rolland himself the starting point of *Civilization and Its Discontents*, in which Freud sought to explain—or explain away—the oceanic feeling in terms of a developmental quirk that allowed an individual's pre-Oedipal, primary ego-feeling to persist into, or reappear in, later life.¹¹ Although, as William Parsons has pointed out, Freud seemed tacitly to offer a distinction between the common man's religion and the more elevated sort practiced by someone like Rolland (hoping, it seemed, to preserve both his arguments in *The Future of an Illusion* and his friendship with Rolland), nevertheless for Freud religion, as a phenomenon ultimately arising from the body just like any other feature of individual and collective human behaviour, was open to explanation in the same way as any other aspect of culture.¹²

For Jung, on the other hand, as for many others since who have been interested in 'post-critical belief'—or what Paul Ricoeur described as a 'second naïveté'—an intellectual critique of religion was compatible with its ongoing positive power in a person's life because the two ran along separate, parallel tracks. It was a question of concepts/signs on the one hand, and on the other irreducible symbols, channelling the potency of the experiential and facilitating the healing power of the unconscious.¹³ The question of whether or not Jung's 'processes of the psyche' had any metaphysical, transcendent correlates or implications was left undetermined by Jung¹⁴, who professed himself lacking in competence on such matters, being (only) a psychologist—though at times he seemed to let slip his ideas and hopes.¹⁵ Either way, Jung blurred Freud's boundary work by implicitly positing a shared terrain for religion and the psy disciplines—that of symbol and myth—of which no adequate conceptual meta-account can be given.

Boundary work between traditions and systems concerned with the self and its development was powerfully in evidence in Meiji Japan too, linked with the emergence and evolution of neologisms and related realms of new and revitalized disciplines and

institutions: *shūkyō*, *tetsugaku*, *shinrigaku/ryōhō*, *seishinigaku/ryōhō*, and indeed *seishin-bunseki*. Recent work by Shimazono Susumu, Janine Anderson Sawada, Gerald Figal, Gerard Clinton Godart, and Jason Ananda Josephson appears to coalesce broadly around the view that Japan inherited from the late Tokugawa era—and from earlier *yamabushi* culture—a concern with the shaping and cultivation of the self, often through systematized bodily practices. Onto this was then imposed a new conceptual matrix formed from Japanese versions of modern western categories, reinforced by the government's state-building agenda and the new university and clinical institutions that were beneficiaries of these political priorities.¹⁶ This role played by politics in the formation and early manipulation of new concepts and institutions is clear in Figal's study of the Buddhist reformer and pioneer of *shinriryōhō*, Inoue Enryō: Inoue was interested in defending a reformed Buddhism, combatting the influence of Christianity, and in being seen to support government policy of the time in ridding Japan of 'superstition'—the precise dividing line between *meishin* (superstition) and *shūkyō* (religion) itself established through key processes of boundary work.¹⁷

The present-day renaissance of religious praxis as 'therapeutic', and the questions and doubts that surround how we delineate the 'religious' versus the 'psy', make this a good time to re-examine the life and work of Kosawa Heisaku: an individual central to Japanese psychoanalysis, whose religious commitments have generally been taken for granted rather than explored in any detail. In this essay, which is part of on-going work both on Kosawa and on the lay analyst Ohtsuki Kenji, to both of whose personal papers I have been privileged to receive access in recent months, I offer some thoughts on the place of religion in Kosawa's psychoanalytic ideas and therapy. Rather than re-trace the valuable ground already covered in previous analyses of Kosawa's method, especially by Maeda Shigeharu¹⁸, I base my analysis on a reading of Kosawa's personal correspondence and the recollections of two of his former clients. One of these clients was the last of Kosawa's career: the novelist Setouchi Harumi, who following her taking of Buddhist vows (receiving the name Setouchi Jakuchō) became arguably the preeminent religious voice in contemporary Japan.

*

Four elements seem to have been crucial to the formation of Kosawa's theory and therapeutic practice, although it is important not to assume too much at the outset about the solidity of such a categorization: his own personal experience, especially from early through to late childhood; typical early twentieth-century Japanese family structures and expectations (for relatively wealthy families, at any rate); the Jōdo Shinshū (or 'Shin') sect of Japanese Buddhism, which emphasized the surrender of a fragile human being to something greater, encompassing, and—on some readings of the Ajase story—maternal in the way that human beings experience it; and the new discipline of psychoanalysis, to which Kosawa became attracted while at university. Two aspects in particular of Kosawa's childhood have been linked to the development of his theory and therapeutic style. Firstly, both Takeda Makoto and Kita Keiko have suggested that Kosawa's time with his ten-year old nanny—in particular his separation from his mother and on one

occasion the experience of being tied to a tree while the other children played—may have contributed significantly towards both his feeling of an existential grudge and his longing for the maternal.¹⁹ Secondly, Kosawa's son, Yorio, noted that his father's hospitalization with serious eye problems as a boy was probably crucial to the intensification of his involvement with Shin Buddhism, which had begun with his acquaintance with the Shin Buddhist priest Chikazumi Jōkan a couple of years earlier.²⁰

Letters written to family and colleagues during and just after Kosawa's time in Vienna in 1932–3—during which he had a training analysis with Richard Sterba, was supervised by Paul Federn, and spent time working on his thesis—shed new light on Kosawa's mixed familial and religious concerns in this early period of his life.²¹ It is now clear that despite the weight usually placed on Kosawa's months of training with major European psychoanalysts, Richard Sterba thought that Kosawa's time with him had amounted to 'nothing more than the opening phase of an analysis'.²² Nevertheless, Sterba believed himself to have acquired, even in this short time, a reliable sense of what was driving Kosawa in his early adult relationships and work: he noted Kosawa's tremendously aggressive attitude towards his father—which 'clearly stemmed from the Oedipus Complex'—together with a 'childlike dependence and close connection to [his] mother'. Sterba thought he saw these early childhood experiences playing out in the young adult Kosawa, particularly in Kosawa's difficult relationship with Professor Marui Kiyoyasu in Sendai.²³ Twenty years later Kosawa's student, Doi Takeo, in criticizing Kosawa's style of analysis, made related suggestions about Kosawa's penchant for the maternal: both an attachment to the figure of his mother and to a motherly style as an analyst.²⁴

One wonders whether, had Kosawa spent longer in analysis with Sterba, his Ajase Complex theory, on which he was working while in Vienna, might have turned out rather differently. It seems that the real significance of Kosawa's time in Vienna lay not so much in the training and mentoring he received there, though this was crucial to his later professional status in Japan, but rather in the insights about his own life arising from his analysis with Sterba and possibly from the chance to reflect that was afforded to him by spending an extended period of time away from Japan. Kosawa confided to his brother, Ichiro, that he actually thought very little of psychoanalysis as it was practiced in Vienna: with the exception of Freud himself, Kosawa thought that his own method of therapy and understanding of psychoanalysis was superior to everyone he met in Vienna, and that it wasn't worth wasting too much time and money being analyzed in Europe. He was eager instead to return home to begin work.²⁵ He felt vindicated in this judgment when Federn himself made approving comments about Kosawa's developing thesis²⁶, and when he suggested at one point that Kosawa really didn't need any further analytic training with him and should instead move on to more advanced matters.²⁷ Kosawa also wrote to his brother about the thinking he had been doing where their father was concerned. He noted that he had finally managed to get his interview with Freud almost exactly one year after their father's death: although their father had had his bad points, Kosawa reflected, he had surely been an incarnation of Amida—'*Amida no gonge*'—and was now looking after him. Everything, Kosawa added, is the work of *mihotoke*, the work of the Buddha. He vowed to his brother that he would return to Japan as soon as he could, and would present his finished thesis at their father's grave.²⁸

Following his return from Europe, Kosawa's new practice in Tokyo garnered interest from clients at a rapid rate. Extant client records suggest that Kosawa saw at least four hundred new clients between 1933 and 1936—possibly more, since some client records from that period may have been lost. Kosawa's diagnoses at this point, detailed in notes written partly in German and partly in Japanese, included obsessional neurosis, depression, schizophrenia, hysteria, kleptomania, alcoholism (of which Kosawa had seen a great deal at the hospital in Vienna where he had worked²⁹), stutter, and fear of leprosy. Only a small proportion of these new clients entered long-term analysis with Kosawa, with the majority of the records indicating just a single visit or a short series of visits.

Besides the clients who came to Kosawa in person, a large number of people wrote to him seeking advice, both before and after the war—particularly from the mid-1950s, following the publication of Kosawa's translations of books by Karl Menninger. Here Kosawa seemed to benefit from the social and professional boundary work that was taking place in Japan between the German-influenced university psychiatry of the day, which was concerned mainly with research and with major psychoses, and the range of more intimate, accessible, clinic-based therapies that straddled medicine, religion, folk healing, and self-cultivation. Although the fact that Kosawa was constrained to work outside the university system is often cited as one of the reasons why both he and psychoanalysis exerted less influence than they might have done in the prewar and immediate postwar periods, Kosawa clearly made a virtue of this situation. The newspaper adverts and signboards that he placed around Tokyo explicitly encouraged people to contact him about any little thing that might be bothering them—one newspaper advert mentioned '*sōdan, oyobi shidō*': consultation/advice and guidance. People took him at his word, particularly during the peak period for his psychoanalytical practice during the years immediately after the war. One woman wrote to him with the concern that her child had become interested in Christianity and was considering the monastic life. Was this a mental health problem, she wanted to know? A young male correspondent said he really loved strong women and that he became sexually aroused in exams when the 'five minutes left' announcement was made—he wanted to know whether this was normal. And a second young man had recently met two women on arranged dates (*omiai*) and wanted Kosawa's help to decide which of the two he should pursue.³⁰

It is impossible to determine at what length, on average, Kosawa replied to such letters. He did, however, see real therapeutic value in such epistolary exchanges: this is clear from his development of the method of *tsūshin bunseki*, or psychoanalysis by correspondence. Kosawa began to develop the method after a patient, constrained to finish his analysis with Kosawa early after thirty-three sessions, suffered a relapse but was unable to come back for therapy. Kosawa wondered whether written free association, with which he had been experimenting personally, might 'serve the same purpose as spoken free association'. After nine exchanges of letters, the patient had been relieved of his symptoms, and Kosawa reported that his new method had gone on to prove useful in twelve other cases so far, including a patient suffering ambulatory schizophrenia. Kosawa also used this method for a while with Doi Takeo.³¹ Karl Menninger, to whom Kosawa wrote about *tsūshin bunseki*, showed some initial concern over Kosawa's approach, but agreed with

Kosawa that Freud had used something similar with a number of his acquaintances. In his correspondence with Menninger, Kosawa made a conciliatory move by saying that this was obviously not ‘psychoanalysis’ as such, but rather ‘psychoanalytically oriented psychotherapy by mail’. Yet he insisted that he was faithfully developing Freud’s own experiments with written free association, in a way that Freud’s other disciples had overlooked.³²

Showing a similar attitude in dealing with Menninger as he had with Freud, in being led less by professional niceties and etiquette than by the questions that most fired his enthusiasm, Kosawa added to his unconventional discussion of *tsūshin bunseki* by volunteering in a letter that his ‘religious belief’ played a key role in his therapy. Although the letter that Kosawa promised to send Menninger on this topic appears never to have been written—perhaps a consequence of the various pressures on Kosawa in the mid-1950s and then his worsening health from the late 1950s onwards³³—other aspects of his correspondence with Menninger are revealing of how features of human experience that we might now naturally separate out into religion, family, and therapy featured in Kosawa’s life and work in a way that transcended, or was prior to, such separations. On one occasion, Kosawa posed a question to Menninger—‘This is important to me’, he said of it—which is worth quoting at length:

In my clinical experience as a psychoanalyst, there were occasions in which either the father or the mother of my clients died or met accident while the patient was showing good progress. In view of the psychological relationship between my patients and their parents, especially the effect of my patients’ recovery from their neuroses upon their parents, these incidents gave me food for much thought.

I was wondering: assuming that the life of one person was absorbed by another person so that the latter may survive (recover from neuroses), and that the life of the former was eventually impaired or interrupted; and assuming that man prefers to stay in this world retaining the physical body, [rather than] departing to the other world—how am I to interpret the foregoing phenomena?

I mean to say: there are occasions in which the parent’s physical welfare is affected when his (her) child’s neurosis is relieved. In other words, the parent might live 15 years provided that his (her) child remained neurotic, whereas the parent might live only 10 years if (and when) the child is cured of its neuroses.

The question is this: should the parent be content to see his (her) child recover—revive—even at the cost of his (her) life (longevity)? If one could believe in the spiritual life after death, there is no question.

Kosawa went on in this letter to ponder the fact that three people involved in the recent Japanese translation of Menninger’s *The Human Mind* had since fallen ill, including Kosawa himself, with one of them already dead and another dying of tuberculosis. As an extension of his idea that the positive progress of a patient might adversely affect

the health of someone close to them, Kosawa wondered whether ‘these happenings [to people involved with *The Human Mind* translation] represent the process of one’s self-destructive instinct being liquidated, thanks to the psychoanalysis effected by ‘The Human Mind’’.³⁴

The first thing to note here is that Kosawa was writing to Menninger from his ‘sick bed... [where he was] confronted with profound problems of life’—an echo of his hospitalization more than thirty years before, which his son Yorio claimed had deepened his commitment to Shin Buddhism. Kosawa was clearly thinking over the high cost to his health of his efforts at promoting psychoanalysis in Japan, and was linking this to the clinical phenomenon he had observed of parents suffering for the progress of their children. This seems to have been more than merely a useful metaphor, of Kosawa ‘fathering’—perhaps ‘mothering’ would be more apt, given his maternal instinct—psychoanalysis in Japan: familial connectedness, the metaphysical fate of the person, religion, and science are all present here, as Kosawa thinks out loud to Menninger. However, here as elsewhere, it is difficult to know precisely how Kosawa understood how all these things interrelated—or whether indeed he ever arrived at a settled understanding at all. What, for example, does Kosawa mean when he talks of ‘the other world’ and ‘spiritual life after death’—especially given the room within Shin Buddhism for interpreting the ‘Pure Land’ as a state of continued existence after death or as something more akin to a liberation from the ‘agonizing pattern of [dualistic] alternation’ between life and death, between good and bad?³⁵ We might loosely look at this as the evocative language—half questioning, half hopeful—of faith and intimacy, especially when set alongside Kosawa’s comments to his brother about their father (see above). We might also recall a feature both of Kosawa’s and Ohtsuki’s writing when it came to dealing with western, and particularly American colleagues, who were unfamiliar with the Japanese religious and philosophical context: both men tended to shift their rhetorical ground to cater for western cultural sensibilities, by talking about ‘God’ or, in Ohtsuki’s case, trying to spell out differences between the philosophical dualism of mainstream western Christianity—a deity that transcends its creation—and the non-dual Buddhist way of seeing the world, which Ohtsuki thought was closer to the truth of things and more compatible with psychoanalysis.³⁶

Perhaps the interpretation of Kosawa’s comments that fits most reliably with the rest of his writings is this: he prioritized first-person experience and the means for living life well, over and above philosophical analysis or the construction of meta-theories. In a revealing comment to Menninger, Kosawa wrote: ‘It is really a sad truth that I have been the only one who not only propagated psychoanalytical knowledge *but practiced and lived it*’.³⁷ It was in the practicing and the living that Kosawa most valued psychoanalysis—this was partly the cause, of course, of his break with the heavily theoretical Marui—and in which he saw little to distinguish psychoanalysis from Jōdo Shinshū. Indeed, he claimed that Freud himself had had a great semi-religious experience when fighting inside his small psychoanalytic circle in the early years had helped him to see that no-one, not even doctors and fully analyzed psychoanalysts, were free from imperfection and from resistances. ‘By this experience’, Kosawa wrote, in English-language notes for a public address, ‘Freudism was firmly established. This spirit is truly fitted

to the work of our Saint Shinran... there is no difference between these two spirits.³⁸ In the same notes he reminded himself and exhorted his audience—a mix of scientists and doctors, it seems³⁹—to:

...study over and over again, tracing... the route of Freud and then consider [it] for ourselves. I use the word ‘route’ of Freud instead of ‘science’. The science of Freud is his human character itself and the route that he walked. It is not a preparation of medicine kept secret by an old doctor’s house [school of thought], not a moral principle of an abstract sort usually [offered] by certain Oriental sages, but a route anyone can find and reach if he does his best.⁴⁰

For Kosawa, both Shinran and Freud were engaged in an effort to make clarity of seeing their bedrock in life, and to show others how they might achieve this for themselves. This seems to fit with Kosawa’s broad cultural inheritance from Inoue Enryō’s pragmatic application of psychology in general healing and in combatting superstition, and with Kosawa’s more direct and personal inheritance from his Shin Buddhist mentor Chikazumi Jōkan. Work by Iwata Fumiaki and Michael Radich has shown the extent to which Kosawa drew on Chikazumi’s personal experiences and writing in his formulation of his Ajase Complex theory: Iwata makes clear that Chikazumi’s own experience of illness and salvation played a part in Kosawa’s connection of the Ajase story to the psychological dynamics of family life and the possibilities for salvific consideration of one’s nature and destiny that the family context provides for—or, rather, sometimes forces upon—an individual.⁴¹

What, then, is this ‘seeing’, this ‘route of Freud’? In the Jōdo Shinshū tradition seeing one’s own weakness in particular is crucially important, because this awareness helps give rise to *shinjin*, or ‘true entrusting’: a dynamic blend of an act and an experience, which carries salvific potential—or which, on some readings, is itself the experience of being saved, of knowing that you have reached ‘the stage of the truly settled’.⁴² Shinran had left behind the Tendai Buddhist order because he felt unable to continue with its complex ritual and intellectual life. His focus instead became the implications of what he realized was his own absolute helplessness and that of other human beings. He came to emphasize the importance of the *nembutsu* and of *tariki*, ‘other power’—or the power of the Other to reach into human life and help to effect salvation. For Shinran humans are so unable truly to do good by themselves that even the recitation of the *nembutsu* cannot be considered a *self*-generated act: the initiative is ultimately being taken by the Other, by the celestial Buddha Amida, who grants human beings a share in his merit and guarantees their rebirth, after death, in his Pure Land.⁴³ As the Shin Buddhist educator and poet Kai Wariko, a near contemporary of Kosawa, put it:

The voice with which I call Amida Buddha
Is the voice with which Amida Buddha calls to me.

In other words, the point at which, and the means by which, we believe ourselves to be seeking some kind of salvation, to be ‘calling’ Amida Buddha, is in fact the point at

which, and the means by which something from outside (and yet at the same time intimately us) is seeking that salvation for us. For Kosawa, influenced by his own personal experience, as well as by Chikazumi's life and by what he read of Prince Ajase, the fundamental emotional challenges of the family situation give rise in the individual to an awareness of his or her inescapable weakness, in a way that has salvific potential in these Shin Buddhist terms.

There is little in Kosawa's writing, or in others' testimony about him, to suggest that he thought about any of this in terms of a dualism of the transcendent and the material. He seems not to have regarded a person's familial and psychological situation as being linked to some separate metaphysical order; nor to have imagined that psychological trauma and healing fulfill some kind of supra-psychological purpose. 'Religion versus psychoanalysis' would have been for Kosawa an unnecessary juxtaposition, although he was committed to maintaining the integrity of their differing languages and methods and to fulfilling the professional requirements of the practicing psychiatrist and psychoanalyst. This would seem to fit well with the observation frequently made about Japanese philosophy and aesthetics, that the phenomenal world is regarded as absolute.⁴⁴ Tendai Buddhism is said to capture this in the notion of *honkaku hōmon*, which implies that enlightenment is a matter of properly understanding the phenomenal rather than somehow moving away from it. Within the Zen Buddhist tradition, Dōgen wrote that 'the real aspect is all things'.⁴⁵ Whether we regard this as a longstanding Japanese view of the world, or as a modern essentialization of a more complex prior set of traditions, it is clear that in the Buddhist and philosophical circles of Kosawa's day, such a view was not uncommon.⁴⁶

Let us pursue this point by referring to the experience of two of Kosawa's clients, with whom I have recently conducted interviews. Mr Fukuda, as we shall call him, went to Kosawa in the mid-1940s plagued by fundamental self-doubt, which had tipped over into neurosis. Fukuda partly blames an old ethics teacher of his during the war, who taught pupils that a 'true man of character' would never display any emotion. Fukuda had put his hand up in class to ask whether the *having* of emotions was permitted, and being told that yes it was, he proceeded to ask more questions. The teacher apparently became quite angry, and put a stop to the exchange by accusing Fukuda of being a pointless quibbler and possibly a Communist. This didn't settle things for Fukuda, and when he walked past Kosawa's house in 1946, and noticed a sign saying '*seishinbunseki*', he decided to knock on the door. He ended up in therapy for around a year, towards the end of which time he recalls walking along the street and suddenly experiencing a falling away of his sense of self, replaced by what he calls a sense of 'being lived', or 'being lived through' by another, by something else. Not only did Mr Fukuda attribute this life-changing event to the effects of intensive analysis with Kosawa, but when he told Kosawa about it he received strong support: this, said Kosawa, is the altered sense of selfhood at which psychoanalysis aims but which it seems to struggle to achieve. Kosawa went on to say that without this sort of experience at its heart psychoanalysis would fail to progress. Although Kosawa never talked about Buddhism during Mr Fukuda's analyses, the two frequently discussed it over tea once the morning or afternoon's analysis was over, as a natural complement to what had gone before. On one occasion Kosawa proudly showed Mr Fukuda a scroll that had been given to him by Chikazumi Jōkan, and on a number

of occasions he took Mr Fukuda along to talks at the Kyūdōkaikan Buddhist centre that Chikazumi had established.⁴⁷

Setouchi Jakuchō's experiences with Kosawa resonate somewhat with those of Mr Fukuda.⁴⁸ She had no interest in Buddhism when she visited Kosawa in the mid-1960s. Instead, she went to Kosawa because the tangled relationships with men that she had turned into her first major literary success in 1963—the novel *Natsu no Owari (The End of Summer)*—had finally overtaken her. At the age of forty, she was proud of having survived on her own wits and talent since her divorce, and she had weathered allegations of pornography against her early work and could now count luminaries such as Kawabata Yasunari and Mishima Yukio among her friends (Setouchi only found out later, just after she read his novel *Ongaku*, that Mishima too had been seeing Kosawa, and to her regret she never spoke about Kosawa with Mishima). Yet she had begun to suffer from what she now sees as having been the total loss of her 'power of judgment'. This manifested in physical terms when she started to drop things, and when on one occasion she tried to travel backwards up a department store escalator. At the same time she was, in her own words, 'starting to become a bit strange'⁴⁹: she used to talk obsessively, non-stop to her friends, sometimes throughout the night, barely realizing what she was doing. Her friend Shibaoka Haruko decided to intervene, and realizing Setouchi's dislike of conventional doctors and medical institutions, recommended that she go to see Kosawa—another example of the social and professional boundary work of this period working in favour of someone seen as working outside institutional medicine. Kosawa was no longer seeing clients, but with Shibaoka as a mutual acquaintance, and with Kosawa's interest in Setouchi's work on Okamoto Kanoko (Setouchi published *Kanoko Ryōran* in 1965), a connection was established and Kosawa agreed to treat her.

As with Mr Fukuda, Setouchi recalls Kosawa's therapeutic method with great clarity. Although Kosawa never talked about Buddhism during or after their analytic sessions, of which there were around eight in total, Kosawa's personal and professional rootedness in a practical confluence of Shinran and Freud—captured in the phrase he often repeated to Fukuda: "*Shinran no kokoro wo motte, seishinbunseki wo suru*": 'practicing psycho-analysis with the heart of Buddhist Master shinran'—came through powerfully, Setouchi recalls. What for Doi was the unpleasant sensation of being 'drunk' or 'devoured' by Kosawa's maternalism was for Setouchi the natural demeanour of a 'lovely, lovely man':

He was wonderful, so gentle. He guided me into the parlour area of his house and, after listening to me talk for a little while, he asked me to lie back on the couch with my eyes closed while he sat just behind my head. 'Now that your eyes are closed,' he said, 'you'll be seeing images floating up in front of you. I want you just to name each one as it appears. As though you're on a train looking out of the window, watching the scenery pass before you.'⁵⁰

Setouchi remembers being able to do this from the very outset, without difficulty, and feeling immeasurably lighter at the end of every session—a successful example of Kosawa's "*torokashi technique*": 'technique of 'melting' a client with a sweet voice and attitude'. The lightness was not merely an unburdening but also a growing sense that her

previous, independent image of herself was in the process of being radically revised:

I'd always thought that it was me making my way in this world, until I went to Kosawa's house. I'd become a novelist because I had talent; my books sold because I had talent — plus a bit of luck. That's not how I see it any more. There's no one born into this world because they decided they would be. You're not born, you're born by something [*nanika ni umaresaserareru*].

Although Setouchi later joined the Tendai order, she links this 'nanika' with the other power in which Shin Buddhism takes a great interest. Her experience in therapy with Kosawa echoes that of Fukuda—both emphasise this altered sense of self, and both use the word 'ikasareru' (to be made to live) in connection with the therapeutic experience—and was enhanced by the regular compliment that Kosawa would pay to her, about her kimono, or her handbag, as he saw her to the door. This may seem a minor detail, but for Setouchi it was integral to the overall effect of psychoanalytic therapy: she remembers that this sort of treatment at the hands of another human being was like nothing else in her life at the time, and she now tries to pass it on in the context of her work with individuals and groups:

When people come to me for help now, I listen to them and at the end I always find some little thing to compliment them on. You should see them: they derive so much energy from that. When people are suffering, when they have some kind of complex, or when they're lonely, they need someone to notice them, simply to recognise them. So when someone who's in real trouble comes to me now, I think to myself, 'What was it that Kosawa did for me?' And I try to emulate that. I try to do exactly that.⁵¹

*

It would be inaccurate to suggest that Kosawa was not interested at all in how the shared aspirations and methodologies of Buddhism and psychoanalysis might be expressible at a theoretical level. In concluding this essay, I will examine briefly just two areas in which Kosawa showed considerable critical interest in how religion and therapy work together: firstly, the false hope offered by new religions, and the need instead for Japanese people to place their trust instead in the sturdy, more challenging truths of science and traditional religion; and secondly, the points of connection between specific Buddhist and psychoanalytic ideas.

For Kosawa there was no dichotomy to be explored between true science and true religion, because they aimed at the same thing. Rather, the crucial dichotomy lay between true science and religion, on the one hand, and false religion, false comfort, on the other. Epitomizing all that was false in his own time was the 'transient phenomena' of the new religions, which he feared were actively taking advantage of postwar social problems—not least by engaging in radio preaching.⁵² Although Kosawa had famously disagreed with Freud's theory of religion—indeed, as Iwata Fumiaki has shown, a defence of

traditional Japanese religion against anti-religionists in Japan was the starting point for Kosawa's first published piece on the Ajase Complex—he recalled with approval, in a letter to Menninger, Freud's comment that weak people opted for religion whereas the strong persevered along the harder road of science.⁵³ Kosawa hoped and expected that in time, Japanese people would have the strength to see the new religions for the shallow, opportunistic phenomena that they were, and would put their trust instead in true science and in true religion.⁵⁴ He once wrote to his brother to say that a close friend—possibly a member of the Kosawa family—was in danger of getting caught up in one of the new religions, and he counselled instead that the person concerned should study the writings of Chikazumi Jōkan and the Edo-era intellectual Hirata Atsutane.⁵⁵

The only one of the new religions for which Kosawa seems to have had some time was Seichō no Ie: writing to his sister, Yoshiko, on one occasion, Kosawa mentions that he visited a friend in hospital and was pleased to see a copy of a Seichō no Ie book by the bedside.⁵⁶ He also corresponded with the founder of Seichō no Ie, Taniguchi Masaharu, advising him on psychoanalytic theory and at one point treating the same patient with him. In his diary, Kosawa recalls going to meet Taniguchi at his house on 30th May 1946, stopping off on the way to pay homage to Admiral Tōgō at the Meiji Shrine (the same day that the Emperor was due to visit the shrine).⁵⁷ The relationship was not uniformly a happy one, however: the two men disagreed over the treatment of their shared patient, and at one point their correspondence degenerated into an exchange in which Taniguchi referred to Kosawa as 'a devil'—to which Kosawa replied bitterly that while everyone else, according to Taniguchi's writings, was God's child, it seemed to be reserved for Kosawa alone to be viewed as a devil.⁵⁸

Kosawa also thought about how particular ideas within Buddhism and psychoanalysis might correlate with one another, but he does not seem fully to have resolved such questions—and it is possible that he did not see an urgent need to do so.⁵⁹ Instead, he returned time and again to an attitude towards, and experience of, life and living that was founded upon the examples set by Shinran and Freud: prior to—and perhaps impossible to capture entirely in terms of—strict religious or psychoanalytic formulations. Where Kosawa did think in theoretical terms, it tended to be a matter of Buddhist and psychoanalytic ideas reinforcing one another, informed at the same time by Kosawa's own life experience. Writing to Freud in November 1931, for example, shortly before leaving for Europe, Kosawa said that when he set Freud's writing on transference alongside his own past experience of interpersonal conflict he finally 'found the meaning of the word [transference]'. He even coined a phrase, at this point, for a consideration of one's own past with the transference dynamic in mind: 'reflexive history'.⁶⁰ The parallels with Morita and Naikan therapies are notable here, both of which centre around meditative consideration of past relationships. Perhaps it was a later development of this method by Kosawa that had so upset Doi when he complained of the way that Kosawa recommended solo free association to his patients, almost as a form of meditation.⁶¹

In the same letter to Freud, Kosawa likened the repetition compulsion to the 'redemption of Buddha'.⁶² This is the most commonly cited connection between Japanese psychoanalysis and Buddhism: the very same year that Kosawa first wrote to Freud, Yabe Yaekichi visited Freud and told him that the cultural familiarity in Japan, thanks to

Buddhism, of the idea that life contains within it an impulse towards death had guided him and his circle of psychoanalysis enthusiasts in Tokyo (a group that included Ohtsuki Kenji) in choosing *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* as an early introduction to Freud for Japanese readers. Some time later, in an undated letter to his brother Ichiro, Kosawa wondered whether the battle between *shi no honnō* and *sei no honnō* (death instinct and life instinct) in the psychoanalytic understanding could somehow be mapped onto that battle (with which Shinran had been so concerned) between *mumyō* (Sanskrit: *avidya* [ignorance]) and our better instincts.⁶³ Kosawa later pursued these questions via a correspondence with a Zen priest by the name of Ōyama Jundō, for whom contact with psychoanalysis had helped make Dōgen's teachings clearer.⁶⁴

It seems that Kosawa was still entertaining ideas about the death instinct as a bridge between Buddhism and psychoanalysis in the late 1950s. Although the precise meaning of his comment to Menninger about the three people who had worked on the translation of *The Human Mind* falling ill is difficult to grasp, Kosawa's point seemed to be this: that simply by reading Menninger's writing about psychoanalysis an effect was achieved whereby these three people were progressively liberated from the psychological investment in the body and its physical health that is associated with the pleasure principle. This interpretation of Kosawa's words seems reasonable (with the implication, perhaps, that his use of the word 'liquidated' was ambiguous or incorrect), since he then went on to write: 'On the other hand, there is the belief that man's physical welfare is the source of his happiness'.⁶⁵

*

A number of recent writers, in particular Shingu Kazushige and Funaki Tetsuo, Chikako Ozawa-de Silva, and Iwata Fumiaki, have suggested that the religious and philosophical nuances of early Japanese psychoanalysis were somewhat lost in the postwar generation and afterwards. The findings in this essay provide support for such arguments, while cautioning against applying too-rigid concepts of 'religion' and 'psychoanalysis' in seeking to understand Kosawa Heisaku's approach to life and psychotherapy. The concept of 'boundary work' may be useful in helping us to avoid this pitfall. Firstly, it reminds us of the fluidity, especially in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Japan, of concepts and institutions concerned with what we typically, perhaps more heuristically than we care to admit, denote using words like 'religion' and the 'psy disciplines'. Secondly, it seems clear from Kosawa's personal writings that for him the world of human experience, emotions, and striving to live a good life was more vivid, and of greater import, than working through in a conceptual way the implications of being a *deshi* both of Shinran and of Freud. The language of 'hybridity' has come to be widely used when discussing the life and work of pioneering, multi-cultural intellectuals in Asia and other parts of the non-European modern world. Yet this seems inappropriate for Kosawa, because to speak of a hybrid of 'Buddhism' and 'psychoanalysis' fails to capture the way in which, for Kosawa, life as a project and a flow of experience came first, with Buddhism and psychoanalysis, as practices and conceptual systems, in an important sense secondary.

There is a danger, here, of course, in idealizing in someone like Kosawa that which

our contemporary world values: his pragmatism and his apparent freedom from the constraints of great systems. We must recognize that Kosawa seems simply not to have had the time, nor perhaps the inclination, to take a more systematically theoretical approach in his work: the pages of his pocket diaries for most of the 1950s are crammed with tiny writing detailing a punishing schedule of clients and meetings, and we know that the institutional politics of Japanese psychoanalysis in its early postwar years absorbed a great deal of his energy, as they did that of leaders of psychoanalytic societies in many other countries in the middle decades of the twentieth century. Moreover, there were those amongst Kosawa's students who disliked his therapeutic style intensely: Doi was grateful to Kosawa in a number of areas, but remembered him too as a powerful negative example where therapeutic method was concerned. Others doubted the thoroughness of Kosawa's grasp of psychoanalytic theory, and certainly, as the evidence offered here from Richard Sterba underscores, on the basis of the international standards of the time Kosawa could not claim to have been properly analyzed—though nor, of course, could Freud.

Perhaps we ought to conclude by allowing the nuance that Kosawa himself brought to his defence of *tsūshin bunseki* to stand for his therapeutic approach as a whole. This may not have been psychoanalysis in the most orthodox sense, but rather a very particular form of psychoanalytic psychotherapy. It was genuinely life changing for at least some of the clients who went through it, as the testimony of Mr Fukuda and Setouchi Jakuchō shows. And from our present vantage point, as the compatibility is re-considered of what have evolved as 'religion' and the 'psy disciplines', Kosawa's therapeutic method seems both strikingly relevant and potentially instructive. Whether an intentional lesson, or the happy outcome of his simply being unable to do things any other way, the locating of the real 'boundary work' between religion and psychoanalysis not in the outer—the institutional and the conceptual—but in the primacy of one's own lived experience represents a valuable and lasting contribution to our thinking on this increasingly important topic.

Notes

1. In supporting my research on early psychoanalysis in Japan I am grateful to very many people and organizations. For making possible this essay in particular, I would like to register my thanks to the family of Kosawa Heisaku, in particular Kosawa Yorio and Kosawa Makoto, along with Geoffrey Blowers, Inoue Yoshinobu, Ikuta Takashi, Iwata Fumiaki, Kanaseki Takeshi, Kano Rikihachiro, Kitanaka Junko, Matsuki Kunihiro, Margaret Ries, Michael Radich, Sato Yuji, Suzuki Akihito, Takeda Makoto, Wakida Yoshiyuki, Yoshinaga Shin'ichi, and of course 'Mr Fukuda', and Setouchi Jakuchō and her assistants. I am grateful also to the Japanese Society for the Promotion of Science, the Japan Foundation Endowment Committee, the Carnegie Fund, and the British Academy, for helping to fund this research.

2. I borrow this term from Nikolas Rose, *Governing the Soul: the Shaping of the Private Self* (1990).

3. See, for example, the work of the UK Royal College of Psychiatrists' Spirituality and Psychiatry Special Interest Group.

4. As Robert Kugelmann has pointed out, psychology's 'secular' status has tended to obscure the fact that it is embedded in philosophical assumptions of its own. Robert Kugelmann, *Psychology and Catholicism: Contesting Boundaries* (2011).

5. See Herbert Fingarette, on how the psychologization of religion has been part of a modern project to remove it from the sphere of the public, the objective, and the legitimate. Herbert Fingarette, *The Self*

in *Transformation: Psychoanalysis, Philosophy, and the Life of the Spirit* (1963). On 'boundary work' see Thomas F. Gieryn, 'Boundary-work and the demarcation of science from non-science: strains and interests in professional ideologies of scientists', *American Sociological Review* 48:6 (1983).

6. See Sigmund Freud, *The Future of an Illusion* (1927).

7. See Jung, 'Psychological Commentary on *The Tibetan Book of the Great Liberation*: On the Difference Between Eastern and Western Thinking', *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Psychology and Religion: West and East* (1958). See also Robert A. Segal, 'Jung as Psychologist of Religion and Jung as Philosopher of Religion', *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 55/3 (2010); Philip Rieff, *The Triumph of the Therapeutic* (1966); Michael F. Palmer, *Freud and Jung on Religion* (1997).

8. See, e.g., William W. Meissner, *Psychoanalysis and Religious Experience* (1984).

9. Letter from Romain Rolland to Sigmund Freud, 3rd December 1927, reproduced in William B. Parsons, *The Enigma of the Oceanic Experience* (1999).

10. See Parsons, op cit, pp. 63–6.

11. See Sigmund Freud, *Civilization and its Discontents* (1930), Chapter 1.

12. See Parsons, op cit, pp. 42–4.

13. As Jung put it: '[Myth and symbol] express the processes of the psyche far more trenchantly and, in the end, far more clearly than the clearest concept; for the symbol not only conveys a visualisation of the process, but—and this is perhaps just as important—it also brings a re-experiencing of it.' Jung, op cit, p. 199.

14. As James Heisig puts it, 'the ontological status of ego and Self in Jung's writing is ambivalent at best, muddled at worst. Depending on the context, they are alluded to as energies, forces, functions, classes of phenomena, archetypes, or entities'. James Heisig, 'Jung, Christianity, and Buddhism', in Polly Young-Eisendrath & Shoji Muramoto (eds), *Awakening and Insight: Zen Buddhism and Psychotherapy* (2002), p. 50.

15. Jung famously declared, late in life, that he didn't 'believe' in God, he 'knew'.

16. Susumu Shimazono, *Iyasu Chi no Keifu* (2003); Janine Anderson Sawada, *Practical Pursuits: Religion, Politics, and Personal Cultivation in Nineteenth-Century Japan* (2004); Gerald A. Figal, *Civilization and Monsters: Spirits of Modernity in Meiji Japan* (1999); Gerard Clinton Godart, 'Philosophy' or 'Religion'? The Confrontation with Foreign Categories in Late Nineteenth Century Japan', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 69:1 (2008); Joseph Ananda Josephson, *The Invention of Religion in Japan* (2012).

17. See Figal, op cit.

18. Maeda Shigeharu, *Jiyūrensōhō Oboegaki* (1984).

19. See Takeda Makoto, *Seishinbunseki to Bukkyō* (1990); Kita Keiko, 'Mondai ha taiji kara', in Okonogi Keigo & Kitayama Osamu (eds), *Ajase Konpurekkusu* (2001).

20. See Iwata Fumiaki, *Kindaika no naka no dentōshūkyō to seishinundō: Kijun ten toshite no Chikazumi Jōkan kenkyū* (2011); Kosawa Yorio, 'Chichi, Kosawa Heisaku to Ajase Konpurekkusu', in Okonogi & Kitayama (eds), op cit.

21. For a broader account of Kosawa's visit to Europe, and the first generation of Japanese psychoanalysts, see Geoffrey H. Blowers and Serena Yang Hsueh Chi, 'Freud's Deshi: the Coming of Psychoanalysis to Japan,' *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 33, no. 2 (1997): 115–126.

22. Letter from Richard Sterba to Kosawa Heisaku, 10th January 1936. Kosawa Family Private Collection.

23. Ibid.

24. Letter from Doi Takeo to Kosawa Heisaku, 28th October 1953. Kosawa Family Private Collection.

25. Letter from Kosawa Heisaku to Kosawa Ichiro, 15th April 1932. Kosawa Family Private Collection.

26. Letter from Kosawa Heisaku to Kosawa Ichiro, May 1932. Kosawa Family Private Collection.

27. Letter from Kosawa Heisaku to Kosawa Ichiro, 10th April 1932. Kosawa Family Private Collection.

28. Letter from Kosawa Heisaku to Kosawa Ichiro, 15th April 1932. Kosawa Family Private Collection.

29. Letter from Kosawa Heisaku to his mother, 15th April 1932. Kosawa Family Private Collection.

30. Letters sent to Kosawa Heisaku, dated respectively: (postmark indistinct); 6th December 1954; 23rd

August 1954. Kosawa Family Private Collection.

31. Letter from Kosawa Heisaku to Karl Menninger, 4th September 1953. Menninger Archives.
32. Ibid. Menninger suggested that Kosawa contribute an article on the subject to the *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*. Letter from Karl Menninger to Kosawa Heisaku, 17th September 1953. Menninger Archives.
33. Kosawa made this promise to Menninger in a letter dated 29th June 1953. Menninger Archives.
34. Undated letter from Kosawa Heisaku to Karl Menninger. Menninger Archives.
35. See K Shingu and T Funaki, “‘Between Two Deaths’: the Intersection of Psychoanalysis and Japanese Buddhism,” *Theory & Psychology* 18, no. 2 (April 1, 2008), p. 254.
36. Ohtsuki Kenji, Draft notes for a book on Buddhism and Psychoanalysis, Ohtsuki Kenji Archives, Waseda University.
37. Letter from Heisaku Kosawa to Karl Menninger, 29th June 1953. Emphasis added. Menninger Archives.
38. Notes entitled ‘Principle of Freud’. Kosawa Family Private Collection.
39. The precise details are not clear from Kosawa’s notes. Kosawa Family Private Collection.
40. Ibid.
41. See Iwata Fumiaki, op cit; Michael Radich, *How Ajātaśatru Was Reformed: The Domestication of “Ajase” and Stories in Buddhist History* (2011).
42. See Shingu & Funaki, op cit.
43. See Robert Traer, “Faith in the Buddhist Tradition,” *Buddhist-Christian Studies* 11 (1991): 85–120, p. 88. See also Alfred Bloom, *Shinran’s Gospel of Pure Grace* (1965), and Susumu Shimazono, *From Salvation to Spirituality* (2004), p. 219.
44. See H. Gene Blocker and Christopher L Starling, *Japanese Philosophy* (2001).
45. Nakamura Hajime, *Ways of Thinking of Eastern Peoples* (1964) p. 350.
46. Of the many writings on the question of how ‘traditional’ Japanese religious and philosophical ideas of the early twentieth century really were, see in particular: Josephson, op cit; Robert H Sharf, ‘Buddhist Modernism and the Rhetoric of Meditative Experience,’ *Numen* 42 (1995) & ‘The Zen of Japanese Nationalism,’ *History of Religions* 33, no. 1 (1993).
47. Interviews with ‘Mr Fukuda’, April 2012 and October 2012. On Chikazumi Jōkan and the Kyūdōkaikan see Iwata Fumiaki, *Kindaika no naka no dentōshūkyō to seishinundō: Kijunten toshite no Chikazumi Jōkan kenkyū* (2011).
48. For a lengthier account of Setouchi Jakuchō’s time in therapy with Kosawa, see Christopher Harding, ‘Couched in Kindness’, *Aeon Magazine*, November 2012 (<http://www.aeonmagazine.com/world-views/chris-topher-harding-psychoanalysis-buddhism/>).
49. Interview with Setouchi Jakuchō, October 2012.
50. Ibid.
51. Ibid.
52. See Inoue Nobutaka, ‘Media and New Religious Movements in Japan’, *Journal of Religion in Japan*, 1 (2012).
53. Undated letter from Kosawa Heisaku to Karl Menninger. Menninger Archives. Kosawa added that he too ‘had no intention to abandon science’, even in his present state of ill health.
54. ‘Principle of Freud’.
55. Letter from Kosawa Heisaku to Kosawa Ichiro, 1941. Kosawa Family Private Collection.
56. Letter from Kosawa Heisaku to Kosawa Yoshiko [undated]. Kosawa Family Private Collection.
57. Diary of Kosawa Heisaku. Kosawa Family Private Collection.
58. Interview with ‘Mr Fukuda’, April 2012.
59. It is striking, in this regard, that over the course of my several interviews with Kosawa Yorio, before his death in 2011, he insisted time and again that he did not recall his father ever discussing Buddhism and

psychoanalysis in highly categorized, dichotomous terms.

60. Letter from Kosawa to Sigmund Freud, November 1931. Freud Archive, Library of Congress (Washington).

61. Doi Takeo, 'Heisaku Kosawa to Nihonteki Seishinbunseki (Heisaku Kosawa and Japanese Psychoanalysis)', short essay based on Doi's speech to the twenty-fifth conference of the Japanese Psychoanalytic Society, 1979. The particular comparison with meditation is the author's, rather than Doi's. On Naikan, and Japanese therapy in general, see Chikako Ozawa-de Silva, *Psychotherapy and Religion in Japan: the Japanese Introspection Practice of Naikan* (2006) and 'Demystifying Japanese Therapy: an Analysis of Naikan and the Ajase Complex Through Buddhist Thought', *Ethos* 35:4 (2007).

62. See, on this point, Shingu & Funaki, op cit. Both psychoanalysis and Japanese Buddhism, they suggest, 'posit an eternalized representational dimension as well as a complete death beyond it', along with a subjective progression from living within the former to achieving the latter. In this context, the repetition compulsion is 'an enactment of samsara' and a hint that humans desire, need even, to make such a progression.

63. Letter from Kosawa Heisaku to Kosawa Ichiro [undated]. Kosawa Family Private Collection.

64. Correspondence between Kosawa Heisaku and Ōyama Jundō. Kosawa later published some of Ōyama's writing in his psychoanalytic journal.

65. Undated letter from Kosawa Heisaku to Karl Menninger. Menninger Archives.

Theories on the Ajase Complex

Freud's correspondence with colleagues in Japan

Edited and Annotated by Osamu Kitayama

I. Introduction

In commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Japanese Psychoanalytical Association, I translated a set of historic documents of great interest in the history of psychoanalysis in Japan. They comprise letters exchanged between Sigmund Freud and Japanese nationals. This is the first time they have been translated into Japanese. They were retyped or photocopied versions of originals that I was able to obtain from the US Library of Congress in Washington, D.C. (I have put the Box and Folder numbers before each letter that forms part of the Sigmund Freud Papers included in the Sigmund Freud Collection at the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.) The parts of other documents shown as “*Diary*” are based on *The Diary of Sigmund Freud 1929-1939*, Freud Museum Publications (1992). Another important preceding study is G.H. Blowers and S.Y.H. Chi.: Otsuki Kenji and the Beginnings of Lay Analysis in Japan. *Int. J. Psychoanal.* 82, 27-42, 2001, which I have used for reference while editing this paper.

I have also included the Appendix (Letter No. 25), since its content was a continuation of previous correspondence. Moreover, although the letters are laid out in chronological order, it is possible that the collection will continue to grow in the future. I have also included the editor's explanations mid-way to facilitate an understanding of the historical order of events. Note, however, that these explanations may include my own personal interpretations. In the course of translating and editing the letters on this occasion, I encountered a number of clear spelling errors. Below are some examples.

Hippon Seishin-Bunseki Gakukai → Nippon Seishin Bunseki Gakkai (Japan Psychoanalytical Association)

Shinyoto → Shunyodo (Publisher)

Zuerich → Zurich

Azase → Ajase

We corrected these to make them easier to read, and put the translator's notes in brackets []. The names of key persons are also inconsistent. This is because we left

Initially published in the Japanese Contribution. Vol.3 (2010) pp.137–160.

Osamu Kitayama, MD, PhD
Training and Supervising Analyst at JPS

unchanged the original descriptions of documents from the Library of Congress. As a result, you may see the name of Yabe sometimes written as Zabé or Jabé; the first name of Marui shown as both Kiyoyasu and Seitai; the name of Kosawa written as Kozawa; and Otsuki sometimes shown as Ohtski. However, they all refer to the same individuals.

II. Mainly Kiyoyasu Marui and Yaekichi Yabe

Letter 1.

From Heisaku Kosawa to Freud (in German)

Box 35, Folder 34

Tohoku, Japan.

15th of April 1925

To Prof. Dr. Sigmund Freud
Vienna

Dear Professor Dr. Freud!

Just as Christianity feels with regard to holy Jerusalem I feel a burning desire to meet you in Vienna in order to get in touch with your great mind even though it sometimes feels as if I knew you already through the study of your works.

I am specializing in the study of psychoanalysis at the Institute for Psychiatry at Tohoku Imperial University under the direction of Prof. Dr. Seitai Marui, who studied in the United States with Prof. Dr. Alfred Meyer.

While studying your work I very often felt desperate because it is so difficult for us Japanese to penetrate into the European way of thinking, but my efforts have been richly rewarded by the depth of your thought. You present the human mind with as much certainty as we found in the cell structures we looked at through the microscope during our student years.

If I wanted to convey to you here how precious the teachings are which I learned from you, and what I owe you, I would have to fill many pages, but since I do not want to bother you too much with my trivial writing I have decided to wait until I am in a position to visit you in person.

I am waiting with great impatience for the moment when I shall be able to discuss some problems with you in detail face to face. I hope, and I am at the same time convinced, that I shall then return home from you with new psychic insights und with many a new pearl of your wisdom.

Yours faithfully

This Letter No. 1 closely resembles Kosawa's later letter No. 9. The correct posi-

tioning of this letter is currently unclear. As far as documents are concerned, full-scale exchanges between Freud and Japanese people began in 1927 when Kiyoyasu Marui wrote to Freud with the hope of obtaining permission to publish the latter's book. (We have not obtained this letter.) We therefore assume that Letter No. 2 is Freud's answer to that letter.

Letter 2.

From Freud to Kiyoyasu Marui (in German)

Box 37, Folder 16

10. Nov. 1927

PROF. DR. FREUD
IX. BERGGASSE 19

WIEN,

Dear colleague!

I am very pleased to hear of your intention to arouse the interest of Japanese scholars in psychoanalysis. Of course, your nation is free of many of the prejudices that have caused trouble for psychoanalysis in Europe and America. I would very much like to know what kind of reception analysis will find in Sagan (Note: Japan) - if only I live [long enough].

You have my authorization for everything you want to translate. If you want to publish the Theory of Sexuality first, you will have to turn to the publisher Fr. Deuticke in Vienna I, Helfersdorferstrasse 4, for the rights to translation. I am convinced he will grant you very favourable conditions. I hope you will base the translation on the latest fifth sixth edition of 1925.

Furthermore, I would most appreciate, of course, the translation of the "Introductory Lectures". I am really grateful to you for your effort. After all, it belongs to the few nice things in life that science can unite us across any distance.

Yours faithfully
Sigm. Freud

On the other hand, on December 24, 1929, Yaekichi Yabe, a psychologist, contacted the International Psychoanalytical Association to undergo training analysis. Yabe managed to travel to Europe and study there for three months. During this period, he underwent twenty training analysis sessions in London from Edward Glover, and attended clinical lectures by Ernest Jones. On May 2, Yabe's Japanese translation of "Beyond the Pleasure Principle" is sent from President Max Eitingon to Freud (*Diary*). On his return trip from London, in the evening of May 7, 1930, Yabe visited Freud, who was living in Berlin at the time with Eitingon. Yabe talked with Freud for more than an hour, and parted late at night. Their conversation spread to the topic of the difficulty of Freud's book, "Beyond the Pleasure Principle." Yabe said that the theory of *Todestrieb*, or the

death instinct, had something in common with Buddhism, making it easy for the Japanese to understand it. Freud, extremely happy to hear this, called Anna, who was in the adjoining room, and the three reportedly had a pleasant chat.

However, as shown in the following letter, confusion about the “two Japanese chapters” began to emerge because Marui did not contact Freud during this period. Marui wrote to Freud on December 13, 1930, telling him that the translation of Freud’s book was now complete. Freud sent the following reply to Marui:

Letter 3.

From Kiyoyasu Marui to Freud (in English)

Box 37, Folder 16

Professor Dr. Sigmund Freud
Wien IX, Bergasse 19.

13 Dec. 1930, Sendai, Japan.

Dear Doctor,

Since I received your kind letter (dated on 10, Nov. 1927), in which you kindly gave me authorization to translate your works, I did not write to so long a time. But I have been all the time studying psychoanalysis, and now I am very glad to tell you, that I completed the translation of your work “Zur Psychopathologie des Alltagslebens”, (Ges. Schriften Bd. IV), and it was recently published from “ARS” the publisher in Tokyo. So I am going to send you a copy of this Japanese translation and I hope you will receive it very soon. I am very sorry to find in this book a serious misprint and lots of petty misprints, but I presume, that you will grant this and I hope and believe that there is no mistake in translation itself. By the way I am very glad to tell you, that in this country we find so many enthusiastic readers of our works at the present time.

Permit me please to utilize this opportunity to write the following; I have a number of analyzed cases of paraphrenia, manic-depressive psychosis, dementia praecox and psychoneuroses, and I intend to ask the publication of articles on those cases after they were ready for it. I expect to go to Europe in a few years and I am very anxious to see you then, if I am permitted to do that. If I am not asking you too much, I beg you to let me study on some subject, and then take me as a pupil of yours.

Very sincerely yours
Kiyoyasu Marui (signature)
Professor in Psychiatry, Tohoku
Imperial University, Sendai,
Japan

Letter 4.

From Freud to Kiyoyasu Marui (in German)

Box 37, Folder 16

30. XII. 1930

PROF. DR. FREUD
IX. BERGGASSE 19

WIEN,

Dear Professor!

Your translation of [the Psychopathology of] "Everyday Life" came to me as a highly pleasant surprise just before leaving. The misprints you deplore cannot, of course, disturb me. I have read with satisfaction about how you have dedicated yourself to the intensive study of psychoanalysis and I ask you to send me all you wish to publish in our journals. I shall see to its inclusion.

However, I also have to make a confession with regard to which I count on your leniency. Since I had not heard from you for three years, I assumed that you had relinquished your intention. I now recognize that I had no right to believe so. But in spring this year, on the basis of this belief, I have for a second time given authorization to translate my writings. That is to Dr. Zabé in Tokyo, who has founded a psychoanalytical society there. His address is: Hippon Seishin-Bunseki Gakukai; to be sure, I am enclosing the envelope of his latest letter. Zabé visited me while I was staying in a sanatorium in Berlin. I have since received from him the translation of my writing "Beyond the Pleasure Principle". The publisher is Shinyoto in Tokyo. From the announcement, I conclude that they are planning a complete edition; also some other translations have supposedly been published of which I am not yet in possession.

Blame for the whole business must undeniably rest with me. I would now like to ask you, in the interest of the cause, to help me out of this embarrassment. If you would please be so kind as to find an agreement with Jabé, a double translation of some works could be avoided and if you united your efforts with his, the entire work could be accomplished much faster. It would also be very desirable if you and your students contacted the society in Tokyo.

Apologizing once again to you I remain with best regards,

Faithfully,
your colleague Freud

Despite Freud's suggestion, the union of both sides did not materialize. As a result, Freud ended up receiving two versions: the Yabe group's translations published by Shunyodo, and the Marui group's versions published by the now-defunct Ars Publishing. Freud wrote to Ernest Jones that he became confused as a result (a letter dated January 4, 1931, *Diary*). One reason may have been that the process of translation had proceeded

without either side becoming aware of it. A more important reason, however, as seen below, was that although Yabe approached Professor Marui in apologetic mode, and extended an invitation to him to join his organization, Marui refused out of pride.

Letter 5.

From Kiyoyasu Marui to Freud (in English)

Box 37, Folder 16

Sendai, 2, February, 1932

Professor Dr. Sigmund Freud,
Wien IX, Bergasse 19.
Dear Doctor,

Received your letter dated on 20 Dec. 1930 and I am very glad to realize that you received my Japanese translation of your article "Zur Psychopathologie des Alltagslebens." Permit me to take advantage of this opportunity to tell you, that following Japanese translations of your articles were undertaken by the publisher "ARS" since the year before last, some of which are already published and some are on the way to be printed.

Studien ueber Hysterie. by Dr. T. Yasuda (published)
Die Traumdeutung, by Mr. R. Niizeki (do.)
Jenseits des Lustprinzips, Das Ich und das Es, Massenpsychologie und Ich-Analyse, Das Interesse an der Psychoanalyse, by Mr. R. Kubo (do.)
Vorlesungen zur Einfuehrung in die Psychoanalyse, by Dr. T. Yasuda (do.)
Witz und seine Beziehung zum Unbewussten, by Dr. S. Masaki (do.)
Totem und Tabu, by Mr. E. Seki (do.)
Die Zukunft einer Illusion, by Mr. K. Kimura (not published)
Zur Psychologie des Liebeslebens, Metapsychologie u.s.w., by Dr. R. Kimura(a pupil of mine) (do.)

I do not mind at all, that you gave authorization to translate your articles again to Mr. Yabe; it is only to be regretted, that I did not write to you for so long, a time. This is however merely due to considerable difficulty and laginess on my part to write letters in foreign language, and I hope you will forgive my fault.

I thank you very much for your kindness in being ready to offer your assistance to our original psychoanalytic articles to be accepted to psychoanalytic journals. Also I think you are so good that you advice us to be in touch with the psychoanalytic society in Tokyo; I guess it will contribute much to the prosperity of the psychoanalytic movement in this country. But I dare say that my pride in life as scientist, especially psychoanalyst, does not allow to enter in that society itself. And why not?

I am afraid that long statement below will disturb and bother you so much; but I shall be grateful, if you will be so kind as to take

trouble to read it and to understand my inmost feeling. After graduation of Tokyo Imperial University and study of psychiatry in Psychiatric Clinic of Prof. Kure, I was sent by the Japanese Government to foreign lands to make further study in that branch of science; of course I wished to go to Europe, but it was just war time and I was not able to do that. So I went to America in 1916 and studied psychiatry for two and half years with Dr. Adolf Meyer in the Phipps Psychiatric Clinic, the Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore Md. After the cessation of the war I travelled through England, France and Switzerland; I got opportunity to see Prof. Dr. Bleuler in Zuerich with a letter of introduction of Dr. Adolf Meyer. We were not yet allowed at that time to enter your country and so I could not get the opportunity to see you, though I was very anxious to do that. Coming home in August 1919 I settled here in Sendai as Professor in Psychiatry of the medical department, the Tohoku Imperial University, and since that time I have been all the time very much interested in psychoanalysis and tried always with my pupils to cure patients through psychoanalytic method and also to encourage the Japanese people especially those of medical circle to get knowledge of psychoanalysis.

Since 1921 I and my pupils held address concerning the results of psychoanalytic investigation each year at the annual meetings of "The Japanese Neurological Association" held in Tokyo, and the association held here in Sendai in April 1929 I made special address on "the development of mind" on basis of psychoanalysis by the order of the association. I also lectured in the meantime many times on psychoanalysis at the meetings of medical men and in special courses for mental hygiene and for care of normal as well as destitute children. On the other hand I contributed very often articles on psychoanalysis to the newspaper and popular magazines for the purpose of enlightenment of the Japanese public. In 1925 I published a book entitled "Mental hygiene of childhood and psychoanalysis," and in 1928 in a book, the title of which is "the psychoanalytic method, recent theories of neuroses and psychoneuroses".

That time, when I came back from America I found no one in this country, who practices psychoanalysis and also we found very few readers of psychoanalytic literature psychiatrists studied psychiatry in German, and no wonder they do not listen to and do not care your idea. There is only one exception in this respect at the present time I must say because Prof. Dr. K. Kubo of the Psychiatric Clinic, the Keijo Imperial University, Chosen (Korea) began to be interested in psychoanalysis. So our clinic has been and practically is yet the only one, which devotes itself continually and systematically to the study of psychoanalysis, I believe that our clinic has been and as yet is at head of the psychoanalytic movement in this country, and I am sure people especially of scientific class of this country acknowledge this fact. No one will deny the fact I guess that we contributed a great deal toward the enlightenment of people concerning psychoanalysis. I personally do not know Mr. Yabe; he is said to have studied psychoanalysis somewhere in the United States and to have come back several years ago. Some time in the year before last Mr. J.?? in Tokyo, a friend of mine and editor of "The Brain" (a

Japanese journal for mental hygiene) sent me a manuscript of a book written by Mr. Yabe, which the latter intended to publish here in this country, asking me to revise it; but owing to circumstances, which I would not like to write here, I was not able to do that at that time. Last year I got the information, that Mr. Yabe has been to Europe and coming back from there he founded "Japan Psychoanalytic Society" in Tokyo with his friends and that he has undertaken Japanese translations of your articles. Now several days ago he wrote to me; in this letter he said that he received a letter from you and asked me to be in touch with the society in Tokyo; he also said that he is anxious to see me. I answered to him that I could consider about that. In his letter described above Mr. Yabe expressed his regret and made apology for having gone to Europe and for having founded the society without telling me at all about that; but of course I do not think it has any thing to do with me.

Dear doctor! It was my long-cherished plan to be permitted to be an active member of the "International Psychoanalytical Association" and to found a society of psychoanalysts in this country; but I thought it would be a prerequisite condition for me to be analyzed by you or some other psychoanalyst to become a full member of the association; so I waited and waited for the time to come, when the Imperial Japanese Government sends me for the second time to foreign lands; and my turn is now near at hand, but I guess I shall have to wait still a year or so. I feel at present that I can not wait any longer. Dear doctor! Will you please tell me, whether there is any way for me to get the privilege to enter the association before going to you or not; and if it would be possible, kindly tell me please the conditions required for that and also procedure to be taken in order to found a society here in Sendai (Sendai Psychoanalytical Society ???). If I need some one to recommend me for entry in the association I believe Dr. Adolf Meyer will be the one, who is quite willing to do that for me.

Mr. Yabe told me that your 75th birthday comes on 1 May this year; to congratulate you upon this birthday I wished to send some Japanese goods as present to you; but I thought at the next moment, that it might rather give you trouble if custom duty will be levied to that goods; so I decided to send quite small sum of 150 Mark by way of foreign money order; I shall be very happy, if you kindly accept this little present.

Apologizing to you for having disturbed and bothered you so much with this long letter, I am still,

Yours very sincerely

Prof. Dr. Kiyoyasu Marui
Psychiatric Clinic,
The Tohoku Imperial University,
Sendai, Japan

Letter 6.

From Freud to Kiyoyasu Marui (in English)

Box 37, Folder 16

March 15th, 1931
Vienna IX, Berggasse 19

Dear Professor Marui,

Many thanks for the letter you wrote me and the present I received in money, which I will spend on the 6th of May, for some psychoanalytic interest. The more I have come to learn about your various activities in favour of the Psychoanalysis as a university teacher, physician and author, the more I regret and wonder at the fact that you never in all these years attempted to get in touch with us, to send us your translations or original contributions. If you have done so, we will have avoided all the actual complications.

When your letter arrived, Dr. Eitingon, the actual president of the I.P.A. (International Psychoanalytic Association) was with me and we discussed your wish to become a member of ours. He said, there was no doubt that you deserved it and we were glad to accept you and your followers. You ought to apply to him directly, even if you were not yet analyzed yourself. But Dr. Jabé's society has already been received, we had the rule that the groups in the same country should not work independent of each other but get united, and so he thought, the best thing for you to do, would be to create a group at Sendai and then establish a connection with Dr Jabé's group in a common organization. I realize that you are in some way sensitive to Dr. Jabé's proceeding and that your official position justifies your claim to be at the head of the psychoanalytic movement in Japan. But in the interest of our science, I think you ought to make amends for your formal neglect of the real situation and enter into an agreement with Jabé. I will be especially happy to hear you have done so, and cannot imagine receiving a more impressive birthday present the volume of my books, which by your care and seal have made their appearance in your language.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

Freud

Letter 7.

From Kiyoyasu Marui to Freud (in English)

Box 37, Folder 16

Sendai, 7th April, 1931.

Professor Dr. Sigmund Freud
Wien XI, Berggasse 19.

Dear Professor Freud,

Received your kind letter on March 15th, and I am very sorry to realize that my former neglect gave much trouble to you and also to Dr. Eitingon and I hope heartily that you and Dr. Eitingon will forgive my fault. I am very glad to know that you and Dr. Eitingon are so kindly ready to receive me in the International Psychoanalytical Association, even though I am not yet analyzed by a certain psychoanalyst. I am also very much pleased to realize that Dr. Eitingon is so good to think that the best thing for me to do would be to create a group here at Sendai, and then establish a connection with Mr. Yabe's group in a common organization. Now I intend to do my best to enter into an agreement with Mr. Yabe's, and I am also sure that Mr. Yabe would be willing to do that for the interest of the psychoanalysis.

Following your kind advice I wrote today a letter to Dr. Eitingon, begging him kindly to take trouble to receive us in the Association and also to help us in creating a group here in Sendai, and I beg you will kindly give my best regards to Dr. Eitingon.

I am going to send all the Japanese translations of your books already published from "ARS" and also my two publications referred to in my last letter, and I hope you will get them before 6th May.

Hoping that I shall be able to inform you something about the connection with Mr. Yabe's, I am.

Yours quite truly,

(Kiyoyasu Marui's signature)
Psychiatric Clinic, the
Tohoku Imperial University,
Sendai, Japan

Letter 8.

From Freud to Kiyoyasu Marui (in English)

Box 37, Folder 16

June 6th 1931

PROF. DR. FREUD

WIEN, IX. BERGGASSE 19

Dear Professor

I am happy to thank you for the books, which arrived today: vol. II, VI, VII, VIII, IX, XI of your translations and two other works which I guess are publications of yourself or your pupils. I congratulate you on the amount of work you have achieved and I trust you will

arouse interest and in the end succeed.

Affectionately yours

Freud

As it turned out, however, Yabe's Tokyo group focusing on liberal arts and psychology, and Marui's medically-focused Sendai group, were not immediately integrated despite the wishes of Freud who, because of having contributed to the rift, attempted to mend the relationship. If I were to explain the situation in my own way, a deep division had existed between a lay researcher and a professor of the School of Medicine at an Imperial University; as well as between psychologists and physicians.

There is a report written in 1933 by Yabe on the practice of psychoanalysis that contains the following. "*During the year 1933, patients received for analysis at my analytical rooms in the city and at home numbered twenty-three, in addition to about an equal number of consultations. The numbers of analytic hours amounted in the aggregate to 1.431, 63.2 sessions per person.*" (Yabe, Y.: Japan: Report on psychoanalytic activities in the year 1933. *Int. J. Psychoanal.* 15: 377-9, 1934.)

III. Mainly with Heisaku Kosawa

Letter 9.

From Heisaku Kosawa to Freud (in German)

Box 35, Folder 34

Prof. Dr. Sigm. Freud:

Dear Prof. Dr. Freud; without yet having seen you I already feel a burning desire, just as Christianity has for the holy Jerusalem, to get in touch with your great mind in Vienna, knowing your greatness from reading your works, which for us are as hard to understand as it is to see through fog.

I am especially concerned with the study of psychoanalysis at the Institute of Psychiatry, Tohoku Imperial University, under the direction of Prof. Dr. Seitai Marui, who studied in America under the direction of Prof. Dr. Alfred Meyer. When studying your works I am sometimes cast down - nay, not sometimes but word for word I feel confused. But the more I penetrate into the depth of your word, the more tears of joy and misery come to my eyes. You present the mind with the certainty we wonder at when we looked at the divine cell structures under the microscope during our student life.

You also taught me that transference in analytical therapy is a battlefield.

I am now dedicating myself to reading your works and I am reading some new publications of 1926-1927 [by] Ferenczi, Abraham, Reich, Reik, Alexander, Anna Freud etc. In doing so I realize that the

thorough study of your works is for me the main prerequisite. When I read that pain in the eye means castration complex and discovered it with my patient I realized how this conclusion was drawn and understood the meaning as in the Japanese proverb "scratching the itches through the shoe".

For a thorough understanding of this method I ask you, dear Professor Freud, to give me the key so that on the basis thereof I may complete my work with Prof. Marui; hysterical amaurosis and compulsory neurosis etc.

Yours faithfully
Dr. Heisaku Kosawa

I can hardly [await] the time when I shall be destined to meet you in person in Vienna, dear Professor Freud, and to work under your guidance.
(/XI-1931)

Letter 10.
From Freud to Kiyoyasu Marui (in English)
Box 37, Folder 16

PROF. DR. FREUD

WIEN, IX. BERGGASSE 19
Dec. 24th 1931

Dear Professor

Thanks for your letter of Nov. 31st (?) with news about your organization and Dr. Kosawa. As regards the first, I am sorry to hear, that you have the same personal difficulties among your people as we experience in European countries. Human nature, as often has been said, seems to be the same everywhere. But I stick to the hope that you will achieve some satisfactory agreement.

Dr. Kosawa I am ready to take under my personal treatment, if several conditions are fulfilled, first that I live, secondly that I have a free hour at the time he arrives, last my prize of dollars 25 for the hour is not too high for him. In any case I will see him and make him over to a very good analyst, if there is any difficulty with me.

With best wishes for well-being and success

Yours Freud.

A letter from Prof. Dr. Freud to Prof. Dr. Kiyoyasu Marui
(Psychiatric Clinic, Medical Facility, The Tohoku Imperial
University, Sendai, Japan)

Although Freud welcomes Kosawa, the issue about fees has surfaced as a problem, even from the start. Kosawa stayed in Vienna from January 26, 1932, and visited Freud. In 1932, a journal by Marui et al. entitled, "Report of the Department of

Psychiatry (Collection of Papers on Psychoanalysis), Tohoku Imperial University College of Medicine” was published.

Letter 11.

From Heisaku Kosawa to Freud (in German)

Box 35, Folder 34

Dear Professor!

Since unfortunately during the first visit I had the honour to pay you I did not expose the real reason for my stay, please allow me to do so in writing for very important reasons. On the basis of my practical work in Japan, I have indeed succeeded in a partial understanding of my self-skotom¹, but in the end I came up against a limitation that I could not overcome myself because there was no expert in Japan who might have analysed me. For example, I ran into certain difficulties with dementia praecox.

Finally, on the basis of my studies of several psychoanalytical works, I arrived at the conclusion that only you, dear Professor Freud, would be in the position to help me overcome this limitation. Although I was completely aware that due to my very insufficient knowledge of German I would have great difficulties at the beginning, I did not want to postpone my journey for long since I was keen to receive my perfection through you. This hidden self-praise may sound a little odd, but comparing my own manifold successes with those described in the relevant literature I couldn't help but arrive at this conclusion. Unfortunately, as I do not receive any government funds neither am I very wealthy myself, I had to realize that my dream couldn't be fulfilled because the financial conditions by far exceed my moderate means.

In order not to have undertaken the costly journey wholly in vain I at least wish to get a criticism of my first independent work (the Hakase work²) which unfortunately wasn't possible [to obtain] in Japan either. I have finished it already in Japanese, of course. When I am more competent in German I shall translate it into this language.

I would like to ask you, dear Professor Freud, to be so kind as to let me know whether you would be willing to then undertake such a criticism and also to kindly announce how much you would ask for it. Finally please take my heartfelt thanks for transmitting the Japanese card forward.

With the expression of my utmost respect and esteem

Yours faithfully H. Kosawa.

13/II 1932

1. The German original here reads “Selbstspotum”. It appears that this is a misspelling of “self-skotom” used again in letter 18. The term refers to the analyst's blind spot. Kosawa, after talking of amaurosis in letter 9, again uses a term from ophthalmology.

2. When talking about his “Hakase work,” Kosawa refers to his doctoral thesis, which may not have been obvious for Freud.

Letter 12.

From Freud to Heisaku Kosawa (in English)

Box 35, Folder 34

Febr 9th 1932
WIEN, IX, BERGGASSE 19

PROF. DR. FREUD

Dear Dr. Kosawa

I had promised Dr. Marui to receive you and will be glad if you can call on me Thursday 11th at 8 o'clock p.m. (after supper) I am sure you talk English, so you need no interpreter.

Sincerely yours
Freud

Letter 13.

From Heisaku Kosawa to Freud (in German)

Box 35, Folder 34

Dear Professor!

I cannot help but convey to you, dear Professor Freud, my deepest gratitude for your being so extraordinary obliging as to grant me an audience with you.

Following your friendly advice I have already called upon Dr Federn who gave me precious advice regarding making best use of my time. It goes without saying that I first have to put all my zeal into studying the German language.

However, every fortnight I attend psychoanalytic sessions that I am very pleased about and that help to get my ear used to the unfamiliar language.

Yours sincerely
Heisaku Kosawa

13/II 1932

Kosawa failed to reach a financial agreement with Freud, and instead received training analysis from Richard Sterba, and supervision from Paul Federn.

On February 18, 1932, Kosawa visited Freud and presented a painting of Mt. Fuji ("The inverted image of Mt. Fuji") created by Kiyoshi Yoshida (1876–1950). (The date is from the Diary. However, according to Kosawa's own memo, the meeting supposedly took place on February 10.) The painting (see Fig.) was later hung inside the waiting



room of Freud's clinic. Currently, it is hung on a wall of the Dining Room in the Freud Museum in London.

Letter 14.

From Freud to Heisaku Kosawa (in German)

Box 35, Folder 34

PROF. DR. FREUD

20.2.1932

WIEN, IX. BERGGASSE 19

Dear Doctor

Many thanks for the beautiful picture, which shows me what I have read so much about but what I wasn't granted the opportunity to see with my own eyes.

I am convinced that your energy will soon allow you to succeed in overcoming the difficulties with regard to your studies. Please be assured that we all here are prepared to support you in your intentions.

With kind regards,
Yours Freud

Letter 15.

From Freud to Heisaku Kosawa (in German)

Box35, Folder 34

PROF. DR. FREUD

16.3.1932
WIEN, IX. BERGGASSE 19

Dear Doctor

I have already agreed to afford you all the support I am able to give and I am very willing to read and to judge your work when it is available in German without you incurring any expenses, of course.

I am sorry it is difficult for you to undertake your analysis with me personally. I am still bound to the necessity of earning money, but instead of \$25 I would charge you only \$10.

With best wishes,
Yours Freud

Letter 16.

From Heisaku Kosawa to Freud (in German)

Box 35, Folder 35

Dear Professor!

Your friendly letter has filled me with great joy & I shall allow myself to present my Hakase work, once it is laid down in German language, to your kind judgement. Regarding your great obligingness with respect to the price for my analysis, I must thank you heartily, however, I cannot yet give a definite answer, as I am completely dependent financially on my brother whose benevolence I have to solicit first.

With etc.
Yours faithfully
H. Kosawa

Letter 17.

From Freud to Kenji Otsuki (in German)

Box 38, Folder 4

Addressed to: Ohtski

Dear Mr Ohtski

16.6.1932

It was with great satisfaction that I received your parcel of two books, newspaper and a small photograph. I would have liked to have become acquainted with your presentation of psychoanalysis, but this is impossible.

Regarding the object that you were expecting from our publisher but have not received, I have asked them what it was. If possible, the consignment will be resent.

With many thanks for your efforts and kind wishes,

Yours Freud

Letter 18.

From Heisaku Kosawa to Freud (in German)

Box 35, Folder 34

Dear Professor!

It was a great pleasure to receive your amiable letter and I would like to thank you very much for it.

I ask you to excuse my taking the liberty of pestering you again by allowing myself to send some more of my little translations to your country house.

I am, with regard to psychoanalysis, in a difficult position since in Japan I am in fact entirely dependent on myself.

With regard to the Azase complex, to which I refer in the work enclosed, I would like to say that it hasn't as yet been treated exhaustively there. But I would be very much obliged to you if you could let me hear your judgement on what already exists, in order to take it into account. As the aforementioned complex is only just sketched in its outlines, I might add further material, to allow for a better survey.

I would like to take this occasion to mention some fundamental questions that have come up in my practice:

At the beginning of my psychoanalytical practice I have applied White's method (under supervision of Prof. Dr. Marui) and in easier cases I had some good results. But in more severe cases (e.g. compulsory neurosis) this method failed. I started to doubt the applicability of this method and asked myself: What is "free" association? I read what you have written about it and finally, in a treatise on psychoanalytical technique, I found the definition. When applying your free association I always achieved good results. But I also found that in easier cases (schizophrenia) free association failed. At the time I remembered most analysts always stressing that the healing powers of the patient, i.e. his wish for recovery, are the main factor in the eventual healing. Of course, the self-skotom³ of the analyst must also be taken into account. But it is precisely this point that receives relatively little attention. According to my experience, however, if e.g. the analyst has solved a love conflict

3. Cf. footnote 2.

well, he won't feel guilty about it and therefore he also won't solve a similar conflict of the patient, the patient too will react to "guilt".⁴

I myself have solved these internal love conflicts within myself with the help of my practice, but as for the sadistic conflict in spite of all my efforts I cannot solve it myself. According to the latest psychoanalytic opinion, patients with dementia praecox show the strongest sadism. With such patients dementia is a mechanism that conforms to sadism.

If I were analyzed by you, Professor Freud, I could master my sadism. It seems to me [to be] the solution for the self-skotom of every analyst and also for me it is the main problem to be pursued.

With the expression of my utmost respect and esteem

Yours most faithfully

H. Kozawa

/VII. 1932

It was also said that Freud received Kosawa's paper on the Ajase complex but did not think much of it. The following is believed to indicate Freud's brief reactions to the paper.

Letter 19.

From Freud to Heisaku Kosawa (in German)

Box 35, Folder 34

PROF. DR. FREUD

30.7.1932
WIEN, IX. BERGGASSE 19

Dear Doctor

I have received and read your article and shall keep it, as you do not seem to intend any immediate use thereof.

Yours sincerely

Freud

While undergoing analysis sessions with Sterba, Kosawa stayed in Vienna from January 26, 1932 to December 29 of the same year, and returned to Japan. He then opened a psychoanalytic clinic in Higashi Tamagawa in Tokyo. Several years later, he opened a similar clinic in Denenchofu, also in Tokyo, and began treating patients as well as providing training analyses and supervisions.

4. Kosawa's argument in the original German letter is not very clear. Does he think that the patient reacts to guilt feelings of the analyst or that the patient reacts by feeling guilty?

Letter 20.

From Freud to Heisaku Kosawa (postcard) (in German)

Box 35, Folder 35

Wien 24.8.1933

Thank you for your letter and the lovely children's picture.⁵
With best wishes, Freud

IV. Mainly with Kenji Otsuki

In May 1933, *Seishin Bunseki* (ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR PSYCHOANALYSE), a journal specializing in psychoanalysis, was inaugurated by the Tokyo Psychoanalytic Institute headed by writer Kenji Otsuki. The journal was to be sent regularly to Freud. The Tokyo Psychoanalytic Institute was founded by Otsuki, together with psychologist Yaekichi Yabe and others, and brought together intellectuals, writers, journalists, and the so-called "lay people" (G.H. Blowers: Japan and Psychoanalysis. In: *The Freud Encyclopedia*, edited by E. Ervin, New York: Routledge, 2001).

In September 1933, Marui visited Freud. During his one-month stay in Vienna, Marui underwent psychoanalysis from Federn for a brief period. Later, he encountered Jones in London, and receives permission to set up the Sendai Chapter of the IPA. At the same time, Yabe's organization had become the IPA's Tokyo Chapter, not its Japan Chapter. Concerning this, a report was submitted in 1934 by Kanji Tsushima of the Tokyo Group (Tokio Psycho-Analytical Society. *Bul. Int. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 16: 261-262, 1935).

In contrast to the Germans, Dutch and Americans who consistently cause problems, the Japanese made a favorable impression on Jones and Anna Freud. In a letter to Jones dated January 30, 1934, Anna Freud wrote that Japan was an ideal country and that she "definitely wanted to visit it." (*Diary*).

Letter 21.

From Freud to Kenji Otsuki (in English)

Box 38, Folder 4

Addressed to Kenji Ohtski,

June 25th 1935
Wien, IX, Berggasse 19.

Dear Mr. Ohtski

I do get your journals regularly and received your book the title of

5. The German term is unspecific as to whether Freud here refers to a picture showing one or more children (possibly even Heisaku Kosawa as a child) or to a drawing or painting made by a child.

which you translate as "Psychoanalytische Miszellen" tantalized in both cases by the impossibility of making out what ought to be a very interesting content. What you write about the resistance in your country is no surprise to me; it is just as we may have expected, but I am sure you have given Psychoanalysis a solid foundation in Japan, which is not likely to be swept away.

I am sorry I am so old and invalid now or I would have grasped an opportunity to come over and have a nice talk with all of my dear friends in Japan.

With kind regards,
Yours sincerely,
Freud

Letter 22.

From Freud to Heisaku Kosawa (in German)

Box 35, Folder 35

PROF. DR. FREUD

2. July 1935
WIEN, IX. BERGGASSE 19

Dear Doctor

I am very pleased to hear that you are so satisfied with your medical practice and that your enthusiasm for psychoanalysis remains unabated. Such a state of mind is the guarantee for further success. Your study gives a very European impression. Only the plant in the background seems to be Japanese.

I shall have a photograph sent to you by our publisher.

With best regards,
Yours Freud

Otsuki sent a replica of the Freud Award medal (*Seishin Bunseki*, Vol. 5, No. 2) and sample pages of "*The Complete Psychoanalytical Works of Freud*." In a letter dated March 3, 1937, Otsuki explained to Freud how the medal had come about, the name of



the award recipient and his/her award-winning papers, and matters related to the publication of this book. By way of information, the award recipient was Fumiharu Nagasaki, and the name of his paper was "Hatred hidden in maternal emotions." (*Seishin Bunseki*, Vol. 5, No. 4, 1937.)

Letter 23.

From Freud to Kenji Otsuki (in German)

Box 38, Folder 4

PROF. DR. FREUD

27.3.1937
WIEN, IX. BERGGASSE 19

Dear Mr Ohtski

Your last parcel brought me several pleasant surprises. I am delighted to hear you are now set about completing the translations. With respect to translation rights, please find [enclosed] an agreement with our publisher [at Vienna] IX, Berggasse 7. The medal is, I find, a lovely piece of art, the head bearing little resemblance to mine, but at least it is more beautiful than my own and similarity is irrelevant anyway. We would be interested to learn who that prince is who donated the award and what led him to do so. With each publication we receive from your part we do, of course, regret that we must stay so ignorant of their contents. There is no Japanese person with us in Vienna at present whom we might ask for a translation. Would you yourself not be able to convey some translations so that we might be in a position to appreciate your works? We would be pleased to print them in our journals.

With thanks and cordial regards

Yours Freud

September 6, 1937: On hearing that Dr. Freud has fallen critically ill, Otsuki sent a get-well letter. To this, Anna Freud replied, explaining that that was a false report, and that Dr. Freud was in exceptionally good health (*Seishin Bunseki*, Vol. 5, No. 6, 1937).



The following year, on January 30, 1937, a talkfest of the psychoanalytic world was held, attended by Tamotsu Morooka, Kiyoyasu Marui, Katsumi Kaketa, Kenji Otsuki, Heisaku Kosawa and others (*Seishin Bunseki*, Vol. 6, No. 2, 1938).

Letter 24.

From Kenji Otsuki to Freud (in English)

Box 38, Folder 4

Tokio, July 16, 1938

Prof. Dr. Sigm. Freud

Dear Sir

I am very sorry to know that you have had to leave Wien, where your formerly life have been so deeply rooted. Since the incorporation of Austria into Germany, your fate was for me an object of constant anxiety, and I asked thereof Dr. E. Berger and Dr. L. Jekels, and the former wrote to me in return about two weeks ago, and informed of you and of himself. At any rate it is my consolation that you are in good health and safely, and now living in London peacefully, I hope.

About the future of our science I should like to hear of your opinion and of any plan I suppose you should be now entertaining.

In our country, there is quite no political oppression on our science and college, and our journal is experiencing by and by a very healthy development.

Hoping your health and happiness

I remain ever yours sincerely

Kenji Ohtski

Freud passed away in 1939. Publication of the journal *Seishin Bunseki* stopped in 1941, and the world plunged in the Second World War. The task of essentially integrating the IPA's two Japan Chapters was to be carried over to after the war.

V. Appendix

Letter 25.

From Kiyoyasu Marui to Eissler (in English)

Box 37, Folder 16

Hirosaki, Dec. 8th, 1952

K.R. Eissler

Secretary of the Sigmund Freud Archives. Inc.

285 Central Park West, New York 24, N.Y.

Dear Doctor Eissler:

In reply to your letter (Nov. 13, 1952) I am sending here copies of letters from Prof. Freud and also copies of letters, which I have written to him. As I am anxious to keep the original letters of Prof. Freud I will send photo-static copies of them later to you.

I had personal contact with Prof. Freud only once. During my stay in Vienna I visited him on some day (I am sorry I do not remember the date exactly) in August, 1933. At that time he was recuperating his health after the surgical operation (resection of maxilla) at a villa in the suburbs of Vienna. I was led to his bed-side; Miss Anna Freud was nursing his father. Prof. Freud was very glad to see me; he stretched his right arm and shook hand with me. He seemed to be deeply moved; I noticed even his eyes glistened with tears. He treated me as though I were his bosom friend of long standing. He tried to speak with smile and cordiality; but his voice was not loud enough and came through his nose, so that I could hardly catch what he says. So we spoke each other through the interpreted, Miss Anna Freud. Our interview did not last long; considering the situation of Prof. Freud I said good-bye to him after 10 minutes or so; but his friendliness and cordial attitude left a deep impression in my mind, which I can never forget.

Yours very sincerely

(Signature of Kiyoyasu Marui)

President, Hirosaki University, President.

In concluding this manuscript, I wish to thank Dr. Yoriko Kosawa, Dr. Sumiko Marui and Ms. Eiko Otsuki who, as members of the bereaved, have given me permission to feature these valuable documents. I also wish to express my special thanks to Ms. Yoshiko Iguchi of Children's Castle in Tokyo and Mr. Robin Cackett in Berlin, who provided me with tremendous help in making the translations. Without their assistance, this collection and translation of letters would never have been completed.

Theories on the Ajase Complex

Encounter and prenatal rancour

Aki Takano

Introduction

In a therapeutic relationship, one sometimes wonders what wheels of fate have worked to bring oneself into such a deep involvement with the patient. It is, then, not a very strange idea to think that the encounter of a patient with his or her therapist is governed by some outside factor unrelated to the intention of the parties concerned. From the olden days, we Japanese have referred to the element that works in bringing together people as “en.” It seems impossible to eliminate completely the element of “en” in therapy, no matter how much importance is placed on reason and intellect during the sessions. However, only too often such aspects become submerged in the process as therapy progresses. The paper focuses on the subject of encounter in psychotherapy, taking up the concept of “en.”

What is “en” ?

Let me first clarify the meaning of the Japanese term, “en.” The word, roughly, has the following definitions:

- (a) An indirect condition that contributes to bringing about an outcome;
- (b) Relationships; and
- (c) Edge and/or brim.

The first (a) is derived from cause and effect (karma), the fundamental concept of Buddhism. In Buddhist thinking, nothing is isolated. No one thing occurs or happens of itself. “En” in this context can be considered as an abstract factor that is indirectly involved in some event and/or occurrence yet decisive to the outcome. In everyday terms, we place importance on encounters as the result of “en” that works to bring together strangers. In (b), relationships that cannot be easily severed, such as parent and child, siblings, and man and wife, are referred to as “en.” The last (c) will be taken up in the discussions. Taking these into consideration, the paper will focus on “en,” which is a

Initially published in the Japanese Contribution. Vol.1 (2004) pp.179–195.

Aki Takano
Private Practice

familiar concept in Japan.

Encounters that occur in therapies can be said to be accidental, but they can also be regarded as a meeting brought about by “en.” Here, I will discuss the encounter between patient and therapist as the workings of “en.” The approach gives rise to discussions on how “en” affects the psychotherapeutic relationship, and how it intertwines with psychoanalytic thinking that places subjectivity in the self. I believe that it should be deliberated from both a cultural and clinical viewpoint; however, “en” is too large a theme to deal with in this paper, so I propose to take up prenatal rancour as one aspect of “en.”

Prenatal rancour

The concept of prenatal rancour was first introduced in psychoanalysis, when it was taken up in the discussions of the Ajase complex. Okonogi has presented the following three aspects of the Ajase complex (Okonogi, 1988 a):

- (a) The conflicting desire of the mother to have a child and to kill it;
- (b) The prenatal rancour and the desire to kill the mother on the child's side; and
- (c) Two kinds of guilt feelings.

Prenatal rancour is included in (b). In Buddhism, it means the resentment one harbors before one is born. According to the Nirvana Scripture, Ajase harbored ill will before he was born, and was called Ajatasatru (meaning both prenatal rancour and a broken finger in Sanskrit) since he was born with his finger broken as a result of some mishap during delivery. Based on the foregoing, Okonogi examined the significance of prenatal rancour, and interprets it as a resentment against the “en” that led to birth and which includes speculation over the origins of one’s birth and inquiry into it (Okonogi, 1991). He goes on to discuss it in connection with a case of family therapy and another of an interview with the mother in treating adolescent patients.

Any therapeutic relationship, in fact, has something in common with the “en” of parent and child, since one becomes—in other words, one is born as—a patient by entering into such. Just as one may speculate the reason why one was born to one’s particular parents, one may wonder why one has been placed in the position as the patient in therapy. Okonogi considers grudges and anxieties associated with the establishment of therapeutic relationships as the transference of prenatal rancour (Okonogi, 1988b). However, there are no published studies on prenatal rancour in the context of transference in psychoanalytic psychotherapy, and this paper focuses on that point. Please note that, although prenatal rancour is a major element, the paper will not take up the entire Ajase complex.

Clinical material

Miss A, a woman in her 30s, attempted suicide and was brought into the emergency care unit of the hospital where I work. I provide psychosomatic and psychiatric consultations there, and subsequently took her on. Her life was saved and she entered, so to speak, by the working of “en” into a therapeutic relationship.

Her family history and growth process, according to what she told me during the therapy sessions, are as follows:

Her brother, seven years her senior, was born with a handicap. It was when her mother's devoted efforts had finally borne fruit and he had just about managed to start walking, that Miss A was born. She was followed a year later by a sister. Miss A was bullied during grade school, but could never talk about her troubles to anyone, although she was reprimanded for not wanting to go to school. Anxiety continued and she could not feel relaxed in personal relations. She managed to finish high school, but stayed home and never went out, withdrawing from society. Miss A did not refer to the fact that her mother had not realized that she was being bullied; rather, she stressed the fact that her mother was the only person who understood and did not pressure her to go out into the world.

Her younger sister, on the other hand, succeeded in finding objects outside the home, and married. As for her father, Miss A referred to him only in passing. She merely mentioned that he was distant although he tried to love her in his own way, and almost immediately reverted to the subject of her loving mother. After her father's death from an illness, her mother, brother, and herself were left at home.

It seemed to Miss A that her mother had given up trying to discipline her brother, and in consequence, that he was increasingly getting out of hand. At a gathering of relatives, something happened to make Miss A lose face, while her brother became overbearing in manner. The incident rankled and eventually, his behavior began to infuriate Miss A. It seems that her resentment against her mother for not being her sole protector had been diverted to her brother. The mother was caught between the siblings and their quarrels began to tell on her, until at last, Miss A persuaded her to arrange for a separate residence for her brother. Her heart's desire was finally attained and she had her mother to herself however, the mother passed away from cerebral infarction only three months later. Miss A felt guilty, thinking that her quarrels with her brother had driven their mother to death. Despite these circumstances, Miss A repeatedly mentioned that "it was always just the two of us." I received the impression that the family's state of confusion had been aggravated by the death of the father.

Her first suicide attempt occurred just after her mother died. She had tried to kill herself in an attempt to follow her. She attempted suicide for the second time by taking an overdose and had been subsequently brought into the hospital where I work.

Psychoanalytic psychotherapy

(1) Beginning of therapy—start of a patient-therapist relation, "en"

In my consultations with attempted suicides, I have sometimes pictured the ambulance as a stork that drops the baby patient into my lap. Miss A turned out to be a very heavy baby indeed for my arms. I went to see Miss A according to the routine consulting system of the emergency care unit for attempted suicides, but she merely gave me wary glances from behind the bedclothes and was altogether unapproachable. On the second day, she thawed somewhat and talked about her suicide, which had been triggered by the death of her mother. She still wished to die and I suggested that she should go into a mental

hospital; however, she refused and chose to visit me as an outpatient, a method which would not ensure her safety. She also checked on the time I would be able to allot to her, which was rather surprising. I felt that it expressed her strong object seeking even though she appeared to avoid personal relationships. However, she also seemed prone to persecutory anxiety. I could see that she would be a difficult case to treat as an outpatient, since she was now suffering from object loss on top of her personality problems and without any supportive environment. However, I felt I had no choice but to do what I could to prevent her from taking her own life, and on that note, 45-minute therapies commenced at a pace of once a week. Incidentally, I assumed the double role of Miss A's psychotherapist and administrative doctor.

(2) Resentment against having been saved

Initially, Miss A was depressive and could not come up with any aim for the therapies, and told me that, for the time being, she wanted to talk about her feelings for her mother. She fondly described her as an idealized figure, saying that she was very kind-hearted and that she had loved Miss A the most. That was how I learned of the circumstances described above. Her feeling towards me, on the other hand, fluctuated between the desire to monopolize and the frustration of such. For instance, she would say that if you wanted to save a suicide, a doctor should be exclusively assigned to the patient on a round-the-clock basis. I was, of course, not her personal doctor, and the only time frame that could be exclusively allotted to her was the appointments she placed.

About a year passed without any notable progress, and Miss A, as was her wont, started reproaching me, saying that if the therapist was incapable of assuaging the pain of losing her mother, saving a suicide was plain torture. I was fed up with her attitude, but feeling that a similarity could be drawn between her life being saved and her being born into the world, said, "You ask me why I saved you, but haven't you been always asking yourself why you were born?" —at which Miss A dropped the offensive, and nodded in silent agreement.

During this time, however, Miss A gradually began to regress, staying in bed most of the time. She reiterated in a clinging manner that she wanted to die, and frequently rang me up. As her administrative doctor, I suggested having someone from the public health center visit her, but she turned down the idea. It was as if she were demanding that I take full responsibility for her, that I had the obligation to do so, having saved her life. She said that she needed me much more, that it was a natural enough claim from her viewpoint even if it sounded unreasonable, and added that she deserved it, considering all that she had had endured. She wanted to have me exclusively to herself and I could see that she had all along been clinging to the fantasy that she could monopolize her mother as much as she liked if only she persevered. The fantasy had been threatened with disintegration when her mother died and she had tried to take her own life so that she would be united in death with her mother. Miss A's desire to have her mother to herself must have always been thwarted by the existence of her brother. As aforementioned, she had always pondered why she had been born and been saved, and I began to think that Miss A harbored prenatal rancour, that she could not be reconciled to the fact that she had been born into a situation that would never fulfill her needs. I suspected the splitting off

of her prenatal rancour when she talked about her unity with her idealized and wounded mother. As for the therapy sessions, she resented having been saved against her will when they did not provide what she needed; in other words, it was manifested as transference of prenatal rancour. However, I did not directly communicate my understanding of the situation to Miss A.

(3) Relation (“en”) cut off then formed again

At the time, I spent the days feeling that it would be difficult to go on supporting Miss A, and was rather overwhelmed with the premonition that it would be impossible to prevent another suicide attempt. I was like an agitated mother who felt she couldn't cope with the responsibility of caring for her baby. And finally, about a year and eight months into therapy, Miss A was rushed into hospital by taking an overdose in a third suicide attempt. This time, she unwillingly consented to temporarily going into a mental hospital. The primary objective of the step was to ensure her safety, but it was also because I felt the need to change the structure of psychotherapy, which hitherto had consisted of one therapist, namely myself. After various arrangements, Miss A was duly transferred to Hospital B near her sister's place, but she could not bear it and left only after three days. According to the report from Hospital B, she had negotiated with her doctor, asking to be released on the condition that she would visit him for treatment from her sister's house. I was surprised with the rapid recovery of her ego function, but at the same time experienced a sense of futility, and expected Miss A to cut off the ties she had with me.

Three months later, however, Miss A appeared looking quite fresh and, equipped with a report from Hospital B, requested resuming therapy sessions with me, stating that she no longer wanted to die. I made it clear that she would have to face up to herself so that she could live a life on her own, and presented it as the objective of the therapy. I also gave as a condition of limit setting that she would have to consent to temporary hospitalization in a mental institution if she found it difficult to control her impulse to kill herself. Miss A consented to both, and I perceived, for the first time, her positive attitude to the therapies. Thus the 45-minute psychoanalytic psychotherapies were resumed at a pace of once a week.

(4) Resentment against having been abandoned

About three months into therapy, Miss A, seeming to make up her mind to tackle me, said that she had not even unwillingly consented to being sent to Hospital B and wanted to know my views on the matter. Afterwards, she became anxious that she had offended me, but rallied after a while. I interpreted her dreams and associations, and found that she had felt that she had been driven away to the mental hospital and resented me for the fact. I informed her of my interpretations.

In step with this, Miss A's idealization of her mother underwent a gradual change. She revealed she had conflicting emotions, saying that it felt as if she never had a life in her own right, since she was shackled to her brother as soon as she was born. She believed that parents whose first born is handicapped not only hope that the next one will be healthy, but expect the child to shoulder the responsibility of caring for the first. She had once told her mother that if she were her she would not have had any other children after

the first handicapped one, and regretted saying so. She also said that it made her feel bad to think that she reproached her dead mother, who had always looked over her in life. It seems that Miss A, in considering the origin of her birth, had long harbored prenatal rancour against the fact that she was assigned the role of guardian for her brother before she was even born and was not eagerly expected in her own right.

After a while, Miss A showed signs of separating herself from the lost object, saying that she felt a little strange that she could allow herself to think of matters other than her mother for the first time since her death. Yet at the same time she harped back on the subject of the mental hospital, repeatedly asking why I had sent her. I was exasperated with her persistence, but perceived a strong anxiety against being abandoned at the back of it. We had to skip one session due to my personal schedule, and at the next one, Miss A confessed for the first time after two years' elapse that she had felt abandoned when she was sent to the mental hospital. I told her that she must have been far too terrified to even mention the fact that she was afraid of being abandoned, and that while the skipped session aggravated her sense of being forsaken, she must keenly have felt the fact that she had no one to talk to. At this, she started to cry, saying that no one had ever been perceptive enough to tell her these things. I believe she recognized and appreciated the existence of a new object who was willing to face up to her anxieties, despite being still unable to give up pursuing the idealized object.

Gradually, Miss A began to intimate in a faltering manner her object seeking, while devaluating the therapy sessions, as can be inferred from her comments including, "I seem to be coming here in vain, but I do because I need the medications" and "I thought I would just mold away, not exchanging a word with anyone for so long." Even after sessions which she had particularly devaluated, she would mumble, "See you again," and slowly and wistfully leave the room. It was at such moments that I realized anew that an accidental encounter ("en") had become an indispensable relationship.

At one time Miss A brought a faded album containing pictures of her infancy, and talked about one of the photos taken with her mother. What struck me most was her father's eyes through the lens. I asked her about it, and she explained that her father had been into photography, and the album itself, with detailed descriptions concerning the photographing, had been compiled by her father. The radiantly carefree way they were smiling into the camera was ample evidence of the emotional exchange between them and the father. This was probably what she meant when she told me at the beginning that her father had loved her in his own way, and here, I felt, the family was presented as a whole with the father in existence. Soon after this, the New Year's holidays were upon us, and Miss A referred for the first time to my family, fantasizing that I would spend the holidays with them.

Discussions

1) Prenatal rancour as a key concept to understanding transference and countertransference

The transference in this therapy can, of course, be interpreted without using the concept of prenatal rancour. For instance, the usual interpretation would be that she had

withdrawn into a narcissistic and omnipotent world and was experiencing rage at its collapse. However, unless we use the concept of prenatal rancour, it seems difficult to understand her manifested mix of dependency and aggression that includes the aspects of being born and/or reborn. Therefore, transference of prenatal rancour, rather than being considered a distinctive form of transference, should be seen to have the function of casting a vivid light on one aspect of the process of transference.

I would next like to take up the issue of countertransference, which had a serious effect on the treatment process. I myself as the therapist, had been destined by “en” to meet my child in the therapeutic relationship, whether I wished it or not. I was, understandably, plagued with conflicting emotions. I wanted to “chuck” Miss A, yet knew I had to care for her. I rather ran to reaction formation and did not give close attention to my feelings of wanting to throw up Miss A. My stance can partly be attributed to my superego as a therapist, which dictated that it was out of the question, as the one responsible for the patient, to chuck her. However, I believe the guilt I felt for wanting to be rid of her played a large part. It drove me to make great efforts to take care of her. It was the concept of prenatal rancour that awakened me to the fact that I had been controlled by countertransference.

Clinically, it then seems that transference of prenatal rancour is not something to convey, as the therapist’s interpretation, directly to the patient and work through with her or him. Rather, I believe that it is useful as a key concept for a more apposite understanding of transference and countertransference in the flow of emotions.

2) Does transference of prenatal rancour occur in all therapeutic relationships?

Kosawa described the concept of the Ajase complex and presented it as a universal psychological mechanism (Kosawa, 1954). Taking it up in a paper on the Ajase complex, Okonogi gave specific examples and described how prenatal rancour was actually experienced (Okonogi, 1988a). He points out that in the process of separation-individuation during adolescence, a child quite often encounters conflicts over prenatal rancour when he or she delves into the origin of birth, and awakens from the fantasy of unity with the mother and becomes aware of separation. He also gives several clinical examples of adolescent cases. Now then, can the transference of prenatal rancour be considered a general phenomenon that occurs in all therapeutic relationships?

In Miss A’s case, although different from adolescent ones, there were many factors that made one consider prenatal rancour, such as her problems with the origin of birth and suicide attempts. Not all cases come with so many tangible elements, but latent thoughts and/or feelings about the “en” that brings people into therapeutic relationships can be said to be inherent in all treatments. For instance, after some time into therapy, it is not uncommon for the patient to reflect on the beginning of therapies and talk about his or her encounter with the therapist. However, the manifestation of prenatal rancour seems to rest with the subjectivity of the patient.

Obviously, there is no question of subjectivity when we are born. That is an impossibility, since we ARE BORN. That is why we look into our origin of birth and reestablish it as our choice during adolescence, when we detach ourselves from the parents and become independent. In psychotherapy, on the other hand, the situation commences by

contract, and at that point should be acknowledged as the result of the will of both the patient and the therapist. However, although the patient may recognize the fact intellectually, the therapies may not always be felt as a mutually subjective experience in his or her inner world. Some may actually perceive it as invasive or depriving. At the same time, it is not uncommon for patients to come to regard the therapy as valuable and become actively involved, even if they entered it on someone else's recommendation. However, when external factors are deeply involved and/or when there is excessive externalization or projection, the passive feeling that they had been dropped into the therapeutic relationship could persist. Consequently, the active part the patient played in making the choice to be treated tends to be obscured, and here lies the groundwork for prenatal rancour to manifest itself.

As mentioned in (1) of this section, prenatal rancour is a key concept, but it does not always appear in all therapeutic relationships, and I do not believe that it is necessary for, and must be taken up in, every therapy process.

3) Reestablishing relationship ("en") and three body relatedness

Although the therapeutic relationship with me began as Miss A's choice, it felt to her as if it had been thrust upon her and the "en" that brought it about was also perceived as having been forced on her. She resented yet clung to the relationship ("en"), and in fact, tried to draw it towards her. However, after I had presented the structure of therapy, including sending her to the mental hospital as a consequence of her third suicide attempt, she became conscious of the fact that she herself wanted the therapy, which led to her request that the sessions be resumed. She now needed the therapist as an object in order to face the difficulties of living instead of dying. By entering into a renewed contract, the therapeutic relationship became her psychological support, since the "en" had been subjectively reestablished.

How did this process develop? Let us look at the change that had simultaneously occurred on the therapist's side. Before Miss A's third suicide attempt, I was, through the workings of "en," placed in a passive and impotent position thrust upon me; however, I then made positive efforts to reconstruct the structure of therapy as an active therapist. I believe that the aforementioned patient's change was in correlation with my move. We had been caught in a deadlock, but the idea of the structure of therapy, which had reality, gave us breathing space, and its introduction helped us review the object relation, making us conscious of our subjectivity in the matter.

However, for Miss A, the structure of therapy was not something that supported her active stance in the treatment; rather, it was perceived as an insurmountable barrier erected between us. In other words, in her eyes, I had become separate and was no longer an object within her grasp to which she could reach out. The presenting of the structure of therapy, so to speak, had been perceived as a paternal existence appearing beside the mother that broke into the symbiotic relation of the mother and child. The paternity here does not necessarily represent the Oedipal aspect that has a sexual relation with the mother, but is the superego that governs reason and order. With the manifestation of paternity in the therapeutic relationship as a significant turning point, the transference of prenatal rancour can be said to have started to undergo transformation, while three body

relatedness also began to appear.

Afterwards, Miss A very gradually began the process of mourning work over her mother. It had been an off-limits realm while she had been caught in prenatal rancour. She could previously think of nothing but the strong feeling of attachment to her idealized mother, but when she faced up to the destructive force of prenatal rancour, she began to speak of various other feelings she had had for her mother. The three body relatedness in the therapy can be said to have supported the progress of these changes.

The process in which the perceived “en” changes from a hated object to that of a mental stay can also be said to be a process in which a grudge turns into feelings of endearment. There is a complicated mixture as well of the process of mourning and the manifestation of three body relatedness, and much remains to be studied in depth.

4) The remaining definition of “en” and therapeutic relationship

Here I would like to take up the third definition of “en,” edge and/or brim, which I briefly referred to at the beginning of the paper. An edge is a boundary of an area, and can be perceived as a separating line that one steps over. Obviously, a therapeutic relationship in psychotherapy belongs to an altogether different phase from everyday relationships. One must go across the edge and enter the realm. The entering into contract for therapies can be said to be a process of transit. Transference of prenatal rancour, consisting of speculations about why one had entered into the therapeutic relationship and whose subjectivity was decisive in the move, seems to be manifested owing to the realization that one is already over the edge and at the point of no return. In Miss A’s case, she had been brought into the emergency care unit in a coma, and as part of the consultation routine, was passed on to the therapist, and subsequently entered psychotherapy. The situation must have worked to make her feel that she had not voluntarily crossed the edge, giving her the conviction that she had been born into the relationship. Once the edge is crossed and one is well into the treatment, one ceases to be conscious of the “en” that brought it about and therapy progresses.

5) Chance and “en” in psychoanalysis

Lastly, I would like to depart from prenatal rancour and consider Freud’s view with the concept of “en.” He states that everything to do with our life is chance (Freud, 1910). The words give a glimpse into his basic stance, since he tried to see everything from the standpoint of natural science, assuming that its law applied to human beings. On the other hand, there is a cause for everything in thoughts concerned with cause and effect (karma). It is interesting to compare “en” with chance, which Freud sees as the all-encompassing fundamental principle of life. I will refer to Tsuiki’s categorization (Tsuiki, 1999) to clarify matters in order to consider chance in psychoanalysis. He classified chance into:

- (a) Something that appears to be an accident although determined by unconscious motivation;
- (b) Something that cannot or need not be taken up in psychoanalysis; and
- (c) Something that can be called chance but is incorporated into the unconscious and so processed that it ends up taking a part in creating the symptoms.

The basic work of psychoanalysis is to find out the chain of various events in the unconscious, as classified in (a) and (c), that seem like chance occurrences. And the connection is basically assumed to exist in an individual's inner world.

Now, "en" is a different framework from psychoanalysis for understanding seemingly chance occurrences. Nothing stands of itself, everything is carried out by "en," and moreover, it does not exist in the inner world of an individual. If we go by that principle and blame everything on "en," one's self will never work as a decisive factor and responsibility is dispersed. If so, there is no common ground with psychoanalytic thinking. However, the term "en" has a deep significance embedded in Japanese everyday life, and is not to be used lightly. In fact, I may safely say that we are already deeply involved in something when we consider "en." It is something absolute beyond the reach of the individual, sometimes the object of rancour, and at other times the mechanism that enables us to accept what cannot be helped. It is also the object of gratitude since it is perceived as something that directs good fortune. Another way of looking at it is as a buffer so that we are diverted from direct emotional involvement with the object in question.

I believe most of us go through everyday life accompanied by this idea of "en." Ganzarain pointed out the aspect of the Ajase complex that works as a defense system by dispersing the whereabouts of guilt (Ganzarain, 1988). Thinking about "en" means that one does not focus on the object one is thinking of, and in that sense, it can be said to work as a defense mechanism in terms of psychotherapy. However, when the situation becomes insupportable, people are forced to actively face up to the "en" in question. The arena for confrontation depends on the individual. A Buddhist may choose to go deeper into Buddhist thinking. Psychanalytic psychotherapy is another way, as has been shown in this paper. Just as in the approach to interpreting chance in psychoanalysis, I believe it is possible to make "en" a personal matter that concerns the self in terms of its positioning, even if "en" is something that is decided without any participation on the part of the self.

Conclusion

The encounter with an attempted suicide has led me to the discussion of "en" in a clinical case of psychoanalytic psychotherapy. In discussing the subject, the paper has focused on prenatal rancour, one of the major elements of the Ajase complex and which means resentment harbored against "en." We more or less live with ideas and concepts handed down to us and peculiar to the Japanese language and Eastern thinking. I hope to appreciate and deepen psychoanalytic thinking, conscious of my cultural heritage.

The paper's significance also lies in the fact that it has taken up prenatal rancour in the context of clinical psychoanalytic psychotherapy in studying the Ajase complex. However, it discusses the subject by presenting apart of the case details and does not take up the entire process involved in the transference of prenatal rancour, and which therefore, will need to be discussed elsewhere.

Finally, I would like to thank Dr. Keigo Okonogi for his advice and Dr. Rikihachiro Kano for his comments, which proved very valuable.

References

- Freud S 1910: Leonardo da Vinci and a memory of childhood. *S.E.* 11.
- Ganzarain R 1988: Various guilts within the Ajase complex. *The Japanese Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 32: 93–102.
- Kosawa H 1954: Two kinds of guilt feelings (Ajase complex). *The Japanese Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 1 (4): 5–9.
- Okonogi K 1988a: Ajase complex: A clinical and historical review. *The Japanese Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 32: 103–116.
- Okonogi K et. al. 1988b: Discussion: Ajase complex. *The Japanese Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 32: 124–134.
- Okonogi K 1991: Le complex d’Ajase. *Devenir*, 4: 71–102.
- Tsuiki K 1999: The problem of chance in psychoanalysis. *The Japanese Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 43: 245–259.

Theories on the Ajase Complex

A “common model” for the formation of guilt in childhood—A comparative study of Oedipus and Ajase complex

Kenichiro Okano

Abstract

The author examines two distinct theories of guilt proposed by S. Freud (the theory of “Oedipus Complex”) and H. Kosawa (the theory of “Ajase Complex”). Drawing upon A. Modell’s theory of guilt, the author proposes a “common model” of the formation of guilt in the childhood period, that underlies apparently contradictory mechanisms that these two theories imply. According to this theory, guilt is felt when an individual recognizes a “positive hedonistic imbalance,” i.e., the experience of more pleasure (or less pain) compared to other people, that is generated both in Oedipal and Ajase situation. Examining Freud’s theory of guilt, which is generally based on fear and punishment, and Kosawa’s theory, which is based on forgiveness, the author found that neither punishment nor forgiveness exclusively cause guilt; the role of each is complex as well as paradoxical, and they generate guilt uniquely when they conform to the “common model”, where the “positive hedonistic imbalance” happens to occur.

Key words

Guilt, Ajase Complex, Oedipus Complex, punishment, forgiveness, “positive hedonistic imbalance”

Introduction

Guilt has been one of the crucial topics in psychoanalytic theory. Since Freud got the insight into his own guilt hidden in his unconscious, it has been considered to carry multiple meanings as well as functions in human psychopathology. Freud’s theory of guilt was then taken over by other followers such as Melanie Klein who further elaborated on

Initially published in the Japanese Contribution. Vol.3 (2010) pp.89–103.

Kenichiro Okano
Training and Supervising Analyst at JPS

it. Whereas many analytic authors still appear to consider Freud's formulation a plausible explanation of the origin of guilt, it is greatly underrecognized that Heisaku Kosawa, one of the founding fathers of psychoanalysis in Japan who created his unique theory about guilt that he called "Ajse Complex", and presented his paper to Freud in 1930s', although Freud did not seem to have been quite impressed by Kosawa's theory.

Was Kosawa's theory really incompatible with Freud's idea? Or could there be a common ground between them from our current standpoint that Freud could not conceive at his time? If there is irreducible difference between them, does it mean that Japanese society could not provide a cultural background for Freudian psychoanalysis? These are very important points yet to be looked into. This paper explores the relationship between Freud's Oedipus complex and Ajase complex. Although guilt can be discussed in different contexts including cultural and philosophical literatures, we focus on psychoanalytic context, and especially conscious guilt observed in early childhood.

To state the conclusion of this paper briefly, despite the conflict on the surface between these two ideas, they have a common ground on which guilt is produced in a very similar psychological process.

Guilt in Freud's and Kosawa's theory

Freud has reportedly gained insight into his hidden wish for his father's death based on his self-analysis. He found that human being has a patricidal wish which is the basis for our unconscious mechanism to produce guilt (Freud, 1913, 1917). Klein's theory on guilt (Klein, 1946) basically followed Freud's footsteps. She explained that man has inborn instincts of life and death, and when the death instinct is projected to the outside world and is then reintrojected, it forms the superego. What was unique about her theory of guilt was the much premature timeline in which she located these psychological events, mostly within the first year of children's life.

Although many analytic authors still appear to consider Freud's formulation a plausible explanation of the origin of guilt, this formulation needs to be reexamined or modified, especially concerning the role of the Oedipus complex and the fear of punishment in the formation of guilt. Freud implies that children do not have a moral sense until they are taught or threatened by an adult, but this idea is not altogether consistent with what recent infant researches found out (Hoffman, 2001).

An issue of special importance here is the role of punishment. In my view, Freud did not stress enough the complex nature of punishment in its relation to guilt. It is true that in some situations, punishment informs a child of what is right and wrong in his or her behavior and helps the child form a basic moral sense. In other situations, however, punishment might alleviate guilt instead of forming it. Typically, guilt fosters an urge to be punished in order to be relieved of it. In other cases, threat of punishment causes repression of one's aggressive or libidinal wishes, which creates a grudging attitude and hostility instead of guilt.

The traditional theory of guilt can also be reexamined from a viewpoint provided by Kosawa, who proposed a quite different theory of the origin of guilt. More than half a century ago, in the early 1930s, Kosawa traveled to Vienna to be trained under Freud.

While he was there, he courageously handed his paper on the origin of guilt to Freud. In his paper, Kosawa presented an alternative theory based on his own viewpoint and cultural background. Whereas Freud considered that punishment plays an important role in the formation of guilt, Kosawa stressed that parental figures have a function of fostering a healthy sense of guilt in their children by forgiving them for their hostility or wrongdoing. In his still theoretically unpolished way, Kosawa proposed, in my view, a crucial perspective that was not developed in Freud’s theory of the formation of guilt, whether or not Kosawa himself was fully aware of the potential impact of his own theory.

Kosawa’s theory may have been confusing to Freud, who reportedly did not pay enough attention to Kosawa’s proposal (Okonogi, 1979). However, Kosawa’s theory could have prompted Freud to broaden his theory of guilt in some ways. It could have invited Freud to consider the roles of indulgence and forgiveness as agents of the formation of guilt. In this paper, I will propose a model of the origin of guilt (the “common model”) that will make Freud’s and Kosawa’s theories mutually compatible rather than antithetical to each other.

Freud’s theory of guilt and the paradox of punishment

First, I would like to revisit Freud’s theory more closely and clarify some of the points he made regarding the formation of guilt. I will then propose an idea of the “paradox of punishment,” which will highlight the fact that punishment has a paradoxical and contradictory function in terms of the formation of guilt: It can either generate or diminish guilt, depending on the nature of the punishment.

In Freud’s theory, guilt plays a crucial role in human psychosexual development. The boy’s libidinal wish, especially the one directed toward the mother, leads to his being punished or being threatened to be punished by the parental figures. These punitive parental figures are then internalized, forming an intrinsic punishing agent, the superego (Freud, 1936, pp. 242–243). Guilt is formed as an outcome of a conflict between this internalized punitive agency and the ego.

In Freud’s formulation, the crucial step is the (threat of) punishment that the child receives from the parent(s). The implication is that the child does not know that the libidinal wish deserves punishment, until he or she is “let know”, because children are immoral and “completely egoistic” (Freud 1900, p. 250). Thus, the formation of guilt is initiated by an external threat and punishment, although this is not enough for the child to become able to feel guilty. There is another crucial step: the internalization of the punitive agent. Thus, guilt could be felt without actual aggression toward others or a presence of any actual punitive agent. (Freud made a distinction between guilt and remorse, the latter being an emotion caused directly by actual aggression and resultant external threat (Freud, 1930, pp. 131–132).

However, as is often the case with Freud’s important notions, he defined guilt differently in other theoretical contexts. For example, in “The Ego and the Id” (1923), he explained that guilt results when the ego is tormented by the punitive superego, in which a “pure culture of the death instinct” is holding sway (p. 53). Because the death “instinct” could not be traced to anything beyond itself, the origin of guilt could not be found

anywhere else (such as in libidinal wishes, as Freud originally thought). It appears that, in fact, Freud was uncertain about the origin of guilt, because these two formulations are rather incompatible with each other.

Thus, Freud's view of the origin of guilt is largely based on threat and punishment. A child is supposed to develop guilt as a result of the internalization of an agent which punishes the ego, either for the child's libidinal wish or due to the death instinct that the punitive agent represents.

Freud's discussion of guilt is not straightforward, and he appears to have been fully aware of the complex nature of the relationship between guilt and punishment. Following Freud's effort, I would like to elaborate on this complex and paradoxical role of punishment that I already called the "paradox of punishment." This idea implies that punishment can cause, worsen, alleviate, or eliminate the feeling of guilt. It can also create a feeling that is the opposite of guilt, such as a grudge or hostility.

There are examples in which guilt is caused by punishment. For instance, as Freud's theory describes, a child might need to be punished originally in order to "learn" that an act was wrong. In the future, each time a mistake or wrongdoing was repeated, the child would feel guilty due to his or her internalized punitive agent. However, there are situations where punishment diminishes guilt. We often want to be punished in order to alleviate guilt caused by knowingly or unknowingly inflicting harm or injury to another person. Freud himself described a situation where a crime was committed in order to relieve guilty feelings (Freud, 1916, p. 332). There are other situations, where punishment can create a feeling that is the opposite of guilt. For example, a person could develop a grudging and hostile attitude after receiving what is felt to be unnecessary or unfairly inflicted punishment.

Kosawa's theory and the paradox of forgiveness

In his paper titled "Ajase Complex: Two Forms of the Origin of Guilt" (1950), Kosawa proposed a type of guilt that is essentially different from the one Freud conceptualized. Kosawa argued that guilt is typically elicited in the child's mind by a self-sacrificing parent. Citing a story from an old Buddhist scripture, he created a notion of the "Ajase Complex," through which this type of guilt is formed. In an article, Nakakuki (1994) summarized this concept:

"Ajase's father, a king, attempted to kill Ajase as an infant as it was predicted by a prophet that Ajase would kill him in the future. Later, Ajase, [having learned his father's intention] murdered his father to take over his father's position as the king, and he discovered his mother's attempt to help and protect his father from Ajase's attempt to kill him, which led to a murderous wish toward his mother. Later, when Ajase suffered from a serious skin disease that spread an extremely bad odor and kept everyone away from him, his mother devoted herself to taking care of him and cured his disease ... The major point Kosawa made was that Ajase was forgiven by his mother for the murder of his father and his murderous wish toward her. This forgiveness by his mother caused intense guilt and remorse in

Ajase, which is in major contrast to oedipal guilt where a child is punished for the oedipal murderous wish toward his father and his libidinal wish toward his mother. The resolution [of the Oedipus complex] is his giving up the oedipal wish and identifying himself with his father. In Ajase complex, the child is forgiven for his murderous wish toward his father and mother; and he identifies himself with his self-sacrificing, masochistic mother" (pp. 246-247).

Kosawa's theory should have been quite foreign to Freud. Instead of assuming that guilt is a consequence of feeling that one deserves punishment, as Freud conceptualized, Kosawa postulated that it is the sense of being forgiven that generates guilt. It is well likely that this type of guilt induced by forgiveness stems from traditional Japanese culture in which Kosawa lived and formed his theory. As Nakakuki suggests in his paper (1994), traditional Japanese women tend to be described as devoted masochistically for her children and her husband, as Ajase's mother was.

In this context, Kitayama (1985, 1994) discussed his theory of guilt based on the violation of what he calls "prohibition of 'don't look'", where self-sacrificing woman plays a key role. In Japan, there are many old folktales that depict relations between a human husband and a non-human wife. In the beginning of one of these tales a crane is transformed into a young woman and marries a human male, who happens to have saved the crane's life. The crane/wife proves to be a diligent wife who also shows a specific productivity in weaving precious cloths in order to help her husband financially. However, she forbids her husband to watch her as she performs the act of weaving by plucking her feathers. When the curious husband eventually breaks this "prohibition of 'Don't look'", he discovers his mate in a form of crane and is astounded. Being ashamed, the crane/wife leaves the husband as well as the human world and never returns. While there is no "forgiveness" per se in this story, the crane/wife's disappearance in a self-effacing manner may have caused her husband to have even stronger sense of guilt.

Although conceived and formulated by a Japanese with a Buddhist background, the idea of guilt produced by forgiveness should not be altogether foreign to those from the Judeo-Christian tradition. When Christ advised his disciple to offer the other cheek when slapped, what Christ might have meant was to invite people to reflect on their various emotional experiences, including guilt and remorse, related to their own act of aggression. In our daily clinical experiences, when patients become extremely angry with some of our remarks, interventions, or attitudes that they find unempathic, we often see that frankly admitting our insensitivity and apologizing for it, if appropriate, can quickly dissolve the patients' anger. Our honest and humble attitude sometimes further induces guilt and apology for their being agitated.

Based on these considerations, Kosawa's point seems plausible in many guilt-provoking circumstances. However, just as we considered the paradoxical nature of punishment, forgiveness could also have various paradoxical roles in the formation of guilt, including its potential for inhibiting its formation. I would call this nature of forgiveness the "paradox of forgiveness."

Obviously, forgiveness has functions other than making people feel guilt. In some cases, people who are forgiven feel less guilty or feel vindicated. In the case of angry

patients in our practice, in response to our apology, some patients would feel even more justified about their own anger and frustration. They would further assert that they were mistreated or mishandled in an unprofessional way, and demand more apology and compensation. The roles of punishment and forgiveness in the formation of guilt are thus complex. In my view, there seems to be no single theory that makes sense of these paradoxes until we consider the “common model” presented later in this paper.

“Pre-oedipal guilt” and Arnold Modell’s formulation: a lead to the “common model”

Before I discuss the “common model”, I will present a theory of guilt proposed by Arnold Modell (1971). His notion of “pre-oedipal guilt” formulates a way in which guilt is produced that is relevant to our discussion of the “common model”.

Modell’s paper, “The Origin of Certain Forms of Pre-oedipal Guilt and the Implications for a Psychoanalytic Theory of Affects” (1971), deals with a basic and essential matter related to guilt. He contends that there is a common ground on which various kinds of guilt, including Freud’s oedipal guilt, are experienced. He suggests that the mechanism of guilt is based on “awareness that one has something more than someone else” (p. 339). He relates this feeling to a “thought which remains unconscious, that what one has obtained has been obtained at the expense of taking something away from somebody else” (p. 339). He calls this type of guilt “pre-oedipal guilt”, and explains Freud’s notion of the negative therapeutic reaction from this standpoint. He further suggests that although Freud’s discovery of this negative therapeutic effect should be appreciated, Freud’s strictly oedipal interpretation does not fully explain this phenomenon, while his own formulation of guilt does.

One important proposal of Modell’s paper, as is evident in the term he uses for this type of guilt, is that guilt does not necessarily await the formation of the superego to emerge. Instead, the early stages of guilt can be produced in the child’s mind much earlier than the oedipal period. Modell’s argument seems to fit well with our observations of children’s emotional experiences.

They sometimes seem to experience guilt, or at least the precursor of it, even before they acquire adequate verbal skills and symbolic capacity. However, our observations also indicate that a feeling of guilt is more readily elicited when others are hurt by the child’s deeds, rather than by a situation, as Modell describes, in which a child feels that by virtue of his or her own goodness, others are deprived of that goodness. I believe that the former type of pre-oedipal guilt is more overt and is frequently seen in our observations of children.

I would like to propose four kinds of situations where pre-oedipal children, or children who are predominantly in the state of two-person relationship already experience emotional pain similar or equivalent to guilt. These are relevant to actual observations in my clinical practice as well as in my personal life. Some of these types of guilt could lead to or develop into oedipal as well as Ajase type of guilt, where the three-person relationship predominates. These four types of situation are as follows:

Type 1. When a child accidentally or intentionally inflicts pain in others, and is aware

that he or she is the cause of the pain.

Type 2. When a child accidentally or intentionally inflicts pain in others, but cannot grasp why he or she is the cause of the pain.

Type 3. When a child accidentally or intentionally violates a rule or breaks a promise that he/she makes to the parental figures.

Type 4. When a child realizes that he or she possesses or monopolizes something good, at the expense of others being deprived of it.

The type 1 situation is characterized by the child's awareness of the causal and temporal relationship between his deed and its harmful consequence to the other person.

For example, a 2-year-old boy accidentally hits his playmate's face while they are romping together, and the playmate starts crying. The boy reacts with bewilderment, anxiety, or terror. He seems to be feeling "bad," whatever this "badness" feels like to him. For the boy who hits his playmate, there is a clear causal relationship between hitting his playmate's face, and the playmate's pain, which is obviously seen in his facial expression. The boy who hits his playmate "knows" what the pain feels like as he himself might have experienced the same pain many times while romping about with his peers and that enables him to sympathize with the playmate he hit.

The type 2 situation is typically seen when a child's undesirable behavior unexpectedly elicits the parent's emotional pain, which is shown to, or at least felt by, the child. The parent's pain may be expressed in the form of either anger or frustration. Although the child may not be able to see the reason for the parent's suffering, he does see himself as the cause of that pain because of the immediacy of the parent's response, and he begins to experience guilt.

For example, a 3-year-old boy is with his mother who is watering the garden, when he suddenly dashes toward the driveway after a rubber ball. The mother is very upset because out of the corner of her eye she sees a car approaching the driveway. She runs after her son, catches him, and spansks him. He does not realize the seriousness of his behavior, because he does not yet have the mental capacity to imagine an actual accident in which he might be involved. Nevertheless, he notices that his mother is upset and terrified, and he realizes that he is the cause of it. He feels bad and a moment later he suddenly starts crying, begging his mother to "forgive" him.

As for the type 3 situation, it would be difficult to elicit an example of a small child who feels guilty by violating a purely internalized set of laws or rules. Usually a rule that a child feels the need to follow is one given by his or her caretaker(s) and there is a clear connection in the child's mind between violating the rule and a punitive consequence administered by the caretaker(s).

An example of the type 3 situation involves a 4-year-old boy who one day plays on a railroad and listens to the sound of an approaching train by putting his ear directly on the track. He does this with a peer who is 2 years older, who actively urges him to engage in this thrilling but dangerous play. The boy has repeatedly been told by his mother that he should never play on the railroad, because a couple of months ago a girl in the same town was almost run over by an approaching train while she engaged in the same type of play. The boy has promised his mother that he will not play on the railroad. When the boy comes home in the evening, he keeps wondering if he should tell his mother what he did.

She is totally unaware of her son's dangerous play, but the boy feels bad about having broken a promise to her. He is also afraid that somebody might have been watching the scene, and will eventually tell his mother about it. She will severely punish him, and the punishment will be even more severe if he does not tell her what he did until it is found out. He then develops a fantasy that his mother already knows what he did, and he finally tells her everything to be relieved of his guilt feelings.

As for the type 4 situation (the one typical of Modell's formulation) it takes greater imaginative capacity for a child to understand the meaning of these circumstances, compared to the first three situations, because the child cannot see directly the consequence of the behavior that is distressing to others.

For example, a 2-year-old girl who is an only child grabs all the strawberries from a bowl on the dining table, even though they are to be shared with her parents. Because they are not yet at the table, no one stops her. However, noticing that putting all the berries in her dish causes her parents to have nothing in their dishes, she looks puzzled and bewildered. After a little hesitation, she puts a couple of berries in the dish of each parent and looks content. In this typical pre-oedipal guilt situation (as Modell would describe it), the girl is clearly aware that the amount of good is limited, and that if she has something, it is at the expense of others.

If we look closely at these four situations, we realize that there is a common theme running through them. In all cases, the child causes some emotional damage or pain to another person (caretaker) knowingly or unknowingly, and the child knows that he or she is the cause of that pain. However, the visibility of that pain to the child differs among these types. While in type 1 and type 2 the pain in others is clearly seen in the peer's and the mother's faces, respectively, it is less visible in type 3 and type 4.

In the type 3 situation (where a child violates a rule or a promise), the direct damage appears to be made to the rule or the promise itself. However, as the example indicates, the boy knew that the violation of the promise led to his mother's distress and anger, which he perceived as emotional "damage" to her. As a result, the child experienced guilt or an equivalent feeling.

In the type 4 situation, the damage that the girl caused was not immediately visible to her, because her action did not cause anyone to be actually upset or sad. All she could notice was two empty dishes that belonged to her parents, whom she loves dearly.

However, through identification with her parents, she could imagine their disappointment and anger. She remembered that she had had similar experiences playing with peers when she was, figuratively speaking, the owner of an empty dish. It is also to be noted that in this type 4 example, the girl's initial pleasure and satisfaction in monopolizing all the strawberries in her bowl actually triggered her realization of what was happening to her parents: the (imagined) pain of not having any strawberries because she had all of them. This feeling is totally opposite to her initial feelings of pleasure and satisfaction.

This pleasure as a trigger of the recognition of emotional damage to others is a result of the temporary juxtaposition of these two emotional states. A child learns to be vigilant to others' distress while he or she is enjoying something because of the coexistence, if not a cause-and-effect relationship, of his or her pleasure and others' pain that frequently occurs in such situations. For example, in the type 2 situation, the joy of running after

a ball led the boy to pay less attention to his environment, including any approaching danger, causing his mother’s emotional distress. In the type 3 situation, the excitement of playing on the railroad led the boy to forget his promise, eventually causing his mother to feel upset and scared. Even in the type 1 situation, the excitement that the boy could be experiencing with his aggressive behavior in hitting his peer might be involved in his recognition that he was causing pain in others.

This recognition that one’s own pleasure might result in others’ pain endorses Modell’s theory that guilt is caused by “awareness that one has something more than someone else.” However, this “something” is not to be restricted to material, physical things. Instead, it includes emotional or hedonistic content: *more pleasure or less pain compared to that of others*.

These examples further indicate that the child’s recognition of damage to others (or to rules) might not by itself be the factor generating guilt. Rather, it could be the child’s acknowledgment that he or she deserves to be punished or to feel pain in some way, but that he or she has not suffered yet, which makes the child feel guilty. The type 3 and type 4 situations describe these circumstances well. The children kept feeling guilty until they recognized that they had compensated for their parents’ emotional damage. The same could be true of the type 1 and type 2 situations. The boys would continue to feel guilty until they “paid” for their damage, such as by apologizing.

Here, Modell’s formulation of guilt needs to be stated more precisely. Guilt is experienced with an “awareness that one [still] has something more than someone else,” resulting in inflicting damage to or pain in others that the child has not “paid” for. In the next section, we will elaborate on this formulation to make it applicable not only to the pre-oedipal types of guilt, but also to the oedipal and Ajase types of guilt as well.

A “common model” of the formation of guilt

I would like to propose a formulation of the mechanism through which guilt is produced that encompasses all four situations in which pre-oedipal types of guilt are observed, as well as oedipal and Ajase types of guilt. I will call this model the “common model” of the formation of guilt.

Although the definition of guilt differs according to the theoretical approaches taken, its general meaning is indicated in commonly used dictionaries: guilt is “the act or state of having done a wrong or committed an offense” (Webster’s New World Dictionary, 1986, p.622). It is an emotional reaction when one recognizes that he or she has hurt or damaged others or property, or has broken rules, societal norms or an ethical code.

This general understanding of guilt has several problems. First, this definition is too broad, and does not focus on the essential component of the guilt-provoking situation. Second, this definition does not cover some of the circumstances in which guilt is produced.

For example, the type 2 and type 4 situations that I described apparently do not match these conditions. Also, there are situations where guilt is *not* experienced, even though a person has hurt or damaged others or violated a rule. Freud and Kosawa tried to define the way guilt is generated via punishment or forgiveness, respectively. As discussed

earlier, however, the paradox of punishment and the paradox of forgiveness indicate that the formation of guilt cannot be explained based merely on punishment or forgiveness. They cause guilt *only in some circumstances*. Following these discussions, I indicated that Modell's theory, if modified, seems to be able to explain fairly well a wide variety of circumstances in which guilt is produced, including four types of pre-oedipal guilt, oedipal guilt, and Ajase type of guilt.

The common formulation of the formation of guilt is defined as follows: *Guilt is experienced when one recognizes that he or she has more pleasure and/or less pain compared to others*. Note that this formulation assumes that human beings have a scheme of assessing and balancing the amount of their own subjective pain and pleasure, compared to others.

An analogy is that we have in our mind a balance sheet (an "unconscious bookkeeping system," as Modell describes it (ibid. p 340)) of our pleasure and pain and those of others, and we are sensitive to whether there is any imbalance between them. I call such an imbalance "hedonistic imbalance," which is further divided into positive and negative.

"Positive hedonistic imbalance" means that the individual has more pleasure or less pain compared to others, and "negative hedonistic imbalance" means the opposite (i.e., less pleasure or more pain compared to others). In this scheme, "more pleasure" is practically treated as equivalent to "less pain," because we are not dealing with an absolute value of pleasure or pain, but a relative value in comparison with others, which is crucial to the generation of guilt.

Human beings have two natural ways of responding to, or dealing with, the positive hedonistic imbalance. These two responses are basically contradictory. One response is to wish to keep the imbalance as it is, or even to expand it, because it contributes to a sense of specialness and superiority compared to others.

The second response is to find it unfair or unjustifiable and to have a wish or an urge to "correct" the imbalance. This latter response usually involves guilt. It is an uncomfortable internal state that urges an individual to cancel out this imbalance in hedonistic terms, by inflicting pain on himself or herself, by seeking punishment, or by making others experience more pleasure and/or less pain. The individual would apologize or materialistically and economically compensate for the hedonistic imbalance.

Whether a positive hedonistic imbalance creates a sense of specialness or a sense of guilt depends on the person and the situation. Some individuals find the imbalance unfair, while others enjoy or feel that it is at least justifiable. However, even if an individual feels that the imbalance is justifiable, this could still be a defense against guilt elicited by the imbalance itself. Therefore, it is more accurate to speculate that the positive hedonistic imbalance could always create guilt, whether or not it is contaminated or countered by other feelings, such as the sense of superiority or specialness.

Using this notion of the positive and negative hedonistic imbalance, the "common model" could be paraphrased as follows: *Guilt is experienced when an individual recognizes the positive hedonistic imbalance, which is yet to be canceled out*. (It is of interest also to think what emotional experiences would accompany the negative hedonistic imbalance; it would be a feeling of unfairness, of being wronged or unduly treated by others or by fate. When a person experiences this feeling and expresses it verbally or non-

verbally to someone else, it can lead to recognition of his or her own positive hedonistic imbalance and resultant experiences of guilt.)

This formulation applies well to the majority of guilt-provoking situations. Let us examine the four types of pre-oedipal guilt that have been discussed in the previous chapters and see how this formulation holds true for each of them.

In the type 1 situation, when the boy accidentally hit his playmate, this created a sudden wide positive hedonistic imbalance by making that playmate physically suffer (while the boy did not). The boy felt guilty and apologized, which in many ways relieved his tension and distress. The act of apologizing itself is usually painful, as the boy needs to admit his own fault and mistake. Because of this very pain that he inflicted on himself, however, the boy was relieved, as it reduced the positive hedonistic imbalance.

In the type 2 situation, the child recognized that he had caused pain to his mother, thus creating a positive hedonistic imbalance that induced guilt. Although the child did not understand why the mother became so upset, this lack of understanding did not really diminish this guilt as long as the child recognized that he was the cause of the mother's pain. As in the type 1 situation, the child continued to experience guilt until he did something to diminish or cancel out the imbalance, either by apology, by self-harm, or by being forgiven in a certain way (see the discussion of the paradox of forgiveness below).

In the type 3 situation, no actual damage or harm resulted from the boy's playing on the railroad. However, in this case, a positive hedonistic imbalance was created in the following way. The boy knew that if his mother learned about what he had done, she would become upset and distressed, resulting in punishment for him. Therefore, as long as the mother was unaware of what he had done, he was basking in the temporary pleasure of not being punished. This pleasure was the source of the positive hedonistic imbalance, causing him to experience guilt. This imbalance increased even more as long as the boy imagined that his mother was already aware of his conduct and was already hurt and upset. The only way the boy could get rid of his guilt was to confess to his mother what he had done and apologize to her, and/or to receive her punishment.

In this type 3 situation, at first the notion of hedonistic imbalance might not seem to apply. Because what is breached is a promise or a rule, the child cannot compare the amount of his pleasure or pain with that of any other person. However, at least at the pre-oedipal level, every promise and rule is personified to some extent and is closely related to an image of the actual punishing agent, usually the child's primary caretaker who made the promise or established the rule. If a promise is breached, the caretaker becomes distressed and hurt, which is usually visible to the child. Thus, the child gradually learns that breaking a promise causes pain in others with whom promises are made, and therefore a positive hedonistic imbalance is created, leading the child to experience guilt. Usually, that guilt is not relieved or eliminated until the moment when the child is punished or reprimanded, because this is the only way the hedonistic imbalance is reduced or cancelled out.

The “common model” best applies in the type 4 situation. In the case I described, no apparent harm seemed to have been done to the girl's parents, who were not at the table. However, the girl was aware that she had more strawberries than her parents, and as long as the strawberries were a source of pleasure for her (as well as for her parents in her

imagination), a positive hedonistic imbalance was created. This imbalance caused the girl to feel guilty, leading her to do something to undo that guilt-provoking hedonistic imbalance.

The “common model” also explains the paradox involved in oedipal guilt as well as in Ajase type of guilt. As for the paradox of punishment, it can either create or resolve guilt, because it can either increase or decrease the positive hedonistic imbalance, depending on the way the punishment is administered. Therefore, no sweeping statement can be made as to whether punishment causes guilt or not.

Explanation of the paradox of punishment with the “common model”

Let us consider circumstances where punishment *creates* feelings of guilt. Suppose that a child is punished for doing something wrong and later repeats the same deed, and he or she feels guilty. There are two possible situations in which this occurs. One is that the child did not know that the deed was wrong until he or she learned through the punishment. When the child repeats the same deed, he or she already knows that it deserves punishment (meaning that there is a positive hedonistic imbalance yet to be resolved), thus creating guilt. The second situation goes as follows: The child already knew to some extent that the deed is wrong when he did it for the first time. When punishment is administered for his behavior in such a way as to even further convince the subject of how much damage he or she has done to others, it certainly produces or promotes guilt. It is because punishment administered in this way creates an even wider positive hedonistic imbalance in the child’s mind, even if the subject does not know exactly how and why his/her deed did such serious damage to others.

This type of punishment generally promotes a conviction that the person has done something wrong and damaging to others, along with a related inner sense of “badness.” Verbal statements or abuse, such as “You could never apologize enough!” or “What you have done can never be forgiven!” are punishments of this sort, making the subject feel guilty by artificially “planting” in his or her mind a recognition of having made a wide positive hedonistic imbalance. (However, if a child realizes that this type of punishment is irrational or unfair, he or she might become angry and spiteful instead of feeling guilty.)

Circumstances where punishment *relieves* guilt are much easier to elicit. People seek punishment in many ways to get rid of their own guilt, because it is an easy way to reduce the positive hedonistic imbalance. In this case, however, the punishment should not have any further guilt-imposing message, such as “You could never repair the damage.” Straightforward request for an apology, monetary compensation, or a jail sentence would serve the purpose if done in a neutral stance and attitude.

Typically, guilt is experienced when a person engages in wrongdoing that is not yet punished or found out by others. This situation creates a positive hedonistic imbalance because the person has not yet been punished but is still basking in comfort, relief, or freedom. In the same vein, a child might feel guilt by just having a homicidal wish toward his or her parent(s). It is the parent’s unawareness of this imaginary homicide and the child’s relief in not being punished for it that together create the positive hedonistic imbalance, thus engendering feelings of guilt.

Explanation of the paradox of forgiveness with the “common model”

Let us now examine the paradox of forgiveness. The “common model” provides an especially compelling explanation of a situation where *forgiveness* causes guilt. In the Ajase situation, the child is forgiven by the very person (the caretaker) that he or she wants to murder, the person from whom the child expects to receive punishment or retaliation. This situation creates a positive hedonistic imbalance even more than in a case where the mother simply does not retaliate. It is because the mother not only suffers from her child’s homicidal wish, but also shows affection to her child nonetheless. Here, a positive hedonistic imbalance is created in two ways: first, by the mother’s pain caused by her child’s malicious wish, and second, by the child’s pleasure with the mother’s show of affection.

However, forgiveness also has its paradoxical effect: It can also *alleviate* guilt, depending on the message that the forgiveness carries. For example, if a person is forgiven in such a way as to make the person believe that the hedonistic imbalance is already undone in some way, that individual no longer suffers from guilt. Verbal messages or reassurances such as “You did not do anything wrong from the beginning,” or “He (the person who experienced pain) suffered, but you suffered enough as well, because you never meant to hurt him,” or “He deserved that punishment, because he wronged you first” all have the effect of potentially canceling the positive hedonistic imbalance that the subject once believed existed.

Summary

The author proposes a theory of the way guilt is generated that applies to various situations in which this feeling occurs. According to the “common model”, guilt is felt when an individual recognizes a positive hedonistic imbalance, that is, the experience of more pleasure (or less pain) compared to others. Examining Freud’s theory of guilt, which is based on punishment, and Kosawa’s theory, which is based on forgiveness, the author proposes two ideas: the paradox of punishment and the paradox of forgiveness. These ideas imply that neither punishment nor forgiveness can exclusively cause guilt; the role of each is more complex and paradoxical. Punishment and forgiveness can either create or diminish the hedonistic imbalance, depending on the way they are carried out. The author also examines several situations in which children in a two-person relationship experience guilt or its precursor, and shows that this “common model” can explain why these different situations cause guilt. The author further shows that the “common model” can explain the paradox of punishment and the paradox of forgiveness.

Bibliography

- Buckley S (ed.) 2001: *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Japanese Culture*. Routledge.
Freud S 1900: The interpretation of dreams. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, 24 volumes. London: Hogarth Press, Vol. 5.
Freud S 1913: *Totem and Taboo*. SE 13.
Freud S 1916: Some character types met with in psycho-analytic work. SE 14.

- Freud S 1917: *Mourning and Melancholia*. SE 14.
- Freud S 1923: The ego and id. SE 19.
- Freud S 1930: Civilization and its discontents. SE 21.
- Freud S 1936: A disturbance of memory on the Acropolis. SE 22.
- Hoffman ML 2001: *Empathy and Moral Development: Implications for Caring and Justice*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Kitayama O 1985: "Pre-Oedipal" taboo in Japanese folk tragedies. *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 12: 173–86.
- Kitayama O 1994: Japanese tragic legends and a maternal prohibition. *Research Bulletin of Educational Psychology, Faculty of Education, Kyushu University*, 39 (1): 7–16.
- Klein M 1946: Notes on some schizoid mechanisms. *Int. J. Ps.*, XXVII, pp. 99–110.
- Kosawa H 1950: Two kinds of guilt feelings (Ajase Complex). *Japanese Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 1.
- Modell A 1971: The origin of certain forms of pre-oedipal guilt and the implications for a psycho-analytic theory of affects. *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, 52: 337–45.
- Nakakuki M 1994: Normal and developmental aspects of masochism: transcultural and clinical implications. *Psychiatry*, 57: 244–57.
- Okonogi K 1979: Ajase complex kara mita nihonteki taishou kankei. (Japanese object relationship from a standpoint of Ajase Complex.) *Gendai No Esprit*, 148: 228–47.

Theories on the Ajase Complex

The mother image in the Ajase complex and its Buddhist background

Fumiaki Iwata

On meeting Freud in Vienna in 1932, Kosawa Heisaku (1896–1968) submitted a paper on the Ajase complex that he had written in German. The Ajase complex theory, which was established on the basis of the Buddhist narrative of Ajātaśatru, heralded the Japanese people's first true encounter with Western psychoanalysis. It may be correct to refer to Kosawa's theory on the Ajase complex as the first unique theory of psychoanalysis by a Japanese national. Later, the theory spread throughout Japanese society via Kosawa's disciple Okonogi Keigo (1930–2003). Okonogi found that the Ajase complex had groundbreaking significance, and stated that, while the Oedipus complex advocated by Freud focused on the theme of patricide in the triadic relationship among the father, mother and child, the Ajase complex focused on the theme of matricide in a mother-child relationship.

As the Ajase complex theory advocated by Kosawa Heisaku came to be known, however, it caused increasing bafflement among many people. The reason is that the majority of Ajase narratives used 'patricide' as their official theme. Although all sorts of variations exist of the Ajase narrative, the story's standard plot is as follows. During the days when the Buddha lived in India, a prince revolted against his father, the king, inside Rājagriha, the House of Kings in the capital of the Kingdom of Magadha. The prince's name was Ajātaśatru (or Ajase), and his father's name was King Bimbisāra. The king's wife and Ajase's mother was named Vaidehī. Ajase staged a *coup d'état*, and imprisoned his father with the intention of killing him. Vaidehī secretly helped her husband in captivity and attempted to prolong his life. However, Ajase learned of this, and, now feeling that his mother was as guilty as his father, he attempted to murder her as well. Ajase's matricidal attempt failed, however, after he was dissuaded by a government minister. Her life was spared, and she was merely confined in a castle. However, Ajase executed his father. Having murdered his father the king, Ajase became tormented by a sense of guilt. Despite agonizing over his actions, he was ultimately saved by the Buddha.

This is the Ajase narrative that is best known among the general public. Since the narrative takes place in Rājagriha, a capital city in ancient India, it is sometimes called "The Tragedy of Rājagriha." In this drama, although Ajase had harbored a murderous

Initially published in the Japanese Contribution. Vol.5 (2016) pp.142–154.

Fumiaki Iwata

Professor, Department of Social Science, Osaka Kyoiku University

intent against his mother, he did not act on it: he murdered only his father. Because of this, the theme of the Ajase narrative was generally interpreted as that of patricide, rather than matricide. In fact, at about the same time as Kosawa presented the Ajase complex, a literary critic wrote a paper that took a different stance from Kosawa and pointed out similarities between the Oedipus narrative and the Ajase narrative¹. Because of this, the fact that Kosawa had used the Ajase narrative to discuss the theme of the mother-child relationship was difficult to understand in some respects, upsetting and confusing some people.

In recent years, research on the Buddhist background of the Ajase complex has made headway, with some studies revealing that the Ajase narrative contains stories that focus on mother-child conflicts. Still, I feel that the very core of the Ajase complex theory has not yet been investigated. In other words, it is the fact that, in the Ajase theory, a mother has been made a symbol of the Buddha. In this paper, therefore, I will examine the Buddhist background to a mother being perceived as a symbol of the Buddha, and hope to clarify the significance of the Ajase theory in terms of the history of philosophical thought.

1. Overview of the Ajase theory

Discussions of Kosawa's Ajase theory have become quite entangled. There are several reasons for this complexity. One is because Kosawa wrote more than one paper on the Ajase complex, and the differences among the various papers have not been clearly understood. Kosawa's Ajase complex can be divided into two types. The first type consists of a number of papers whose content changed slightly over time. These papers can be classified, according to such changes, into four kinds of paper. The four kinds of papers that belong to the first type are listed below.

- (1)“*Seishin-Bunsekigaku jōkara mitaru Syūkyō* [Religion as Seen from the perspective of Psychoanalysis],” featured in *Gonryō*, a bulletin of the College of Medicine, Tohoku Imperial University *Gonryō-kai*, No. 8 (June 15, 1931 issue) (originally written in Japanese)
- (2)“*Zwei Arten von Schuldbewusstsein—Oedipus und Azase* [Two types of guilt feelings—Oedipus and Ajase],” featured in *Seishin-Bunseki* [*The Journal of Psycho-analysis*] Vol. 3, No. 2 (1935) (originally written in German)
- (3)“*Seishin-Bunsekigaku jōkara mitaru futatuno Syūkyō* [Two Religions as Seen from a Psychoanalytic Viewpoint],” featured in *Seishin-Bunseki* [*The Journal of Psycho-analysis*] Vol. 3, No. 2 (1935) (originally written in Japanese)
- (4)“*Zaiaku-ishiki no Nisyu (Ajase Konpulekusu)* [Two Kinds of Guilt Feelings: The Ajase Complex],” featured in *Seishin-Bunseki Kenkyū* [*The Japanese Journal of Psycho-analysis*], Vol. 1, No. 4 (1954) (originally written in Japanese)

1. Hasegawa Seiya: “*Edipusu-Monogatari to Buttentyū no Ruiji-Densetu* [The Oedipus Legend and Similar Legends in Buddhist Scriptures],” in *Seishin-Bunseki* [*The Journal of Psycho-analysis*] inaugural issue, 1933.

Of these, the last paper (4) is the source of Kosawa's paper that is categorized as the first type. This is the only paper that is currently available for ordinary Japanese to read for themselves. It was re-featured in *Gendai no Esprit* (No. 148, 1979), as well as in a book entitled *Ajase Konpulekusu [The Ajase Complex]* written and edited by Okonogi Keigo and Kitayama Osamu (Sōgensha, 2001). The paper was also translated into English, allowing many readers in English-speaking countries to familiarize themselves with Kosawa's theories. The title of the paper, in English, is "Two Kinds of Guilt Feelings: The Ajase Complex," and is featured in *Japanese Contributions to Psychoanalysis*, Volume 2, 2007, pp. 3-11. As far as the differences between Papers (4) and (1) (2) and (3) do not create a special problem, in this article I will discuss the first type of paper, using the terms employed in this English translation.

Apart from the various papers that belong to the first type mentioned above, there are some that belong to the second type. In 1953, Kosawa translated Freud's *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis* into Japanese. When the translation was published by Nihon Kyōbunsha, Kosawa wrote a Translator's Afterword, in which he explained the Ajase complex. This became an essay of the second type. Later, only part of the Translator's Afterword that described the Ajase complex was excerpted and included in the aforementioned *Ajase Konpulekusu [The Ajase Complex]* written and edited by Okonogi Keigo and Kitayama Osamu, in the same way as the first type.

As we have seen, there are several papers on Kosawa's Ajase complex theory. My view of the change seen in the content of these papers is from a discussion on religion to a discussion on psychoanalysis. To begin with, the Ajase complex theory made use of a discussion on psychoanalysis to present a discussion on religion. As time passed, this discussion on religion gradually developed and expanded into a discussion on psychoanalysis that made use of a discussion on religion. In discussing the Ajase complex theory, researchers often questioned whether the mother-child relationship based on the Ajase narrative should be used as the theme or not. Before questioning the rights and wrongs of this, however, there is a need to first emphasize the fact that the Ajase complex theory was initially presented as a discussion on religion.

I therefore wish to show, in concrete terms, how the change actually took place from a discussion on religion to a discussion on psychoanalysis. Paper (1), which was published in *Gonryō*, was written as a discussion to defend religion against anti-religious movements. This is clear if we look at the opening section, which was deleted in the subsequent paper. The opening of paper (1) contained the following.

"Anti-religious movements sprung up, and anti-anti-religious movements that opposed them emerged. Newspapers have always reflected various aspects of religious movements. *Gonryō*, desperate to be at the cutting edge, may have seen this as a problem, and commissioned me to write a paper under a title such as the one shown above. Having no extra time to spare, I initially turned down the request. However, anti-religious movements represented a major problem. I had thought about writing something somewhere someday without actually being asked. However, this is much too sudden, and I was given much too short a time to write anything. This is my own fault. I'd be glad if this will be a lesson for all of

you. Is religion the opium of the masses?”

The papers of the first type contain discussions on psychoanalysis, interspersed with discussions on religion, so his line of argument is sometimes difficult to understand. This is particularly the case with papers written after the one whose opening sections had been deleted. However, if we read this opening section, it becomes clear that, as the title “Religion as Seen from Psychoanalysis” shows, this paper was written primarily as a discussion on religion, and that psychoanalysis was then used as a tool to reinforce it. Following the opening sentences, Kosawa introduces Freud’s totem theory as follows²:

In discussing religion, Freud first wrote about a scene which he envisaged the ‘totem meal,’ a ritual similar to the bear festival of the Ainu in Japan. ... Psychoanalysis has revealed that the totem animal is in reality a substitute for the father (*Vaterersatz*).

After mentioning Freud in this manner, Kosawa clearly states that Freud, who had used Judeo-Christianity as his model, has not grasped religion in its entirety.

If I were to summarize Freud’s discussion, I would have to conclude that religion is an attempt to allay the emotion of wanting to kill one’s father, and to reconcile with the father with ‘deferred obedience,’ and therefore is a mental state that is manifested from a child’s sense of guilt.

But is only this situation representative of all the religions that exist in this world? Is religion that has emerged out of a child’s sense of guilt the only and universal religion? I am compelled to say that there are other types of religion. What had emerged out of a child’s sense of guilt is ‘religious desire or demand without spiritual enlightenment’ and not a perfect, well-established religious state of mind.

Kosawa stated that a religion that uses Judeo-Christianity as its model is not something that is perfect or well-established. He stressed that “A perfect, well-established religious state of mind” is “a situation whereby a child develops a sense of guilt for the first time after his murderous tendencies are ‘melted down and dissolved’ by the parent’s self-sacrifice.” This is clearly a state in which repentance occurs, with the child being ‘melted down and dissolved’ by the parent’s self-sacrifice and causing a feeling of repentance. The Ajase narrative is being used as a concrete example of this religious outlook. As I have already discussed this in my other papers, the major part of Kosawa’s Ajase narrative quoted, and transcribed, part of *Zangeroku* [*Confessions*], by Chikazumi Jōkan (1870–1941), a priest of the True Pure Land Sect of Buddhism (often referred to simply as ‘Shin Buddhism’)³. If the sections that had been transcribed were applied

2. The documents that follow after this introduction, i.e., papers (2), (3) and (4), are almost the same as (1).

3. I have discussed the relationship between Chikazumi Jōkan and Kosawa Heisaku in the following writings:
(a) Iwata Fumiaki, “*Rekishi to Monogatari—Ajase Konpurekkusu no Seisei* [History and stories—the formation of the Ajase complex],” in Hase Syōtō and Hosoya Masashi, editors: *Syūkyō no Kongensei to*

to “Two Kinds of Guilt Feelings: The Ajase Complex” in *Japanese Contributions to Psychoanalysis*, we find that about 74 lines, from after line 27 on page 6 to line 16 on page 8, were excerpted and transcribed from the Ajase narrative on pages 52 to 102 of Chikazumi Jōkan’s *Zangeroku* (publisher: Morie Shoten, 1905). Kosawa was a devout believer in Shin Buddhism, and Chikazumi was Kosawa’s teacher of Buddhism, whom he greatly respected. The fact that a majority of Kosawa’s Ajase narrative was quoted from Chikazumi’s writings signifies that Kosawa’s understanding of religion had followed that of Chikazumi.

After this quoted passage, Kosawa used a different Ajase narrative, in which he focused on the tense relationship between Ajase and his mother. The narrative he used to emphasize the mother-child relationship is assumed to derive from *Thusa jātaka*, recorded as the 338th story in the *jātaka*, a collection of Buddhist folklore written and edited in Pali⁴.

Kosawa then used Freud’s theory of oral sadism, and proposed the concept of the Ajase complex. In other words, ‘a person’s tendency of wishing to kill the mother because he or she loves her’ was what Kosawa’s Ajase complex was all about. Kosawa also perceived this to be a premise for the ‘perfect, well-established religious state of mind.’ To illustrate this, Kosawa cited, as an example, a certain patient who was his analysand, and ended the discussion by writing as follows.

The way he viewed life changed completely, as if silver had changed to gold. This psychology is the most harmonious state that human beings have managed to attain, to this date, even when seen from contemporary cutting-edge scientific and psychoanalytical perspectives. Lastly, therefore, I wish to pose, to thinking people, the question asked at the opening of the paper: “Is religion the opium of the masses?”

As seen, Kosawa’s paper is structured with a question being posed at the opening of the paper, “Is religion the opium of the masses?”, and Kosawa using the Ajase narrative and Freud’s discussion on psychoanalysis to answer the question, ultimately concluding that religion is not the opium of the masses. It is clear that the Ajase complex theory featured in Paper (1) had been submitted as a discussion on religion.

Gendai [Modernity and the Foundation of Religion] Vol. 1, Kōyō Shōbō, 2001; (b) Iwata Fumiaki, “Ajase Konpulekusu to Chikazumi Jōkan [The Ajase Complex and Chikazumi Jōkan],” in *Rinshō-seishin’igaku [Japanese Journal of Clinical Psychiatry]* Vol. 38, No. 7, 2009; and (c) Iwata Fumiaki, *Kindai Bukkyō to Seinen [Chikazumi Jōkan, Youth, and Modern Buddhism]*, Iwanami Shoten Publishers, 2014. Part of the following documents, moreover, are translated into English: “The Dawning of Japanese Psychoanalysis: Kosawa Heisaku’s Therapy and Faith,” in Christopher Harding, Iwata Fumiaki, and Yoshinaga Shin’ichi, editors, *Religion and Psychotherapy in Modern Japan*, Routledge, 2014, pp. 120–136.

4. The Ajase narrative contains numerous stories that use the father-child conflict as the theme. However, several stories also exist that use the mother-child conflict as a theme. Several studies have been published that investigated variations of the Ajase narratives such as these, and elucidated their relationships, including Iwata Fumiaki’s aforementioned paper, “*Rekishī to Monogatari—Ajase Konpurekkusu no Seisei* [History and stories - the formation of the Ajase complex].” As a study of diverse Ajase narratives, the following book, written in English, may serve as a reference: Michael Radich, *How Ajātaśatru Was Reformed*, The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 2011.

Next, let me clarify the content of Papers (2) and (3) from their relationship with Paper (1). Papers (2) and (3) are included in the same journal, namely, *The Japanese Journal of Psycho-analysis*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (March and April 1935 issue). The cover of this journal shows the title “*Zwei Arten von Schuldbewusstsein—Oedipus und Ajase*,” and explains that it is the German translation of “Two Religions as Seen from Psychoanalysis.” Bearing in mind that Kosawa returned to Japan from Vienna in 1933, it is most likely correct to regard this German-language Paper (2) as the paper on the Ajase complex theory which Kosawa reportedly handed to Freud. Although the difference between Papers (1) and (2) is slight, we can point out that the focus has moved from a discussion of religion to a discussion of psychoanalysis. Notably, the title has been changed to “*Zwei Arten von Schuldbewusstsein—Oedipus und Ajase*” (Two Kinds of Guilt Feelings: Oedipus and Ajase), which seemed to work well as a discussion of psychoanalysis. The opening sentences quoted earlier were deleted. In its place, Kosawa inserted a sentence stating that he had written this paper before reading Freud’s *Civilization and Its Discontents*.

The title of Paper (3) differs slightly from that of Paper (1). However, like the title of Paper (1), it signifies that the paper is a discussion of religion using psychoanalysis. As mentioned above, however, part of the opening section of Paper (1) was deleted, but it reappears, virtually unchanged, as the Introduction to Paper (3). The sentence at the end of Paper (3), moreover, differs from the sentence at the end of the aforementioned Paper (1), and has been changed to “Lastly, therefore, I wish to pose the question to thinking people: ‘What does religion mean for ordinary people?’” This is the result of an adjustment having been made that affected a few words, with the passage containing the question at the opening of the paper, “Is religion the opium of the masses?” having been moved to the Introduction.

Paper (4) can be positioned as a document based on Paper (2), written in German, and, together with Paper (3), which was written in Japanese, expands the discussion of religion to a discussion of psychoanalysis. Like the German-language paper, its title is “Two Kinds of Guilt Feelings: The Ajase Complex.” The Introduction featured in Paper (3), written in Japanese, has also been removed. The final sentence is the same as in Paper (3). Paper (4) served as a draft for subsequent papers that belong to the first type; however, since it is based on Paper (1), originally written as a discussion of religion, but with a different title, opening, and ending sections, it does not fully qualify as an independent discussion on psychoanalysis. This also made its argument difficult to follow.

Compared to papers that belong to type 1, papers that belong to type 2 are better organized and constructed as a theory of psychoanalysis, making their logic considerably easier to understand. Whereas type 1 papers use a discussion of psychoanalysis to back up a discussion on religion, type 2 papers, which were written after the elapse of more than twenty years, have a different composition, in that they use the Ajase narrative to construct a discussion on psychoanalysis. In other words, Kosawa used the story of Ajase’s salvation as a model for a psychoanalytic theory.

Papers of the second type of begin their discussion by describing the agony of Ajase’s mother Vaidehī. The focus then moves to mother-child conflict and confrontation. Presentation of the narrative ends as Ajase receives salvation by the Buddha. Here,

Ajase, the child, is made the model of a neurotic patient who breaks away from maternal constraints. The papers clearly state that the true purpose of psychoanalysis is to “attain a type of personality that can grow, mature, become released from maternal constraints, adapt to society, and become able to love others.” The second type of papers therefore became a discussion on psychoanalysis about a child who had tried to commit matricide. In this section, I have clarified how Kosawa’s discussions on the Ajase complex, which was originally written as a discussion on religion, expanded to a discussion on psychoanalysis.

2. The mother as a symbol of the Buddha

A number of factors can be assumed to explain why Kosawa Heisaku shifted the axis of confrontation and conflict in the Ajase narrative from father-child to mother-child, transforming the already widespread narrative.

The first factor is that, as I have mentioned so far, a discussion on the Ajase complex had come about from a discussion on religion. The original starting point of Kosawa’s discussion was that, to protect the *raison d’être* of religion, he examined the salvation provided by Buddhism, which differs from that of Judeo-Christianity, and stated that here, true religious psychology has been made complete. It may be said that, in so doing, Kosawa emphasized the motivation of ‘matricide’ in Buddhism to present a narrative that can contrast with Freud who had designated ‘patricide’ as the root of the establishment of Judeo-Christianity.

The second factor that can be cited is Kosawa’s clinical experience. His type 1 and type 2 papers mentioned earlier both describe cases of patients who struggle with their mothers and whom Kosawa treats by means of psychoanalysis. Clinical experiences such as these have become the major reason for forming his discussion on the Ajase complex. The third factor is the presumed existence of a large psychological desire among the Japanese in those days that enveloped Kosawa. In the course of Japan’s absorption of Western civilization and promotion of modernization, the environment surrounding families, as well as parent-child and marital relationships, underwent major changes. In this context, it is possible to presume the existence of a psychological desire to seek a new mother-child image. Concerning the essence of this psychological desire, Kawai Hayao, Japan’s leading Jungian psychologist, made the following comment: “The ‘transformation’ that occurred in Kosawa was not induced intentionally. Instead, the story induced a ‘cultural transformation’ in the hearts of the Japanese.” Regarding the essence of this transformation, moreover, Kawai assumes that Kosawa may have unconsciously tried to communicate an image of an idealized Japanese woman⁵. Although the existence of such psychological desires is still hypothetical, we can nevertheless theorize that the pattern of desires of the Japanese, including Kosawa, in the late modern period was behind the creation of Kosawa’s Ajase complex theory.

The fourth possible factor is the presence of the Ajase narrative that uses the mother-child conflict, in particular, the mother’s agonies, as its theme. In fact, Kosawa

5. Kawai Hayao, *Yungu Shinrigaku to Bukkyō* [*Jungian Psychology and Buddhism*], Iwanami Shoten, 1995, pp. 104–105.

incorporated, in his discussion of the Ajase complex, the Ajase narrative as generally known by the general public, as well as the kinds of Ajase narrative that differed from it.

As we have seen, several reasons can be contemplated that might explain why Kosawa chose mother-child relationships, instead of father-child relationships, as his theme. In my paper, however, I wish to clarify the content of Buddhist thinking that supports Kosawa's mother-child image which lies at the root of these factors. The reason is that past studies have not taken note of the Buddhist thinking that had enabled a shift in confrontation/conflict in Kosawa's discussion from father-child to mother-child.

Of all the scriptures featuring Ajase's mother Vaidehī as the main character, it was the *Contemplation Sūtra* that the largest number of Buddhists revered. The *Contemplation Sūtra* describes Buddha's preachings toward Vaidehī who, while imprisoned by Ajase, was overcome with despair, making this scripture one of the basic sacred writings of the Jōdō sect of Buddhism that preaches salvation by Amida Buddha (or Amitābha). However, researchers have long argued over how Vaidehī and other characters who appear in the scriptures, such as King Bimbisāra and Ajase, should be viewed⁶. The focus of their arguments lies in whether to regard Vaidehī as a 'saint in training,' or as a common person lacking the ability to understand Buddhist teachings. Leading priests in 6th century China, such as Jizang (549–623) and Huiyuan (528–592), referred to scriptures other than the *Contemplation Sūtra* to perceive Vaidehī as a saint. In contrast, the 7th century Chinese priest Shando (618–681) followed the text of the *Contemplation Sūtra* and viewed Vaidehī as a common person. Shando had a major influence on the development and spread of the Jōdō sect of Buddhism in Japan. Honen (1133–1212), a priest and a founder of the Jōdō sect who played an active role from the 12th to 13th century, and who followed Shando's understanding of Vaidehī, went so far as to preach, "Rely solely on Shando." However, Shinran (1173–1262), a disciple of Honen, had a different interpretation. Despite being Honen's disciple, Shinran did not imitate Honen's teachings word for word. Shinran deepened his teacher Honen's understanding of the Jōdō sect of Buddhism in a variety of aspects. Although Shinran himself had no wish to establish a religious sect different from that of Honen, because of the difference in the interpretation of the Sūtra's text, he ended up being regarded as the founder of Jōdō Shinshu (or Shin Buddhism), a religious sect different from the Jōdō sect which Honen had founded. Kosawa was a devout Jōdō Shinshu Buddhist.

Kosawa frequently expressed his reverence toward Shinran by comparing his writings with Freud's academic discipline. In his 1934 paper, "*Seishin-Bunsekichiryō nikansuru nisanno jige* [Several personal views on psychoanalytic treatment]," in *Seishin-Bunseki* [*The Journal of Psycho-analysis*] Vol. 1, No. 2, 1934, he claimed that the activity of Eros, or libido, which Freud was still unable to sufficiently elucidate, could be essentially identified from Shinran's words and actions, stating, "Here, in the biography of saint Shinran, I have discovered a passage that appears to say that the essence of psychoanalytic treatment has been elucidated."⁷ When Freud passed away in September 1939,

6. The discussion on how Vaidehī is regarded in Buddhism was based on *Kyōgyōshinshō Kōgi* [*A lecture on Kyōgyōshinshō*] Volume on *Kyōgyō* by Yamabe Shūgaku and Akanuma Chizen, Hōzōkan, 1951, pp. 63–69.

7. Kosawa Heisaku, "*Seishin-Bunsekichiryō nikansuru nisanno jige* [Several personal views on psychoanalytic treatment]," in *Seishin-Bunseki* Vol. 1, No. 2, 1934, p. 9.

moreover, Kosawa, in grief, wrote an article entitled, “Mourning the death of Dr. Freud.”⁸ In this memorial article dedicated to Freud, Kosawa wrote, “I cannot help considering the similarities between this state of mind of Dr. Freud and that of Saint Shinran,” once again comparing Freud and Shinran.

Shinran’s interpretation of Vaidehī was unique and different from that of Zhiyi, Shando or Honen: he saw the woman neither as a saint nor as a common person. In the opening paragraph of his main book, *The Kyōgyōshinshō*, Shinran declares that all the characters appearing in the Ajase narrative that took place in the ancient capital of Rājagṛha, such as Vaidehī and Bimbisāra, were ‘incarnated ones.’ In other words, Shinran took the view that, to spread his teachings, the Buddha temporarily disguised himself and took human form. Renowned Buddhist scholar Daisetz T. Suzuki explained what Shinran had referred to as the ‘incarnated ones’ as follows.

In Buddhism, ‘incarnation’ refers to the infinitely varied forms assumed by the Buddha in order to reveal the Dharma to ordinary beings and deliver them from ignorance.

Shinran believed the incident at Rājagṛha held the key that opened the doors to salvation. He perceived that the protagonists in the story, entangled in the web of their karmic inheritance, were forms or means through which the working of Amida’s compassion was made manifest. He thus refers to them as the ‘incarnated ones,’ in the sense of their being manifestations of Amida’s compassion⁹.

According to Shinran’s interpretation of the scripture, both Vaidehī and Bimbisāra are people who were made to appear to express the compassion of Amida. Vaidehī and Bimbisāra, therefore, become individuals who symbolized Amida’s compassion. This led to the emergence, among the believers of Shin Buddhism, of those who regarded their own parents as ‘incarnated ones,’ based on this interpretation of the scriptures by Shinran. One of these believers was Chikazumi Jōkan, a priest and religious teacher under whom Kosawa had studied, and who had conveyed Shinran’s teachings directly to Kosawa.

Chikazumi had a view of salvation that centered on the parent-child relationship, a paradigm that was deeply rooted in his own experience of conversion. In 1897, Chikazumi made a fateful and conclusive conversion in his hometown of Shiga in Japan. He compared himself, after this experience, to Ajase, overlapped his own parents with Ajase’s parents Vaidehī and Bimbisāra, and talked repeatedly about his conversion¹⁰. He also regarded his own mother as the Amida Buddha, and stated that he would forever serve her¹¹. In Chikazumi’s soul, a place of worship had been opened where he could

8. First appeared in *Tokyō Iji Shinshi*, No. 3155, 1939. Reprinted in *Seishin-Bunseki Kenkyū* [*The Japanese Journal of Psycho-analysis*] Vol. 1, No. 6, 1954.

9. *Gutoku Shaku Shinran*; translated by Daisetz Teitarō Suzuki, *The Kyōgyōshinshō: The collection of passages expounding the true teaching, living, faith, and realizing of the Pure Land*, Shinshū Ōtaniha, 1973, p.209.

10. Chikazumi Jōkan, *Zangeroku Jyō* [*Confessions*], Introduction).

11. For Chikazumi Jōkan’s views on family, I referred to Chapter 7 of the aforementioned *Kindai Bukkyō to Seinen*.

perceive both his parents as symbols of the Buddha.

Chikazumi often compared Amida's compassion to parental love. Whenever he preached, he was said to have consistently used the *ubasute* legend (the practice among the poor of abandoning elderly people to die in the mountains) and presented moral poems associated with this story, such as "While being carried up to the mountain, why does a parent snap twigs off the trees and drop them on the ground? It's for its son who will return home after abandoning it, so that he does not get lost." Saying that he had heard the story as a small child, Chikazumi describes this Japanese legend as follows¹². So as to have fewer mouths to feed an unfilial son decided to abandon his elderly parent on a remote mountain. He placed the parent in a basket and strapped it to his back. Expressing no complaint, the parent meekly reached out from inside the basket, broke off the occasional overhanging twig, and tied grass around it to mark it as a guidepost. The son secretly thought that, after being abandoned by him, the parent intended to use them to find its way home again. He watched his parent doing this with some contempt. The two finally arrived at the destination. As the son was about to leave, his parent caught him by the sleeve, and said, as the last words to him, "So, I must bid farewell to you, my son. Take good care of your health, no matter what. We've come a very long way, deep into the mountains. I bet you've lost track of your way home. So, on the way here, I put up a few guideposts for you. Follow them so as not to get lost, return home safely, and carry on our family name." Despite being an unfilial son, he was taken aback by these unexpected words of farewell. He immediately placed both his hands on the grass, shaken to his core to learn the extent of his parent's compassion, was moved to tears, and could not stop crying. He was said to have asked it, "Please get inside the basket once again. I will take you home and serve you forever." Chikazumi says that this tale describes how a parent's true compassion resonated to the depths of the unfilial son's heart, moved him deeply, and caused him to repent. What we must keep in mind, however, is that this story is told from the viewpoint of highlighting the Buddha's compassion and mercy. Even if an ideal parent is being depicted in the story, it is merely a metaphor used to attain truth and faith, and that the 'parent' illustrated here is the symbolic presence of the Buddha. What is aimed at in this story is not the ordinary conciliation of a parent-child relationship, but 'a state of deep faith.' In other words, Chikazumi used a parent-child relationship as a teaching example of Amida's absolute compassion. Chikazumi taught that the masses, who are the 'children,' should adopt a state in which they repent their ways after being disarmed by Amida's compassion. If one understands the way this *ubasute* legend is accepted, it is easy to understand the chronology of events that had caused a shift in the axis of the confrontation and conflict in the Ajase narrative, from father-child to mother-child, which many researchers had difficulty understanding. According to a Buddhist doctrine, the 'parent' in this *ubasute* legend is the same, whether it is a father or a mother. Chikazumi merely mentions it as 'parent.' Chikazumi repeatedly preaches the Buddha's compassion by comparing it to a 'parent.' This does not apply only to the *ubasute* legend. Buddhists are free to think about this 'parent' in real-life form, either as a father or a mother. In other words, here, a forum is being opened in which the parent-child relation-

12. Chikazumi Jōkan. *Jiai to Shinjitsu [Compassion and Truth]*, Chōjiya Shoten, 1954, pp. 30–33.

ship can be replaced by both the father-child and mother-child relationship.

There are also writings which show that Kosawa regarded his own parents as a symbol of Amida and incarnation of the Buddha. Several letters which Kosawa, while living in Vienna, had written to his family back in Japan, were kept at the Kosawa residence in Denenchōfu, Tokyo. In a letter dated May 1932, addressed to his older brother Ichiro, Kosawa recalled his late father and confessed his belief that his father, who was protecting him from his place in heaven, was the incarnation of Amida¹³. Kosawa's faith can also be noted in another letter to his older brother, Ichiro, dated February 20, 1932. Kosawa had met Freud in person on February 11. It so happened that February 11 was the date that Kosawa's father had passed away, exactly a year previously. Because of this, Kosawa wrote that it was thanks to his father that he was able to meet Freud, and that it was an act of the Buddha that had made it possible.

Although none of his writings that describe his mother as the incarnation of Amida can be found, there is no doubt that Kosawa regarded her as the incarnation of Amida. The compassion of Amida can be symbolized by both a father and a mother, so Kosawa was able to bring either his father or his mother to the fore, depending on context. This faith, which enabled Kosawa to regard his own parents as symbols of the Buddha, lay at the root of his transformation of the Ajase narrative. Kosawa's view that there was a 'perfect, well-established religious state of mind' that differed from the tradition of Judeo-Christianity, was formed against the backdrop of this faith.

Elucidating the backdrop to his discussion on the Ajase complex in this manner also reveals the nature of his clinical treatment. To begin with, 'the faith of Jōdō Shinshū' coexisted with 'the practical wisdom of psychoanalysis' in Kosawa's discussion of the Ajase complex. As time passed, its religious tone weakened, eclipsed by psychoanalytic theory. Kosawa's faith had not, however, disappeared. It had merely changed its form and remained within Kosawa's practice of psychoanalysis.

The technique that Kosawa used for psychoanalysis is referred to, in a word, as '*torokashi* (melting down and dissolving).' Kosawa believed that the primary objective of psychiatric treatment was to melt down and dissolve, with unconditional love, the diseased outlook, known as hatred, which the patient directs toward his or her analyst. The origin of the word '*torokasu*' lies in Chikazumi, who was Kosawa's teacher of Shin Buddhism. There are numerous examples of Chikazumi using the term '*torokashi*.' In explaining his own decisive conversion, moreover, Chikazumi used the term *torokashi*, such as "My heart was 'melted down and dissolved' by the Buddha's merciful heart"¹⁴.

To Chikazumi, the power of *torokashi* came not from human beings, but the Absolute Amida Buddha: the compassion of the Amida Buddha melted down and dissolved ordinary people's egocentricity. A parent's love becomes a symbol of Amida Buddha's *torokashi*, and the mother-child relationship becomes a symbolic space in which *torokashi* takes place. Kosawa's psychoanalytic therapy was an interpretation of Chikazumi's teachings on the Buddha's compassion melting down and dissolving ordinary people's hearts. As quoted earlier, in his discussion of the Ajase complex, Kosawa had described

13. I was allowed to confirm the letters that had been left at the Kosawa residence by special consideration given to me by Mr. Makoto Kosawa, Heisaku's grandson.

14. Chikazumi Jōkan, *Shinkō no Yoreki* [*The Remaining Droplets of Faith*], Bunmeidō, 1974, p. 14.

the “perfect, well-established religious state of mind” as a condition in which an awareness of guilt has formed for the first time after a child’s persistent murderous tendencies have been melted down and dissolved by a parent’s self-sacrifice (underlined for emphasis by Iwata).

In Kosawa, the focus shifts to a mother’s love melting down and dissolving a child’s rancor. When actually executing psychoanalysis, however, Kosawa instead plays the role of the Buddha. In other words, although the confrontation and reconciliation between the human parent and child were the main themes of the Ajase complex, in practical aspects, Kosawa himself, who was the therapist, had provided to the patients something that replaced the salvation brought about by the Buddha’s sympathy and overwhelming compassion. Because of this, even though explicit transcendence cannot be recognized in the mother image that Kosawa mentions in his papers, the act of treatment itself leads to Buddhist practice. Transcendence was drawn into it, giving a transcendental basis to an ideal mother image.

Kosawa had two sides: he was both a believer and a psychoanalyst whose thought was founded on academic theories. Ultimately, however, he had the character of a religious teacher, as was noted by all his students who received training analysis from him. For example, Takeo Doi declared that Kosawa was deeply motivated by religious sentiments, and had a strong awareness of being a savior. Because of this, Doi critically stated that Kosawa had taken in his patients and ‘swallowed’ them¹⁵.

Kosawa’s disciples Okonogi Keigo, Doi Takeo and others criticized the religious tinge to Kosawa’s treatment, and, while ‘decoloring it,’ they attempted to help psychoanalytic treatment make headway in Japan. The religiosity of Kosawa’s discussion of the Ajase complex became a target of criticism, and, partly because of this, its religious background has not been fully elucidated. However, it is an undeniable fact that, once Freud’s psychoanalysis had spread to the land of the Orient, where different religious traditions prevailed, Freud’s thoughts stirred up and uncovered the religious tradition present inside the Japanese people’s minds. As a result, Freud’s thought came to be gradually accepted, mediated by the Ajase complex and other thoughts rooted in Japan’s religious traditions.

15. Doi Takeo, “Kosawa Sensei to Nihonteki Seishinbunseki [Dr. Kosawa and Japanese-style psychoanalysis],” in *Seishin-Bunseki Kenkyū* [*The Japanese Journal of Psycho-analysis*], Vol. 24, No. 4, 1980. To see an even more concrete relationship between Doi and Kosawa, I used, as a reference, *Amae Riron no Kenkyū* [*The study of the Amae theory*] by Kumakura Nobuhiro and Ito Masahiro, Seiwa Shoten, 1984.

Past volumes

The Journal of The Japan Psychoanalytic Society vol. 1.

Contents

Foreword to the Journal of the Japan Psychoanalytic Society Osamu KITAYAMA 1

Theories and Techniques

On inability to depend: A clinical discussion
[International Conference Paper] Soh AGATSUMA 3

Clinical Communications

Silent catastrophe—A cognitive transformations in psychoanalysis
[Original Paper] Kunihiro MATSUKI 11

On the formation of the body images in psychosis—In Kleinian thoughts
[Original Paper] Takayuki KINUGASA 23

Who opens the door of narcissistic retreat?
[International Conference Paper] Satoshi YOSHIMURA 36

Interdisciplinary Studies

Dependence and transience
[International Conference Paper] Osamu KITAYAMA 43

Educational and Professional Issues

Learning from my experiences and mistakes with suicidal patients
[International Conference Paper] Nobuaki ETO 56

The Japanese Edition

Dependence and transience
依存とはかなさ Izon to hakanasa Osamu KITAYAMA 68

Editor in Chief's Postscript Kunihiro MATSUKI 79

The Journal of The Japan Psychoanalytic Society vol. 2.

Contents

Foreword Kunihiro MATSUKI 1

Theories and Techniques

Psychic functioning outside of mental representations
—Implications for psychoanalysis
[International Conference Paper] Rudi VERMOTE 3

Some speculations on Freud's reasoning
[International Conference Paper] Tak Yoo HONG 17

Clinical Communications

The copying of psychoanalysis and faith in psychoanalysis
—Emerging from an omnipotent phantasy
[International Conference Paper] Kunihiro MATSUKI 24

Everyday analysis and dream interpretation
[Original Paper] Takayuki KINUGASA 38

On reverie in psychotic interactions
[Original Paper] Yuri SEINO 50

Special Interviews

Interview with Patrick Casement Patric CASEMENT 63
Nobuaki ETO, et al.
(interviewers)

Short interview with former president of IPSO Leonardo ARAÚJO 85
Satoko KAMO, et al.
(interviewers)

Postscript Kenichiro OKANO 89

The Journal of The Japan Psychoanalytic Society vol. 3.

Contents

Foreword Kunihiro MATSUKI 1

Theories and Techniques

Study on the pathological personality in object relations theory in England
—Especially on the concept of a pathological organization
[Original Paper] Takayuki KINUGASA 3

Nothing and imagination—Two approaches to the analytic reality in late Bion
[Original Paper] Yuri SEINO 14

Clinical Communications

A female element that was split off and excluded from a perverse male patient
[Original Paper] Eita TÔNAI 21

Being natural, and based on true feelings
[Original Paper] Hideyuki NAWATA 32

Encapsulated catastrophe in personality disorder: A mind that is able to dream
[Original Paper] Kaoru KOHAGURA 43

Postscript Kenichiro OKANO 61

Postscript

We are delighted and also relieved to finally publish this fourth volume of *The Journal of The Japan Psychoanalytic Society*. This volume differs from previous volumes on two points. The first is that it is being published for the first time on an online open-access basis, with our wish that it be widely read by those in other countries who are interested in Japanese psychoanalysis. Some of our editorial members were apprehensive about taking our journal online with free access, as there is the possibility that some confidential clinical matters might be contained therein. For this reason, and this is the second point of difference from other volumes, we chose to make this volume into a special issue on the topic, “Ajase Complex” of Heisaku Kosawa, the de facto founder of the Japan Psychoanalytic Society who created this theory in the 1930s. We have integrated papers written in English on this topic that have already been published in the *Japanese Contribution to Psychoanalysis*, an English journal published every three years, between 2004 and 2016 in five volumes.

Currently, the Japan Psychoanalytic Society is still suffering from the serious impact of COVID-19, although we are gradually recovering our pre-COVID activities. Clinical practice and supervisions as well as academic course works are mostly conducted on site, occasionally supplemented by online material. However, we are still reeling from the effects of this pandemic and feel that a sense of uncertainty about how and when we get back to our “normal” activity is still lingering, which might not have been there from the beginning.

I regret that this is the last issue for which I will be responsible as chief editor, but it is my sincere hope that from now on this journal will be open to readers all over the world.

1st June, 2022

Editor-in-Chief, Kenichiro Okano, M.D.

The ideals and editorial policies of The Journal of the Japan Psychoanalytic Society: Principles, editorial policies, and manuscript submission guidelines (Prepared and approved on April 12, 2018, Revised and approved on February 18, 2019)

Basic principles

1. *The Journal of the Japan Psychoanalytic Society* offers a forum for individuals linked to the Japan Psychoanalytic Society (JPS) to publish information on their clinical practice of psychoanalysis and academic studies based on it. English is the language used.
2. As the bulletin of our Society that informs on Japanese developments, the *Journal* aims to be a forum by which to release, globally, information on clinical practice and research being carried out in Japan, and to conduct international exchanges.
3. As an academic journal for psychoanalysis, it aims to present an abundance of highly sophisticated content.

Editorial policies

1. An Editorial Committee will be organized. Members of the Committee, chiefly the Chairperson and Vice Chairpersons, will be responsible for the editing work. They will ask overseas IPA Members for their assistance in serving as Visiting Editorial Committee Members.
2. Eligible to submit manuscripts are members of the Japan Psychoanalytic Society and other suitable individuals; members of other countries' psychoanalytic societies and who are approved by members of the Editorial Committee as being eligible; and individuals within other institutions whose papers and articles are approved by the members of the Editorial Committee as worthy of being featured in the *Journal*.
3. Language used: Papers and manuscripts are to be submitted in English. Japanese language editions may also be inserted if the authors so request, and with the Editorial Committee's approval. When contributing a paper, authors are advised to attach, where possible, a Japanese translation.
4. Publication will be in an e-journal (electronic edition) format. The *Journal* will be distributed only to JPS Members and related individuals, to overseas psychoanalytic societies, and psychoanalytic institutes.
5. The content will consist of two types of manuscript: reviewed and not reviewed. The details will be outlined in the Manuscript Submission Guidelines.
6. The *Journal* will feature papers related to the acquisition of qualification as a JPS-certified psychoanalyst and psychoanalytic psychotherapist.
7. Because the *Journal* uses English as its official language, it will be a separate entity from the *Annual Report*, which is published in Japanese.
8. The *Journal* is planned to be published once a year, prior to the Society's Annual Meeting held in June.

Manuscript submission guidelines

1. Manuscript format: Papers should be about 5,500 words in total, including references and charts that have been kept to a minimum. The total should, in principle, not exceed

8,000 words. All material must be produced in MS Word form and sent as an email attachment. Essays and reports must not exceed 4,000 words in total; and letters and book reviews, no more than 2,000 words in total. These numbers include all the content, not only the body text but also the title, affiliation, references, acknowledgments, etc.

2. Criteria for acceptance or non-acceptance: To be decided by the Editorial Committee.
The paper must not have been already published in English: papers that have already been inserted in other English journals will not be considered for review.
In conducting our investigations, three members of the Editorial Committee, selected to look at each paper, will review the manuscripts. The opinions of non-Japanese analysts, who are Visiting Editorial Committee Members, may also be obtained as necessary. The Editorial Committee will then study each paper, based on the comments made during the review.
The date on which a paper has been submitted will be designated the Date of Receipt, and the date on which inclusion in the *Journal* has been decided will be designated the Date of Acceptance.
3. The paper/report must comply with accepted ethical codes that govern scientific research. The authors will be responsible for meeting confidentiality obligations.
4. The themes and categories of manuscripts acceptable for submission are as follows.
Theories and techniques, clinical communications, child psychoanalysis, history, interdisciplinary studies, psychotherapy, educational and professional issues, essays, Letters to the Editor, obituaries, and book and journal reviews. These themes and categories may be revised and/or enlarged.
Authors submitting their research papers are asked to submit an original paper, as a basic rule, which will then be reviewed. However, direct insertion of invited lectures or presentations given at international conferences, etc., may be approved, based on examination by the Editorial Committee. Educational and professional issues, essays, letters, book reviews and the like will be proofread by the Editorial Committee.
5. The submitted paper should be constructed as follows.
The author must clearly write, above the title of the paper, the category in which he or she requests the paper to be published.
Next should follow the title (if needed, a subtitle may be added), name, affiliation, postal address and email address; then the key words (up to 5 words), abstract (up to 600 words), body text, and references. The IPA *Journal's* writing style should be followed when writing the references.
6. Diagrams should be clear and inserted in the correct position in the text. The diagrams' original image file and source data (in Word, Excel, or PowerPoint form) should be sent separately.
7. The author should proofread the manuscript for the first proof only.
8. The Japan Psychoanalytic Society reserves all rights. No part of this journal may be reprinted, reproduced, utilized for imports into our Internet database accessible by JPS Members, or distributed, without permission in writing from the JPS.
9. The paper must be sent to The Japan Psychoanalytic Society's e-mail address: tokyo@jpas.jp

The Japan Psychoanalytic Society
Yotsuya 3-Chome, Shinjyuku-Ku, Tokyo 160-0004, JAPAN
E-mail address: tokyo@jpas.jp Fax: +81 33 3263 8693
Homepage: www.jpas.jp/en