Must we Burn Masud Khan?[1]

Dany Nobus

The history of the psychoanalytic movement is not exactly short of eccentric, rebellious and troublesome characters. Already during the first decades of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, Freud's circle attracted quite a few people whose intellectual brilliance often expressed itself against the backdrop of a cluttered, unsettled, and occasionally self-destructive mind. Some of these figures, such as Otto Gross and Viktor Tausk, have nigh on disappeared from present-day thought, whereas others, like Wilhelm Reich, continue to exercise a strong influence on contemporary accounts of the human body as a locus of radical power and freedom (see, for example, Laing, 2021).[2]

The early years of psychoanalysis were also marked by sustained clinical experimentation, practitioners often taking liberties with their patients that would now be considered anathema. In the absence of clear, explicit rules and regulations

[1] On the death of Masud Khan (1924-1989), worldwide ownership of copyright in his unpublished works was gifted to the International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA), which is incorporated in London, England. The IPA has granted to the authors, editors and publishers of this volume of the journal *Psychoanalysis and History* a copyright licence covering all those works published here in which the IPA owns copyright. For the cover photograph, every effort has been made to trace the copyright holders, yet to no avail. If they come forward, the publishers will be pleased to make the necessary acknowledgement at the first available opportunity. Photographs 1-4 are published courtesy of the Estate of Robert and Sybil Stoller. Photograph 5 appears with the kind permission of James W. Anderson.

[2] For biographical accounts of Otto Gross, see Hurwitz (1990) and Heuer (2017). For the controversies surrounding the life and death of Viktor Tausk, who committed suicide on 3 July 1919, shortly after Helene Deutsch had stopped her psychoanalytic treatment of him upon the explicit insistence of Freud, with whom she herself was in analysis, see Roazen (1969) and Eissler (1971; 1983).

governing the practice of psychoanalysis—apart from the unspoken *noli me tangere*—the 'unconventional' approach was very much the norm. Clinicians tended to rely on their creative resources to direct the treatment differently for each patient and almost completely without pre-established or superimposed restraints. Here too, in a sense, it was Freud who showed the way, even though he would never go so far as to document his foibles in print, much less to develop an argument that the psychoanalytic treatment cannot progress without them. Between Christmas and New Year 1907, the young lawyer Freud dubbed the 'Rat Man' came to his psychoanalytic session feeling hungry and so Freud took him into the kitchen of his apartment and offered him a herring (Freud, 1955[1907-1908], pp. 303-308). Towards the end of Freud's treatment of a wealthy Russian, who became known as the 'Wolf Man', Freud suggested to his patient that he give him a present in order to alleviate the feelings of gratitude that he would be left with. Fully aware of his analyst's love of antiquities, Sergei Pankejeff promptly bought an expensive, ancient Egyptian statuette, which Freud gratefully accepted (Obholzer, 1982[1980], p. 42). When, during the mid-1920s, Freud agreed to take Princess Marie Bonaparte into analysis, her treatment rapidly developed into a deep, mutual and long-lasting friendship (Bertin, 1983; Bourgeron, 1993; Amouroux, 2012). Sometimes the Princess would join the Freud family for part of their Summer holidays. On occasion, patient and analyst also discussed the fate of other patients, whereby they agreed that cases of psychosis could only benefit from biological interventions (Nobus, 2020; Amouroux, 2022, pp. 493-494).

Reflecting upon the rise and fall of the psychoanalyst M. Masud R. Khan, I have often found myself thinking that he might have felt much more at home amongst this

early, slightly ‘wild’ cabal of pleasantly disturbed luminaries than he ever was in the British Psychoanalytical Society (BPS). The Viennese may not have turned a blind eye to all his clinical transgressions, let alone his deeply reprehensible opinions about Jews, but it is quite unlikely that they would have taken formal action against him for socialising with patients, testing the boundaries of psychoanalytic practice, or questioning the validity of a formal code of conduct for practicing psychoanalysts. Even though he was a protégé of Donald W. Winnicott—his third analyst, whose friend and collaborator he became—and could always rely on the unconditional support of Anna Freud, Masud Khan (or Sud as he was known to his friends) somehow did not belong in the professional environment that had accommodated him, when he was still in his early twenties, to start a training analysis. It is difficult to avoid the thought that the young Muslim man from Pakistan regarded the BPS as another chapter of British colonial power and *vice versa* that the BPS not only recognised in him a brilliant Oriental mind that, under the right circumstances, could be trained and educated, but also an insolent immigrant who should be tamed and subdued. As he rose through the ranks of the BPS to become a Training and Supervising Analyst, Khan spent more and more time with fellow psychoanalysts in Paris, where he felt much more accepted and appreciated, whilst the BPS grew increasingly concerned about his alcohol abuse and his recurrent clinical boundary violations.

Between January 1977 and July 2019, the psychoanalyst Masud Khan died no less than four times, following executive decisions by the BPS and its superordinate professional body the International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA)—a tally which does not include his own physical death, which occurred on 7 June 1989. During the Winter of 1977, Khan was defrocked of his honourable position as a Training and

Supervising Analyst, which implied that he could still accept 'regular' patients for psychoanalytic treatment, but no longer conduct training analyses and supervise the work of junior psychoanalysts (Hopkins, 2006, pp. 297-300). In July 1988, shortly after the release of Khan's book *When Spring Comes* (Khan, 1988) he was formally expelled from the BPS, on the grounds that he had brought psychoanalysis and the British Society into disrepute (Hopkins, 2006, pp. 370-371). Following the publication of an explosive article by Khan's former patient Wynne Godley in the *London Review of Books* of 22 February 2001 (Godley, 2001), the BPS held a special meeting later that year, with two distinct aims: 1. "[T]o think together about how as a Society we failed to protect the patients and psychoanalysts"; 2. "[T]o focus on the institutional issues and the unconscious collusion that took place, in order to attempt to better safeguard the practice of psychoanalysis in the future" (Hopkins, 2006, p. 386). Ethical and deontological considerations aside, the implicit assumption pervading these discussions was that Masud Khan should never have been accepted for psychoanalytic training in the first place, or that the BPS should have immediately stopped him from seeing patients as soon as his deviant practices had come to light. Two years after this third, posthumous institutional character assassination of the BPS's golden boy, who had once been celebrated for his erudition and the exceptional value of his clinical work, the French IPA flagship journal *Revue française de psychanalyse* did not hesitate to diagnose Khan as a narcissistic pervert (Bauduin and Denis, 2003).

Finally, in July 2019, the IPA proceeded to destroy the entire Masud Khan archive that they had in their possession and which included thousands of letters from and to Khan, the original 39 volumes of his *Work Books* (a professional diary covering the years 1967 to 1980), countless unpublished notes and manuscripts, and numerous

patient records. Since Khan had not mentioned a literary executor in his last will and testament, the fate of his archive had been the subject of vehement discussions within the IPA until April 1991, when it had finally been agreed that the IPA would become its custodian (Hopkins, 2006, pp. 384-385). The Masud Khan papers were accordingly kept in secure storage at the IPA's offices in Broomhills on Woodside Lane in North London, which already held the IPA's administrative papers, with the stipulation that access to all materials should be restricted until 2039 (Hopkins, 2006, p. 385). Invoking the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the advice of a senior British lawyer, the IPA then issued a statement at the end of July 2019 that back in January its Executive Board had arrived at the conclusion that, given the extraordinarily sensitive nature of the materials contained in the Khan archive, it would no longer be in a position to comply with the GDPR and that the entire archive should therefore be returned to the (unnamed) executor of the Khan Estate. When the executor resolved that everything should be destroyed, the IPA Executive dutifully obliged (Ungar, Nick and Dalewijk, 2019).

When I suggested, just over a year ago, to the editor of this journal that we should devote a special section to Masud Khan, my main intention was not to provoke another polemic, even less to ponder how psychoanalytic organisations should deal with undisciplined members, but rather to keep his memory alive and to inform the reader of important documents that have survived the auto-da-fé of 2019 and that are (or will soon become) newly available to researchers. In an oft (mis)remembered sentence from 1905, with which Freud was undoubtedly familiar when he composed his 1914 paper 'Remembering, Repeating and Working-Through' (Freud, 1958[1914*g*]), the Spanish-American philosopher George Santayana opined: "Those

who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it" (Santayana, 1905, p. 172). Whereas some people would most certainly argue that scandalous figures such as Khan do not deserve to be remembered, it cannot be ignored that, for a period of almost twenty years, he played a hugely important role in the BPS, as a highly esteemed clinician, an extremely gifted scholar, and an admirably effective editor. And if he subsequently became a symptom of organisational failure, it would be all the more important to recall and examine the precipitating and perpetuating factors of its manifestation—not just to avoid its repetition, but to understand the function and place of belonging in the life-cycle of a professional body. This would require the organisation to look beyond the duties and responsibilities of the profession that it represents, to ascertain and integrate the human being behind the professional, and to not only confirm its punitive power when the human being has put the profession at risk, but to equally accept its duty of care towards the human beings that take on a professional role.

During the early years of his private practice, Khan's professional behaviour towards patients was already distinctly unorthodox, as many of the case vignettes in his critically acclaimed first book *The Privacy of the Self* (Khan, 1974) bear witness to. Reading through these clinical fragments, one often gets the impression that for Khan the analytic experience was a clinical game of chess, with the analyst in the position of the black queen who takes full advantage of the complete freedom of movement that her status has granted her, with a view to protecting at all costs her own vulnerable private self, as symbolised by the quasi powerless king. When, during the late 1960s, Khan's marriage to the star ballerina Svetlana Beriosova began to crumble and both he and his wife started seeking solace in alcohol, extra-marital affairs, and

violent arguments, Khan's clinical moves became more aggressive and more cunning. Relying on the authority that he was being granted as a psychoanalyst, Khan often employed his position to rescue and safeguard his own private self, which was becoming more and more fractured through the trials and tribulations of his personal life, and through the death sentence that he received in October 1976, when he was diagnosed with terminal cancer and given just a few months to live (Hopkins, 2006, pp. 286-292). It would have been the perfect time for Khan to go back into analysis and confront his demons, yet Winnicott had been dead for more than five years, the majority of senior clinicians in the BPS were suspicious of him (a feeling that was to all intents and purposes mutual), and his psychoanalyst friends in Paris were simultaneously geographically distant and emotionally near. If the BPS had been more forthcoming in offering Khan advice, support, and guidance, I do not believe that Khan would have accepted it. But this does not mean that the offer would have been by definition futile and inconsequential. In any case, the last word about "the *enfant terrible* of psychoanalysis of the second half of the [twentieth] century" (Limentani, 1992, p. 155) has not been said and I hope that the newly available archival documents will rekindle scholarly interest in the complex, conflicted and contrary man that was Masud Khan, and his place in the psychoanalytic movement.[3]

Since Khan's death, five biographical studies of his life and times have been published (Cooper, 1993; Willoughby, 2005; Hopkins, 2006; Gazzillo, 2008; Larivière, 2022). Of these accounts, the massive book by Linda Hopkins, which is the result of more than a decade of research, provides the most comprehensive picture of the

[3] The reason why "the second half of the [twentieth] century" is specified here probably does not just relate to the fact that Khan's professional activity unfolded during that period, but also intimates that the first half of the twentieth century had had its own *enfant terrible* in the figure of Sándor Ferenczi.

psychoanalyst's family background, his spectacular rise to fame in the BPS, and his gradual decline during the last 15 years of his life. In addition, Willoughby's book contains valuable information about Khan's intellectual preoccupations until the very end of his life, which cannot be found in any other sources. In her work, Hopkins drew extensively on Khan's *Work Books*, or rather on a copy of the text that Khan had bequeathed to his close friend Robert J. Stoller in Los Angeles and that had been carefully preserved by his widow Sybil, after her husband's untimely death in September 1991. In the Autumn of 2022, a first abridged set of these *Work Books*, covering books 1 to 14 for the period 1967-1972, was published as a single volume under the Karnac Books imprint, with a further two volumes in preparation (Hopkins and Kuchuck, 2022). In the first text that follows, Hopkins reflects upon how she became interested in Masud Khan, how she approached the immense task of gathering materials for his biography, and how publication of the *Work Books* was delayed owing to copyright issues and their alleged inclusion of strictly private and confidential, patient-related comments. Apart from these *Work Books*, Hopkins also relied on Khan's vast correspondence with various French psychoanalysts, such as André Green, Wladimir Granoff and Victor Smirnoff. Of these three epistolary exchanges, that between Khan and Smirnoff is by far the most intense and voluminous. Covering the period between September 1964 and April 1989, i.e. until a few months before Khan's death, the correspondence contains approximately 2,500 handwritten and typed letters, as well as postcards, telegrams and other written materials, such as offprints of published papers and copies of other people's letters. The correspondence between Khan and Granoff is less extensive, because it only runs for roughly six years, but remains immensely instructive for anyone studying the

history of psychoanalysis in France and the United Kingdom during the late 1960s. It is also of great value as a paradigmatic instance of Khan's relation to writing and his experience of friendship. Some of Khan's missives to Granoff are no less than 90 pages long and often resemble love letters to an intimate soulmate.[4]

When Hopkins wrote her biography, only a very small selection of Khan's letters had ever been published. In the Summer of 1989, Victor Smirnoff was asked to contribute to a commemorative issue of the *Nouvelle revue de psychanalyse* on Masud Khan, which encouraged him to release nine short letters he had received from Khan between 1967 and 1989 (Smirnoff, 1989). Hopkins' biography in turn included additional fragments of correspondence, yet the majority of Khan's letters remained sequestered in private archives, without the prospect of their ever being transferred to a publicly accessible repository. Now, in the Spring of 2024, the situation has changed, because scholars and researchers can request access to the complete, original correspondence between Khan, Wladimir Granoff, and Victor Smirnoff, following my decision to donate all of these materials to the Freud Museum London. The story of how I came into possession of this invaluable cache of archival documents may not be of interest to everyone, yet for the historical record I nonetheless feel that I should briefly reconstruct the circumstances, if only to acknowledge and pay tribute to the person whose care and generosity allowed for the papers to be preserved. The story of their provenance and acquisition may also serve as a contextualising narrative for the materials included in this journal issue.

[4] A special section of a forthcoming issue of *Psychoanalysis and History* will be devoted to the legacy of Wladimir Granoff.

In the Summer of 2018, my dear friend Judit Szekacs-Weisz invited me to present a paper at the forthcoming international conference on 'The Balints and Their World: Object Relations and Beyond', which was scheduled to take place at the Freud Museum London on 9 December that year. Gratefully accepting her invitation, I proposed to speak about the role Michael Balint played during the first institutional split in the French psychoanalytic community and, more specifically, about the importance of Balint for the development of Jacques Lacan's thought during the early 1950s.[5] This proposal, which Judit enthusiastically endorsed, inevitably led me to re-read the text of the three sessions Lacan devoted, towards the end of his first public seminar, on *Freud's Papers on Technique*, to a discussion of Balint's recently published book *Primary Love and Psychoanalytic Technique* (Lacan, 1988[1975], pp. 201-233; Balint, 1952). The first thing that struck me when revisiting these lectures, although I had known it for 35 years, ever since I had first read the seminar, is that the transcription of the first session on Balint is significantly shorter than that of the other sessions, because on that day (26 May 1954) Lacan had asked Wladimir Granoff to give a presentation on Balint's book which, in accordance with the editorial principles governing the publication of Lacan's seminars, had not been included in the official, printed version. To obtain a complete picture of these historical discussions on Balint, which took place under the auspices of the clinical training programme of the newly established *Société française de psychanalyse*, I set out to retrieve the manuscript, or at least a complete transcription of Granoff's intervention at Lacan's seminar and a possibly less polished record of Lacan's intermittent interruptions and comments.

[5] For two, extensively revised versions of the paper I presented at the Balint conference, see Nobus (2023; 2024).

By virtue of the wonder that is the internet, I managed to find various transcriptions of Granoff's presentation on-line, yet none of these seemed particularly reliable, both with regard to the names of the other seminar participants who intervened on that day and in terms of Granoff's references to Balint's text. Despite these shortcomings, I nonetheless produced a collation of the different records that I had been able to find on-line to prepare a first draft of my own annotated transcription and English translation of Granoff's intervention. However, I also decided to consult the Wladimir Granoff Papers at the *Bibliothèque nationale de France* (BNF), hoping that another, potentially more reliable version of the presentation would be available in this collection. As per the access protocol for all personal archives in the manuscript division of the BNF, prior permission needs to be granted by the legal executor which, in the case of Wladimir Granoff, I assumed to be his widow, Ms Martine Bacherich. Rather than contacting the BNF archivist in charge of the Granoff papers, I then decided to get in touch with Martine Bacherich directly, following useful information and solid reassurance received by Elisabeth Roudinesco.[6]

Coincidentally, my first email to Martine Bacherich was sent one day after the twentieth anniversary of her husband's death. Apprising her of my project, she welcomed the initiative in ways that I could never have anticipated and also granted me unrestricted access to the Wladimir Granoff Papers at the BNF. Owing to Covid restrictions and other commitments I did not succeed in arranging a trip to Paris until April 2021, yet during the fourteen months that had passed since my first email to her Ms Bacherich and I exchanged numerous emails about Wladimir ('Wova') Granoff—

[6] For the final, translated and annotated version of Granoff's intervention on Balint at Lacan's seminar of 26 May 1954, see Granoff (2024[1954]).

his Anglophilia, his passion for cars, his theoretical contributions, his institutional roles, and his numerous friendships. As far as the latter is concerned, Ms Bacherich disclosed to me that, between September 1963 and October 1969, Wova had entertained a close friendship with Masud Khan and that she still had all their letters in her possession. She also told me that, apart from this correspondence, she owned a much larger set of letters that had been exchanged between Masud Khan and Victor Smirnoff, which had been transferred to her by Smirnoff's partner Marie-Claude Fusco in 2001. At some point during our conversations, Martine Bacherich then suggested that she would like to donate these two sets of correspondence to me. Deeply honoured by her offer, I responded that it might be better for us to identify and agree upon a location where the letters would be preserved indefinitely and could, with an accompanying access statement, be made available to researchers.[7]

When I eventually met Martine Bacherich in person, on 21 April 2021, we talked for 9 hours straight about all our mutual interests and it was on that day that we formally agreed that the letters should be deposited at the Freud Museum London. The two principal arguments were that Anna Freud, who continued to live at 20 Maresfield Gardens until her death in October 1982, had never withdrawn her support of Masud Khan, despite his alleged boundary violations, and that Khan's professional career, for all its eventual infelicities, could not be dissociated from the British psychoanalytic context. To this, I added that his legacy would probably not be misplaced when it was housed alongside that of the other *monstre sacré* of

[7] Apart from the two sets of correspondence between Khan and Granoff, and between Khan and Smirnoff, there is also a large cache of letters between Granoff and Smirnoff, whose content is almost inaccessible because it is written in at least four different languages at the same time (Russian, French, German, and English), and occasionally in a newly invented idiom that would only have made sense to the two correspondents. For now, these letters are kept in a private archive.

psychoanalysis, the controversial Hungarian psychoanalyst Sándor Ferenczi, of whom the Freud Museum London already had a substantial archive of letters, manuscripts, notebooks and photographs in its collections.

After having secured the approval of the Freud Museum London's Board of Trustees, I collected the Masud Khan papers in person from Martine Bacherich's apartment in Paris at the end of June 2023. Over the following 5 months, I read through the entire contents of the 8 archival boxes, often feeling irritated by Khan's relentless reflections on his own state of mind, but also experiencing profound admiration for the care he took in composing and preparing the letters—many are adorned with intricate drawings, or written on meticulously designed postcards—and intermittent surprise at the remarkably original, clinical and theoretical considerations he regularly included in them. Khan's final note to Smirnoff, written in a trembling hand from his hospital bed at the London Clinic made me cry: "What an end to my life/I was getting too sick so I decided to withdraw/I have no friends in London/Keep in touch" (Smirnoff, 1989, p. 359).

In Khan's correspondence with Smirnoff, whom he called Pnin—after the protagonist in Vladimir Nabokov's eponymous novel (Nabokov, 1957)—I also discovered samples of writing that I had never come across before: a long series of individually numbered epigrams, typed on thin pink paper, and organised according to the year during which they had been written. The style of these concise, often witty observations about the human condition is reminiscent of La Rochefoucauld's famous *Moral Reflections or Sententiae and Maxims* (La Rochefoucauld, 2007[1678]). Khan called them his *Anticahiers* (Anti-notebooks), a title which may have been inspired by the Chilean poet Nicanor Parra's book *Antipoems*, which he had read in September

1962 (Khan, 1962; Parra, 1985[1954]). Linda Hopkins, who briefly referred to the *Anticahiers* in her biography, told me that Khan left behind 3 volumes of these epigrams, one volume covering the period 1965-1967 and 2 additional volumes for the years 1979-1980. She also informed me that he had sent a copy of them, as he had done with his *Work Books*, to Robert and Sybil Stoller in Los Angeles. Because the style and contents of the *Anticahiers* show a side of Khan that has never been properly acknowledged I thought it would be a good idea to include the first series, which is part of volume 1 and relates to the year 1965, in this issue of *Psychoanalysis and History*. The maxims are reproduced exactly as they appear in the document that Khan sent to Smirnoff and contain quite a few typographical errors, which have been highlighted with the standard [*sic*]. The errors may have been due to mistakes made by the typist, which was undoubtedly one of Khan's secretaries, when she transcribed Khan's handwriting, or they may appear as such in the original handwritten text, which is now lost. English was not Khan's first language and he occasionally committed spelling errors rather than looking up the orthography in an English dictionary.

When a first volume of Khan's *Work Books* was released on 3 November 2022, courtesy of Linda Hopkins and Steven Kuchuck, the publication was hailed as a major event. The distinguished American psychoanalyst Glen O. Gabbard, who read through thousands of pages of unedited material, in order to ensure that all confidential information would be redacted, wrote: "Psychoanalysts have long been aware of the fact that extraordinary intelligence and alarming corruption can co-exist in the same individual. However, the case of Masud Khan is truly exceptional . . ." (Gabbard, 2022). On 10 December 2022, an on-line booklaunch was held for the first *Work Books* instalment, which attracted a virtual audience of roughly 300 people from around the

world. Introduced by Brett Kahr, who narrated his own encounter with Khan's works, Linda Hopkins and Steven Kuchuck patiently explained their editorial decisions and also considered more broadly the style and contents of Khan's professional diary and the function it might have served for the development of his own thought.

Shortly after the book launch, I contacted Linda and Steven to brief them about the imminent arrival of the original letters between Khan, Granoff and Smirnoff at the Freud Museum London and to ask them some questions about the contents of the *Work Books* that had not been published yet. In the course of our conversations, the idea of devoting a section of *Psychoanalysis and History* to Khan, possibly coinciding with the centenary of his birth in July 1924, started to take shape and it was Linda who suggested to me that I also get in touch with James Anderson at Northwestern University, because he had interviewed Khan in October and November 1981, without publishing the transcript of these meetings. Anderson was entirely supportive of my proposition to publish these historical interviews. His response to my invitation actually exceeded my expectations when he told me that he had also written a separate essay containing his own thoughts and observations about his meetings with Khan, which even included an unknown letter by John Bowlby. Both Anderson's edited transcript of his interviews with Khan and his reflective essay are now included in this journal issue. To the best of my knowledge, Anderson's is the only interview with Khan that has ever been published. Apart from James Anderson, Linda also introduced me to Jonathan Stoller, son of Robert and Sybil Stoller, who kindly put a large collection of previously unreleased photographs of Masud Khan at my disposal, some of which are included in the pages that follow.

Over the past year, Linda Hopkins and I have emailed intermittently, partly to discuss her contribution to this special section on Khan, partly to consider the possibility of her own archival Khan materials also being deposited at the Freud Museum London. In this respect, it primarily concerns the full copy of the *Work Books* that Khan shared with Robert and Sybil Stoller, but also the roughly 100 letters Khan wrote to his second wife Svetlana Beriosova during the 10 happy years of their marriage. As Hopkins recounts in her biography of Khan, these love letters, which are sometimes 15 pages long and were often sent by Khan some days prior to his wife's departure for a performance, so that they would be waiting for her upon her arrival at the hotel in the city where the show took place, were discovered by the photographer Zoë Dominic in an old suitcase under Svetlana's bed, after her death in November 1998 (Hopkins, 2006, p. 395). When Dominic informed Linda Hopkins of her discovery, Linda took photocopies of the entire correspondence. Earlier this year, she generously decided to donate these materials to me, with the prospect of their being added to the Khan archive at the Freud Museum London. At present, we do not know where the originals of Khan's letters to Svetlana might be, whereas Svetlana's replies would have been destroyed by the IPA in July 2019.

Reading through this new set of missives, some of which were reproduced in Hopkins' biography (see, for instance, Hopkins, 2006, pp. 57-59), I uncovered yet another side of Khan's personality, which may have been ignited by his being madly in love, or his feeling desperately lonely in the absence of his beloved wife. Whatever the cause may have been, his letters to Svetlana often reveal his deep sense of vulnerability, his craving for the simple pleasures of shared domesticity, and his desperate need for emotional closeness, for which he often compensated by having

recourse to the silent company of books. To give the reader a flavour of these marvellous letters, I decided to include two in the pages that follow. The reason why I have chosen these two is threefold. First, their content shows a rarely acknowledged feature of Khan's wide-ranging interests, notably his obsession with James Joyce. For many years, Khan never travelled without his copy of Joyce's *Ulysses*, whereby he consistently made a note of the exact location and date of his foreign sojourn on the front free endpapers of the book.[8] Second, even though these letters are, in the strictest sense, love letters, their style is not markedly different from the way Khan wrote to many other people, especially his close friends in Paris. The style is rhapsodic yet carefully structured at the same time. One letter 'develops' over the course of an entire afternoon and evening. Third, the content and style of the letters also mirrors, and one might even be tempted to say 'anticipates', the approach Khan subsequently adopted for his *Work Books*. Even though the latter were primarily, but not exclusively addressed to himself, he often pursued ideas in them in a way that is simultaneously punctuated and free-floating.

As I pointed out earlier, the main purpose of this special section on Masud Khan is not to reopen a polemic about the acceptability of some of his personal and professional actions, the extent to which the BPS and the IPA were right in imposing their sanctions, and the question whether Khan's clinical boundary violations could have been avoided if a stricter protocol of psychoanalytic training had been followed. However, I am not so naïve as to think that, in the wake of the release of his *Work Books* and the publication of the additional documents in this journal, a new debate

[8] Khan's copy of Joyce's *Ulysses* is in the archive of the Hellenic Society of Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy in Athens. For an interesting discussion of Khan's engagement with Joyce and the modernist movement in general, see Poore (2014*a*; 2014*b*).

concerning the nature and value of his place in the psychoanalytic movement will not be elicited. As Adam Limentani, the former president of the IPA, wrote at the end of his obituary of Khan, which was notably published three years after his death: “This was the life of a man who has been said to be a maverick, an iconoclast, and apostate. He was full of contradictions which affected his external and internal relationships. On that basis, his friends and enemies will form their own judgment” (Limentani, 1992, p. 159). Of course, more often than not, judgments are already passed before the evidence is fully considered. With the opening of a Khan archive at the Freud Museum London, which will hopefully be expanded in the years to come, scholars and researchers will at least have an entirely new opportunity to scrutinize some crucial elements of the riddle that was Masud Khan.

The only thing that remains is for me to express my heartfelt thanks to those people who have made the preservation of the Khan archive possible and who have lent their support to the compilation and publication of the documents in this issue. First of all, I remain extremely grateful to Martine Bacherich for her trust and her friendship. In addition, the project would not have materialised without the support of Giuseppe Albano, James W. Anderson, Lisa Appignanesi, Paul Crake, Bryony Davies, Matt ffytche, Dagmar Herzog, Linda Hopkins, Steve Kuchuck, Max Maher, Sue Prevezer, Carol Seigel, and Jonathan Stoller. The numerous material, intellectual, and other contributions they have made to the incubation and delivery of this (still ongoing) project have been received with the greatest appreciation and I can only hope that I will one day be able to repay my debts with my own tokens of generosity. As Khan put it in one of his epigrams: “To receive the *givens* generously is sufficient gratitude” (Khan, 2024[1965]).

References

Amouroux, R. (2012) *Marie Bonaparte: Entre biologie et freudisme*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.

Amouroux, R. (ed.) (2022) *Marie Bonaparte/Sigmund Freud. Correspondance intégrale 1925-1939*. trans. O. Mannoni. Paris: Flammarion.

Balint, M. (1952) *Primary Love and Psycho-Analytic Technique*. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis.

Bauduin, A. & Denis, P. (2003) La perversion narcissique de l'analyste et ses théories. *Revue française de psychanalyse* 67(3) : 1007-1014.

Bertin, C. (1983) *Marie Bonaparte: A Life*. London: Quartet Books.

Bourgeron, J.-P. (1993) *Marie Bonaparte et la psychanalyse à travers ses lettres à René Laforgue et les images de son temps*. Genève: Champion-Slatkine.

Cooper, J. (1993) *Speak Of Me As I Am: The Life and Work of Masud Khan*. London: Karnac Books.

Eissler, K. R. (1971) *Talent and Genius: The Fictitious Case of Tausk Contra Freud*. New York NY: Quadrangle Books.

Eissler (1983) *Victor Tausk's Suicide*. New York NY: International Universities Press, Inc.

Freud, S. (1955[1907-1908]) Addendum: Original Record of the Case. *SE* 10, pp. 251-318. London: Hogarth Press.

Freud, S. (1958[[1914*g*]) Remembering, Repeating and Working-Through (Further Recommendations on the Technique of Psychoanalysis II). *SE* 12, pp. 145-156. London: Hogarth Press.

Gabbard, G. O. (2022) Endorsement. In Hopkins, L. & Kuchuck, S. (eds) *Diary of a Fallen Psychoanalyst: The Work Books of Masud Khan 1967-1972*. London: Karnac Books, back cover.

Gazzillo, M. S. F. (2008) *Sua maestà Masud Khan. Vita e opera di un psicoanalista pakistano a Londra*. Milano: Raffaello Cortina Editore.

Godley, W. (2001) Saving Masud Khan. *London Review of Books* 23(4): 3-7.

Granoff, W. (2024[1954]) Presentation on Balint at Lacan's seminar *Freud's papers on Technique*, 26 May 1954. trans. & ed. D. Nobus. In J. Szekacs-Weisz, R. Soreanu & I. Ward (eds). *Michael Balint and His World: The Budapest Years*. London-New York NY: Routledge, pp. 120-144.

Heuer, G. M. (2017) *Freud's 'Outstanding' Colleague/Jung's 'Twin Brother': The Suppressed Psychoanalytic and Political Significance of Otto Gross*. Abingdon-New York NY: Routledge.

Hopkins, L. (2006) *False Self: The Life of Masud Khan*. New York NY: Other Press.

Hopkins, L. & Kuchuck, S. (eds) (2022) *Diary of a Fallen Psychoanalyst: The Work Books of Masud Khan 1967-1972*. London: Karnac Books.

Hurwitz, E. (1990) *Otto Gross. Paradies-Sucher zwischen Freud und Jung.* Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Khan, M. M. R. (1962) *Letter to Svetlana Beriosova of 14 September 1962*, private collection.

Khan, M. M. R. (1974) *The Privacy of the Self: Papers on Psychoanalytic Theory and Technique*. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis.

Khan, M. M. R. (1988) *When Spring Comes: Awakenings in Clinical Psychoanalysis*. London: Chatto & Windus.

Khan, M. M. R. (2024[1965]) Anticahiers. Volume 1: 1965. *Psychoanalysis and History* 26(2): xx (this issue).

Lacan, J. (1988[1975]) *The Seminar. Book I: Freud's Papers on Technique (1953-'54)*. ed. J.-A. Miller. trans. J. Forrester. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

La Rochefoucauld, F. de (2007[1678]) Moral Reflections or Sententiae and Maxims. In *Collected Maxims and Other Reflections*. trans. E. H. and A. M. Blackmore & F. Giguère. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Laing, O. (2021) *Everybody: A Book About Freedom*. London: Picador.

Larivière, M. (2022) *Le prince de la psychanalyse. Vie de Masud Khan*. Montréal: Editions Liber.

Limentani, A. (1992) Obituary : M. Masud R. Khan (1924-1989). *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 73(1): 155-159.

Nabokov, V. (1957) *Pnin*. London: Heinemann.

Nobus, D. (2020) The Madness of Princess Alice: Sigmund Freud, Ernst Simmel and Alice of Battenberg at Kurhaus Schloß Tegel. *History of Psychiatry* 31(2): 147-162.

Nobus, D. (2023) "Votre popularité parmi nous est immense": Le rôle de Michael Balint dans la scission de 1953. *Topique* 157: 9-29.

Nobus, D. (2024) Lacan's Balint: Synergies and Discords in a Professional Friendship. In J. Szekacs-Weisz, R. Soreanu & I. Ward (eds). *Michael Balint and His World: The Budapest Years*. London-New York NY: Routledge, pp. 145-172.

Obholzer, K. (1982[1980]) *The Wolf-Man Sixty Years Later: Conversations with Freud's Patient*. Trans. M. Shaw. London-Melbourne: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Parra, N. (1985[1954]) *Antipoems: How to Look Better and Feel Great*. Trans. L. Ferlinghetti. New York NY: New Directions.

Poore, B. (2014*a*) *Modernism and the Making of Masud Khan*. PhD Dissertation, Queen Mary University of London.

Poore, B. (2014*b*) "An Irish emigrant the wrong way out": Masud Khan Reads James Joyce. *Postcolonial Text* 9(4): 1-21.

Roazen, P. (1969) *Brother Animal: The Story of Freud and Tausk*. London: Allen Lane/The Penguin Press.

Santayana, G. (1905) *The Life of Reason or the Phases of Human Progress*. New York NY: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Smirnoff, V. (1989) By mail. *Nouvelle revue de psychanalyse* 40: 352-359.

Ungar, V., Nick, S. & Van Dalewijk, H. J. (2019) *Memorandum on the Destruction of the Masud Khan Archive*, private collection.

Willoughby, R. (2005) *Masud Khan: The Myth and the Reality*. London: Free Association Books.