

---

# 8

## REMARKS ON THE PROBLEM OF FREE ASSOCIATION

ERICH FROMM

[1955]

---

### INTRODUCTION

Marianne Horney Eckardt

Ideally, psychoanalysis is an interdisciplinary science. Many scholars, distinguished by their varied backgrounds, have enriched our field. Outstanding among this company is Erich Fromm, known as a Talmudic scholar, a moral philosopher, a sociologist, a social critic, a writer, and, of course, a psychoanalyst. His contributions uniquely reflect the scholarly roads he traveled. But foremost we think of him as a humanist. He himself referred to his pursuits as developing a humanistic science of man, or a humanistic view of the world, or humanistic ethics. This orientation developed at an early date, as he was born into a family deeply rooted in rabbinical tradition. Fromm became, as mentioned, a Talmudic scholar, and all his life was fascinated by the teachings of the prophets. One of my favorite books by Fromm (1966) is *You Shall Be As Gods*, in which he presents his humanistic beliefs as evolved in the Bible and by the prophets. His interest in man led him to the study of sociology and philosophy. The writings of Aristotle, Spinoza, and the young Karl Marx proved to be particularly meaningful. Psychoanalysis fascinated him by the deepened insight into human activity and motivation it offered, and by its discovery of the dynamic unconscious and personality formation.

Fromm was born in 1900 in Frankfurt, Germany. He received his psychoanalytic training in Berlin. He worked with, and was briefly married to, Frieda Fromm-Reichman. His associates then and later were creative,

---

Marianne Horney Eckardt, M.D. is a member of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis.

independent thinkers who forged their own paths. His friends Georg Groddek and Wilhelm Reich opened up new debates. Later, after arriving in the United States, Fromm, Harry Stack Sullivan, Karen Horney, Clara Thompson, and Abraham Kardiner met regularly to challenge, debate, and clarify the mysteries of psychoanalysis and contributed immeasurably to each other's creative productiveness. This group became known as the neo-Freudians, as they began to question the libidinal roots of all neurotic pathology and in many different ways emphasized the impact of culture, family, early environment, and society on normal and neurotic personality development. Fromm (1941) was then at work on his first book, *Escape from Freedom*. He was ever aware of the fact that man is a social animal, that society has formative influences on him, and that he in turn shapes society.

Fromm's activities were rarely limited solely to the practice of psychoanalysis. He participated in a sociopolitical research study on the authoritarian character of workers in Germany. He taught at the New School for Social Research, at Yale, and at Bennington. He lectured all over the world. Above all, he authored more than 25 books and numerous essays and papers. He wrote about the theory of psychoanalysis, though never about individual case histories. He wrote as a social psychologist, as a moral philosopher, and as a social critic. He wrote for a worldwide public and with a mission.

A few more facts about his life should be mentioned before some of his contributions are described. He participated in the founding of the William Alanson White Psychoanalytic Society and Institute in 1944. He met and married Henny Gurland, a photographer. Her illness caused them to move to Mexico City in 1949, and here Fromm established a psychoanalytic institute at the University of Mexico City. Henny died in 1952. The following year Fromm married Annis Freeman. A wonderful companionship enriched their life together. They moved to Cuernavaca and later, because his health demanded it, to Locarno, Switzerland. While Fromm helped found societies and institutes, he did not wish to be a leader nor to have followers. He was, however, a teacher with a vision and a mission.

I will select and emphasize just some of Fromm's contributions and concepts. Fromm believed in evolution. Man has the potential for good or evil. Fromm's (1941) vision pertains to man's humanistic potential as expressed in these lines by Pico della Mirandola, with which Fromm begins his *Escape from Freedom*:

Neither heavenly nor earthly, neither mortal nor immortal have we created thee, so that thou mightest be free according to thy own will and honor, to be thy own creator and builder. To thee alone we gave growth and development depending on thy own free will. Thou bearest in thee the germs of a universal life.

We also encounter this vision in Fromm's notions of the biophilic person who loves life, is productive, and relates caringly to his fellow man. We can understand his mission only if we grasp his concept of the essence of man. Man evolved out of animal existence. Our essence consists in the contradiction of being part of nature yet transcending it, as we are endowed with reason and self-awareness. Man has to act to find solutions. No absolute answers exist. Human beings, of course, find a myriad of solutions of many

different qualities. Fromm pointed to regressive and progressive solutions. His life long mission aimed at making people aware of bad solutions, those that do not serve the welfare and growth of man, and pointing to existing alternatives and their consequences. Fromm (1962) wrote, "Confrontation with true alternatives may awaken all the hidden energies in a person, and enable him to choose life. No one else can breathe life into him" (p. 146).

Man is a social animal. He has to live in groups and cooperate with others. He must have a frame of orientation that permits him to grasp reality and to communicate with others. This frame of orientation is acquired by learning, but to a large extent it comes about by way of social character formation. Fromm is not referring here to individual character but to social character, that is, to predominant traits that are common to a group. The concept of social character is to Fromm a key concept for the understanding of the social process. "Character," writes Fromm (1992), "is the form in which human energy is channeled during the process of 'socialization' and 'assimilation.' Character is, in fact, a substitute for instincts" (p. 7). In *Escape from Freedom* Fromm (1941) describes the influence of the modern industrialized state on character development. Old family and social bonds are weakened. People feel increasingly powerless and insignificant, and crave an authority that will promise salvation or security. Thus they can become victims of dictatorships.

Fromm's (1947) book, *Man for Himself*, depicts various character orientations and their consequences. These character orientations have definite ethical implications. Fromm is emphatic in his belief that psychology cannot be divorced from ethics. He writes:

My experience as a practicing psychoanalyst has confirmed my conviction that problems of ethics cannot be omitted from the study of personality, either theoretically or therapeutically. The value judgment we make determines our actions, and upon their validity rests our mental health and happiness. . . . Neurosis itself is, in the last analysis, a symptom of moral failure [p. v].

In contrast to Freud, Fromm sees character not as an outgrowth of various types of libido organizations, but as specific kinds of relatedness to the world. He describes the following nonproductive character orientations: (a) The receptive orientation is at its core organized around the idea of being given love, nourishment, security. Persons seem amiable but become anxious when their "source of supply" is threatened. (b) The exploitative orientation is centered around the necessity of taking what one needs as it will not be given voluntarily. (c) The hoarding orientation relies on safety by saving and hoarding. (d) The marketing orientation revolves around experiencing oneself as a commodity, the value of which depends solely on the forces of the market. There exists no solid sense of self, no integrity, as behavior is designed to go with the prevailing winds. In contrast to these orientations, Fromm projects the productive orientation arising out of a capacity of relatedness in all realms of human experiences. Productiveness is man's ability to use his powers for love, caring, and creativity, and to realize the potentialities inherent in him. Every human being is capable of developing this attitude, unless he is mentally and emotionally crippled. Fromm believed

in the existence of an inherent striving for health and happiness. His books *The Sane Society* (1955), *The Art of Loving* (1956), and *You Shall Be As Gods* (1966) give us a sense of what we and society could be, a goal to strive for.

The Fromm article on free association that is presented here is remarkable and unique. It could serve as a classic model for how technical issues in psychoanalysis ought to be discussed, though rarely are. What makes the essay so refreshingly readable is Fromm's language. All concepts are immediately translated into everyday experience and everyday language. He demystifies all jargon. His style may give the impression of addressing an audience unfamiliar with psychoanalysis, but this would fail to recognize Fromm's goal of conveying his thoughts in as clear a manner as possible and not hiding behind abstractions.

Fromm places his comments on free association into the context of the great discoveries of Freud: the unconscious, the mechanism of repression, and how to make this unconscious accessible. Freud taught his patients to bypass their rational conventional mode of thought and to allow thoughts or feelings to arise from somewhere inside them, maybe the belly or the heart. Memories or thoughts were thus revealed which proved amazingly relevant. But methods can deteriorate. They have to retain their meaning and vitality to be effective and this is where Fromm points to the problem. Obedience to the technical rituals of psychoanalysis can take the heart out of the methods and thus rob them of effectiveness. This is particularly true of free associations, which were heralded as the royal road to the unconscious.

To fully appreciate Fromm's criticisms, it is important to understand some core themes of his writings. Most important is his reaffirmation of the old biblical injunction against idolatry. Even in the Bible, the emphasis was not on the worship of one God versus the worship of many gods, but on the worship of one unknowable God in contrast to the worship of images or objects that could be seen, touched, and possessed. Fromm's concern is not with God, but with idols, that is, with what should not be worshiped. Fromm finds that the source of our pervasive human inclination to look for a powerful omniscient person to guide us and promise protection is in our evolutionary emergence from the animal kingdom into human beings with self-awareness. Our instincts alone did not guide us any more; we had to make decisions. We were aware of our vulnerability and helplessness. Thus religions and institutions were born to respond to a deep-seated longing in us to believe in an all-powerful, omniscient, all-caring person or social body, a longing that is ever ready to form an intense affective bond with this magic helper. It resembles the attachment of the child to mother and father in being essentially passive, hoping, and trusting. Fromm calls all these longed-for figures by the generic name of idols. The person transfers his own strength and power to the particular idol, and in so doing curtails his own creativity and individuality. Fromm plays this theme in many different ways. He contrasts two differing approaches to life, the mode of "having," or possessing, and that of "being," which does not rely on what one has, be it power, money, fame, status, or the certainty of knowledge. We find it again in his contrasting the necrophilic person, who wants to possess and takes pleasure in destroying, to the biophilic person who loves life, spontaneity, creativity, affectionate caring, and is open to hope. Hope

replaces certainty. We can hope for and strive for but we do not possess the answers for tomorrow.

Fromm sees the possibility of lessening the tendency to believe in idols. Fromm (1992) writes:

I am led to the conclusion that the sense of powerlessness, and hence the need for idols, becomes less intense the more a person succeeds in attributing his existence to his own active efforts; the more he develops his powers of love and reason; the more he acquires a sense of identity, not mediated by his social role but rooted in the authenticity of his self; the more he can give and is related to others, without losing his freedom and integrity; and the more he is aware of his unconscious, so that nothing human within himself and in others is alien to him [p. 52].

Before elaborating on the relevance of the theme of idol worship to the Fromm article on free association presented here, I want to convey some of Fromm's descriptions of the unconscious. In the article he likens it to our being two people, the rational, conventional person, what C. G. Jung called our persona, and the other, the dissociated person, the child in us, be it of one or three or fourteen years of age. Both these personalities determine our feelings and actions. Unconsciousness is a function, not a place. We can be more or less unconscious. The concept of the "social filter," consisting of the language, logic, and mores of the world around us, appealed to Fromm. We are raised to think, speak, and behave in certain ways, and to adapt to our sociocultural environment. Yet our subjective being coexists, though it may remain private, or secret, or may just appear in our dreams. Fromm equates unconsciousness with the unawareness of truth; becoming aware means discovering the truth. What is not allowed into consciousness is not just what is bad, like hate and feeling murderous; it can be a whole range of perceptions that happen not to blend easily into conventional perceptions. Psychoanalytic therapy is not the only road to truth or to being awakened. New experiences brought about by changes in the environment, be it in the workplace or in new relationships or artistic endeavors, can radically change our perspective and allow a new outlook to emerge.

All of the above does have relevance to the Fromm article you are about to read. The process of deterioration in the manner in which the tool of free association is used is an illustration of how we regard prescribed analytic techniques as sacrosanct, that is, as idols. If you are an obedient, conscientious analyst and routinely tell your patient to obey the rules and say what comes to mind, then all should be well. If all is not well, the assumption arises that the patient's resistance may be causing the trouble. In the article, Fromm restores meaning by offering suggestions as to how to retain pertinence, aliveness, and effectiveness in using this procedure. These are meant only as illustrations. Do not make them into prescriptions to follow! In my own practice, however, I have found very helpful his suggestion to make occasional but deliberately timed intervention by asking for free associations. I want to stress also the importance of Fromm's distinction between requests for information or requests for a rational discussion and requests for free associations. Many analysts do not feel free to ask questions for their own enlightenment because they believe that their patients know their world, take

most of it for granted, and will not mention important details unless they have become emotionally charged. I remember a time when an accidental question of mine revealed that the family never ate together, and in another instance that talk at the dinner table was minimal because the father, or perhaps it was the husband, read the newspaper while eating his meal. Details are important. They enliven the information for us, and thus permit some meaningful empathy. While we listen, our imagination replays the scenarios the patient is presenting to us. We notice gaps and vagueness in our understanding and we inquire. We have to be alert and create an atmosphere of aliveness. Fromm (1976) writes: "The essential factor in psychoanalytic treatment is this aliveness quality in the therapist. No amount of psychoanalytic interpretation will have an effect if the therapeutic atmosphere is heavy, unalive, and boring" (p. 34).

The article is a good example of what Fromm means by aliveness. It speaks to the reader in direct language. Its critical analysis is alert to all nuances of concepts and practicalities. It informs and aims to be helpful by giving perspectives rather than rules. His hope that man has the possibility for a more creative, active, caring existence reaches out to us. Read the article and enjoy it!

**T**he great discovery of Freud lies in two directions: one is of substance, and the other is of method. I would say that, as far as the first part of Freud's discovery is concerned, the most lasting and fundamental discovery is that of the unconscious. And, as far as method is concerned, it is the discovery of a method to recognize the unconscious, that is, to see something which usually cannot be seen. What Freud showed was that everyone of us is two persons. One is the adult, rational, conventional person, the official person, so to speak, which we all are when we are awake, when we behave conventionally, when we go about our business. Then there is this other personality, the little child in us; or several children, one of six months, and one of one year, and one of three years, perhaps, and one of fourteen; all together being alive, acting, determining our feelings and actions; yet never directly observable, never directly visible. Our behavior, our feeling, our thought, is always a mixture, always a blend of the "day personality," and that other personality which you might call the unconscious or the dissociated personality in us. Actually, this dissociated personality can be observed directly only in several instances: in psychosis, under hypnosis, under the influence of drugs, or during sleep, in our dreams, which Freud described as a transitory psychosis. We are listening in our sleep to this dissociated personality; it comes to the fore, talks, thinks, and sees things; the day personality is

*Psychiatric Research Reports*, No. 2, pp. 1-6. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.

relegated to the background and speaks only with a very small voice, by distorting and embellishing certain things that the dissociated personality says. Indeed, among psychoanalysts there are differences about what is the essence of that dissociated personality. Freud thought it was centered around a core of infantile sexual desires. For other psychoanalysts, the concept of the dissociated personality is a broader one and not essentially centered around this sexual core. But, in spite of such differences, they too define the dissociated personality in terms of the child which has not yet fully emerged from his mother's womb, or which has not yet been fully separated from mother's breasts, or which has not yet fully separated from obedient attachment to father's authority, and emerged into an active, productive life of his own. These differences do not matter, from the standpoint of our discussion here, because the essential point and the greatness of Freud's discovery was that there is this secret, hidden, dissociated personality, and that this personality has a tremendous effect on everything we do, and everything we think. If there is any definition of psychoanalysis, whatever school of psychoanalysis we are talking about, then it is based on this concept of the unconscious, and psychoanalysis has to be described as a method which tries to uncover the dissociated part of a person's personality.

Now as to the method, I would say again that it is one of the great achievements of Freud to have overcome the seemingly unanswerable logical objection to a method of discovering the unconscious. The logical objection being: If something is unconscious, we cannot become aware of it, therefore there is no method by which we can arrive with any degree of certainty at a picture of that which is dissociated; by its very nature, it is not open to inspection. Freud did find ways for the observation of the unconscious. One was the interpretation of dreams; the other was the analysis of transference; the third was free association.

How could we describe in general terms the meaning of free association according to Freud? What Freud discovered was that a person, even if he is not asleep and dreaming, even if he is not insane, even if he is not in a hypnotic trance, nevertheless, can hear the voice of his unconscious, provided that he does something which seems very simple: namely, that he leave the realm of conventional, rational thought, and permit himself to voice ideas which are not determined by the rules of normal, conventional thinking. If he does this, ideas emerge, not from his head but, as the Chinese would say, from his belly; ideas which are not part of his official personality, but which are the language of this dissociated, hidden personality. Furthermore, Freud discovered the fact that if I permit myself to associate freely, then these very thoughts which come from this dissociated realm attract other relevant and germane thoughts from the realm of the unconscious.

Originally Freud thought it to be necessary for the stimulation of free association to touch the forehead of his patient, after having given him the instruction that, when he touched his forehead, the patient should say what was on his mind at that very moment. Later, Freud found that one did not even need to touch the forehead, that one could give the patient the general instruction that throughout the whole analytic session he should "free associate." Freud tried to help the effectiveness of this idea by the technical arrangement which he chose for the treatment, that is, the "use of the couch." The idea was brilliant, and seemed to be very promising. But actually what happened was, I think, a deterioration of the whole method of free association. In orthodox Freudian analysis (not always, but in many instances), free association has become an empty ritual. The patient lies on the couch, he is instructed not to hide anything, to say everything that comes to his mind. That is fine. Let us assume that the patient does that, and is conscientious and honest, and says whatever comes to his mind. What guarantee do we have that the things that do come to his mind have any meaning in the sense of the dissociated personality? That in speaking without restriction he is saying things which are relevant? In many instances free association has deteriorated into meaningless chatter, into "free talk," into uncontrolled complaining, and sterile thinking. All that passes for free association because the formal rule is observed: namely, not to omit anything which is on one's mind. The original meaning of free association was to be spontaneous association; the deteriorated free association is not spontaneous at all; it is free only in the negative sense that no thought is omitted. The patient comes in, and he says for the twentieth time what he has said to his wife, what his wife has said to him, what happened in his business, and this and the other, and the analyst sits there and listens and does not say anything. The hour ends, and both are satisfied because everything has happened according to the ritual.

My criticism of free association is not at all meant to be criticism only of orthodox psychoanalysis. I, myself, am not an orthodox psychoanalyst. But I must admit that in observing what goes on in non-orthodox analysis, I conclude that free association has deteriorated there just as much as it has in orthodox psychoanalysis, except in a different way. Instead of the ritualistic priest-like, authoritarian attitude with which the patient is confronted, you find a tolerant, reasonable, friendly attitude. The analyst does not sit behind the couch. He is not so silent. He also instructs his patient to say anything that comes to his mind. But there is often the danger of transforming the situation into a friendly dialogue, instead of the more austere Freudian monologue.

Often several approaches are confused with the request for free association, particularly (a) the request for more information, and (b) the

question as to what the patient *thinks about* a dream, or an occurrence. One should strictly differentiate between these three approaches: quest for information, for opinion, and for free association. In the quest for more information the analyst asks the patient questions in order to clarify what he is saying, in order to bring out contradictions, in order to see, perhaps, where the patient is omitting something or distorting something. Such questions should be as precise, concrete, detailed, and clear as possible. Secondly, it is something else again if the analyst invites the patient to join him in rational thought about the meaning of certain things. To ask him, "What do you think this could mean?" "What is your idea about this or that behavior, or this or that incident?" This also is not free association. It does not make any difference whether it is phrased in the form of a question, or whether it is phrased in the form of a hypothesis. If I invite the patient to join me in reasonable thought about an object matter, then this is thinking, and not free association. And thirdly, there is free association in the sense of spontaneous association. We should indeed separate the latter from the former two, and be aware when we use free association as a tool, and when we do not use it.

What can the analyst do to avoid the deterioration of free association?

First of all, I believe he must convince himself that it is not enough to explain to the patient the basic rule of analysis, not even to begin each session by using the ritualistic formula and saying to the patient: "Tell me what comes to mind." Rather than doing this, I find it helpful to stimulate free association at various times during the session by asking the patient in a definite way: "Tell me what is in your mind *right now*." The difference sounds small, yet it is considerable. What matters is the *now*, the urgency of the request. Usually the patient will answer this request more spontaneously than the general question, "What comes to mind?" When he has said what is in his mind, one can go on requesting further association with the ideas expressed. In the tone of voice, the definiteness, the suddenness in which the question is asked, lies a factor similar to Freud's original touching of the forehead.

There are other active methods to stimulate free association. Let us assume you have analyzed the patient's relationship to his father, but want more unconscious material than he has offered in his associations; you tell the patient: "Now, concentrate on the picture of your father, and tell me what is the first thing that comes to your mind." I might draw your attention to the fact that there is a certain difference between asking the patient, "What comes to your mind about your father?" and the second way of telling him: "Now, concentrate, focus on your father." Or, "Visualize your father now, and tell me what is on your mind." There seems to be only a slight difference in wording. However, there is a very great difference in the effect.

Another way of stimulating free association lies in giving the patient the picture of a certain situation, then asking what comes to his mind. For instance, you tell the patient: "Assume tomorrow morning your telephone rings and the person calling tells you I have died. What comes to mind?" Well, you will find that there are very interesting free associations which come up.

There is one technique which the late Augusta Slesinger developed, which goes just a little further along these lines. She used what you might call concentration techniques to further increase the possibility of free association. She would tell a patient: "Now close your eyes. Try to think of nothing. Try to make your mind completely blank. Try to do this by imagining a white movie screen with no pictures on it. After a few minutes, I shall give you a sign. Let us say, I shall say 'now.' Keep your eyes closed, but tell me what goes through your mind at this very moment." The advantage of this technique is that by this short period of concentration the patient's conventional thought process is by-passed, as it were, and usually the associations come from a deeper level of the unconscious. You can use this concentration technique in various ways. One experiment, for instance, also suggested by Mrs. Slesinger, is to give the patient the instruction: "Try after this period of concentration to form the experience 'I,' and then to say what comes up in your mind at the very moment when you try to feel 'I,' 'I, myself.' " Now if you do it (you can also do it yourself when alone), you find all sorts of interesting things. You discover how terribly difficult it is for most people to have a clear experience "I." At this very moment, when they try to feel "I," other thoughts come to their minds which, however, usually are indicative of that which is a substitute of their sense of self. Let me give you an example of free association with this kind of technique. One is of a man who was a very good teacher and a very good speaker; when he was supposed to say what came up in his mind, he saw himself in a beautifully cut suit, standing on the platform and lecturing, with everybody looking at him. This is his concept of "I,"; he experiences himself as himself inasmuch as he is this good-looking, elegantly dressed lecturer. Another patient saw himself as a prisoner of war, completely alone and abandoned by everybody, crying for help. And in the next picture he saw himself leading a regiment into battle on a white charger. Now actually, this was a patient whose whole personality was split between a person who, in his social relations or in his love relations, was a helpless person feeling lonely and powerless; in his professional relations as a surgeon, he was sure of his authority, fearless and competent with an element of grandiosity.

You can use this concentration technique for other purposes too. You can say, for instance, after the concentration, "What comes to your mind about me, the analyst?" or your father, your mother, or any other person.

Or you can use it by asking the question, "What comes to mind when you think of the thing you like least in yourself, or are ashamed of, or are most proud of?" The use of it is varied; the principle is simply to reinforce the purpose of free association by this concentration technique. These are just a few examples by way of emphasizing that free association must not become a ritual. It must be something which is pursued intentionally, with a certain suggestive and stimulating attitude by the analyst. While it is one of the most important tools in the understanding of the dissociated personality, it is at the same time a tool which must not be taken for granted.

I should like to raise another question which is also related to free association. Namely, the question that there is not only the problem of free association for the patient, but there is also the problem of free association for the analyst. Should the analyst free associate too? In order to understand a patient, you must make the fullest use of your own imagination. Your own imagination must be mobilized to the highest extent. We all are crazy, we all are neurotic, we all are children, and the difference between us is only of degree. But unless we can mobilize in ourselves the very same irrational fantasy which exists in patients, we certainly cannot understand them. And we must have the courage to do it. If we, as analysts, consider ourselves to be the "normal" person, *here*, and the patient the "irrational" person, *there*, then we shall never understand the patient. Then communication is indeed a fraud; then nothing goes on between two persons except words and chatter.

To understand means to respond, to answer, to be in touch. To interpret means to react with one's own imagination and free associations to the patient's utterances. It does not mean to apply the patient's associations to the theory. The analyst's function is to a large extent not thinking, but free associating, and often helping the patient in his free associations by presenting him with his (the analyst's) own. All this means that the analyst is, as Sullivan put it, a "participant observer," not a blank mirror, a detached observer. The process of analysis may well be described in this way. Two people communicate. The one says whatever goes through his mind. The other listens, and says what reactions (associations) the patient's utterances have produced in him. His, the analyst's, ideas are not said with the claim that they are right, but only because they indicate how one person's imagination reacts to the patient's imagination. The only claim the analyst can make is that he has been concentrating on what the patient was saying, and that his imagination is trained by experience and appropriate theoretical thoughts. The patient then reacts with new associations to the analyst's, who in turn reacts again, and so on, until some clarification and change is reached. (It must not be understood that I mean there is continuous dialogue; in my concept of analysis

the patient does, quantitatively speaking, most of the talking, but what matters is that the analyst's "interpretations," when they are given, are essentially his free associations.)

To sum up: The analytic relationship is a unique reality of communication, based on mutual freedom and spontaneity. Free association is one of the most important tools. However, it must be cultivated, furthered, and stimulated, and prevented from deteriorating into a sterile ritual.