Podcast Series with Professor Miles:

# On the Legacy of Sigmund Freud

**Rafi:** Welcome to our podcast. Today we are diving into a fascinating historical and conceptual question:

*What is the legacy of Sigmund Freud for Daseinanalysis?*

Freud's psychoanalysis shaped 20th-century understandings of the psyche. Yet Medard Boss, the founder of Daseinanalysis, turned away from Freud's metapsychology toward Heidegger's existential ontology. But did Daseinanalysis truly leave Freud behind, or does Freud's influence still live quietly in its practice?

So let us start from the beginning — with the historical and conceptual roots. We all know the myths and the clichés about Freud — couches, cigars, the Oedipus complex — but beneath the caricatures, what was his essential breakthrough that still matters today?

**Miles:** Well, he invented psychoanalysis. In fact, I think it's true to say that psychoanalysis is the first psychotherapy. I say that because what he did was unprecedented. He took the conversation that had taken place between the psychiatrist and the hospital inpatient — a conversation that was very limited in his time and throughout most of the history of madhouses and insane asylums, since it was thought you couldn't really talk with someone who was "crazy" — and he brought that conversation home, literally.

Not being a psychiatrist and being someone who was interested as he was in the depths of human motivation, he took an unprecedented step. He took individuals literally into his home — into the privacy of a room set aside there for his private practice of the art of conversation. He had an examining room there, too, as a neurologist, and in another cozy room nearby he began to experiment with what became psychoanalysis.

That started out as a form of what was called the *pressure technique*, where he would put his hand on the head of the individual. He was allowed to do that because he was a physician. Then he used hypnosis, which he had learned from Charcot and had observed elsewhere, but primarily with Charcot. And then, finally, he abandoned that. After abandoning the pressure technique and hypnosis, he decided that simply talking to the person — without touching them or trying to change their state of consciousness, as hypnosis was supposed to do — would be the way. He would simply have a conversation with them.

This conversation, in the privacy of his home, was unprecedented. And this set the stage for others to do the same thing. But it also suggested to certain people that such conversations could happen in the hospital setting.

This would include, for example, his early protégé Carl Jung, whom he hoped would take over psychoanalysis as a psychiatrist — again, which Freud was not — and become the next leader of the psychoanalytic movement. That did not happen, of course.

So, his relation to psychotherapy is as its inventor. He blurs the distinction between the hospital and the home by bringing the patient, inviting the analysand, into his home to talk with him. That's the beginning of the story of psychotherapy.

He was accompanied in the early days by Joseph Breuer, who also tried to do this — but Breuer got scared off. Being somewhat older and more traditional, when he caught on that something later called *transference* had taken place between a woman patient and himself, Breuer said: *"No more of this. I'll stay with my Frau and my children. You go as you will, my dear friend."*

But by that time, of course, they had collaborated on what was published as *Studies on Hysteria* in 1895. So Freud went boldly forward in this blurring of the doctor's office in the hospital and his consulting room at home.

I think this may be what is not often enough realized and admitted about what the psychotherapeutic setting really was from the beginning. It finally ended up in big buildings, back in hospitals or clinics, or now in rented spaces where eight, nine, or ten therapists have their offices. This, I think, takes something away from the legacy of Freud as the inventor of psychotherapy.

There were others who were talking with individuals with a quasi-therapeutic goal such as Pierre Janet, and I don't want to leave them out. But as far as the one who had the most influence, of course, we have to stick with Freud.

**Rafi:** Before meeting Heidegger, Boss was already a well-established psychiatrist in Zurich. How deeply, would you say, was he rooted in the Freudian tradition at that point in his career?

**Miles:** Very, very intimately and deeply. In his younger days, in his early twenties, he had a few hours — not many, just over a couple of weeks — on Freud's couch.

How did it happen? He was traveling. He was in Vienna, and he didn't have much support for this, because it was still while he was making up his mind about what he wanted to do with his life. Early twenties, right? And his father was not particularly supportive. But he decided he wanted to meet this man Freud. And so he did.

Freud welcomed him, even gave him some money for food one time because he heard his stomach growling — Boss hadn't had lunch or breakfast when he came for the session. This broke all the rules, of course, that we assume were tight and irrevocable in psychoanalysis from the start.

That "analysis" was short-lived. He returned to Switzerland, eventually completed a medical degree, and with Hans Behn-Eschenburg as his training analyst completed the full psychoanalytic preparation program that had been established by the psychoanalytic institute in Zurich. This was part of the International Psychoanalytic Association, which by then was spreading everywhere through Europe — from Austria, to Germany (Berlin), then into France, Italy, and very soon also into Hungary, where it had a powerful influence.

So Boss had that initial personal experience with the man himself, and then he had the formal training with Behn-Eschenburg. Some of the correspondence between the two of them — not many letters — was brought out for publication a year or two ago.

**Rafi:** Are they actually available to read today?

**Miles:** Between Boss and his Swiss analyst, yes. I have copies of them, and they were incorporated into some other correspondence with I helped edit. There are just a half-dozen or so, not too many. Nothing of great interest, because Boss — or his wife — took most of Boss's private material and locked it up, for reasons of confidentiality. But a few of these somehow sneaked out on their own, and we captured them.

**Rafi:** Fascinating. I would love to read them if you could share them — that would be an amazing piece of history to bring closer. Let me move us forward. When Boss began to articulate Daseinanalysis more clearly, especially after his intensive dialogues with Heidegger, what were the aspects of Freud's teaching that he most explicitly rejected? Why did he feel that Freud's framework could not serve as the foundation for a truly new therapy?

**Miles:** Well, you mentioned the most important element — and that is his *metapsychology* or what we might call his philosophy. 'Metapsychology' is a code word for his philosophy. There's a Freudian philosophy, and a *Weltanschauung*, a worldview, and the philosophy is deeply entrenched in the natural sciences.

This, of course, Boss rejected systematically in his writings. As important was his rejection of concepts such as transference, countertransference, projection, introjection, even empathy. He did this kind of housecleaning of psychoanalysis in order to refine from it what he thought was worth preserving.

And so there was in Boss this critique of Freud's philosophical position and certain concepts associated with it. But nevertheless, he did not speak badly of Freud. He never doubted that Freud was a fine therapist — perhaps

even a kind of closet daseinanalyst, right? Because what Freud actually did in his consulting room was at such great variance with what he wrote and published, which people then read and took as guides to technique — in particular the papers on technique, some of which Freud himself threw away because he didn't want people to imitate him.

So Boss continued all his life to think highly of Freud the therapist, but not much of him as a thinker, in the sense that he would eventually embrace Heidegger as a philosopher and thinker. Freud himself, in a few places, said, *"I want nothing to do with philosophy. Philosophy is airy, metaphysical, not grounded in reality, not grounded in nature."* But what he failed to understand was that, of course, he himself had a philosophical position. There's a paper by Freud on *worldviews* that I think is worth reading, in which this is in the background of the discussion.

So that philosophical grounding is gone in Daseinanalysis. Gone are the notions of transference and counter-transference — and then the other concepts I mentioned—and the dynamic unconscious.

What he retains of Freud, as you know, is **(1) the use of the couch**, which Boss thought was absolutely indispensable. He also retains from psychoanalysis what came to be called **(2) the fundamental rule** — simply saying to the person: *"Look, you can talk about anything you want here. The sky's the limit. No holds barred. You don't have to worry about what kind of language you use, what words you use."* You don't invite the person to be vulgar or to shout and scream, but you imply that what could be very unpleasant to say in an ordinary social setting, in the analytic setting you have to be able to say it. And Freud and later analysts had to be able to take it. So do daseinanalysts. We hear some nasty pronouncements.

So that's the second element he retained from Freud. And the third is a tremendous **(3) interest in dreaming life**.

These three — the couch, the fundamental rule, and the focus on dreaming life — are what Boss rescues and preserves as the pure gold of psychoanalysis for Daseinanalysis.

**Rafi:** So in a way, there are also points of continuity between Freud and Boss. Could we say that — that Freud was not simply abandoned, but rather carried forward in transformed ways?

**Miles:** Yes. These are the ties, I think, to psychoanalysis that remain.

**Rafi:** You've already spoken about the fundamental rule. Let me ask you now to talk more on the couch. On the surface, it seems such a simple piece of furniture. Yet it became iconic for Freud — and Boss did not abandon it. So I'd like to ask: in your view, what is the meaning of the couch within psychoanalysis and within Daseinanalysis? Why did it remain indispensable, even after so much else of Freud was set aside?

And then, of course, dreams. Dreams were central for Freud, but Boss seems to speak more of *dreaming life*. Do we still see traces of Freud's understanding of dreams in Daseinanalytic work, or is the emphasis now placed differently — more on the continuity between waking and dreaming existence?

**Miles:** Yeah. Let's do the couch first — and then if I forget what the second part was, you remind me. But I think it will be about dreaming life.

**Rafi:** We will remember.

**Miles:** At first, Freud faced people and tried hypnotic intervention. And there are various stories about why the couch came into play.

What he discovered when it did happen is important. But has for how the couch came to introduced into the consulting room, one story is that he had a patient, a wealthy woman, who had a bad back. She said, "Sitting in a chair is uncomfortable for an hour with you." She suggested maybe a Victorian daybed would be more comfortable. She could put her feet up, her back would be more comfortable. So he bought one.

He went to the local counterpart of a department store and bought pillows and rugs and made it comfier — not as hard as a Victorian daybed would have been. It went out flat but had a slight angle, a chaise longue, so you weren't lying down really flat, but more or less reclined, much as you are in a dentist's chair.

By the time I was in analysis — and I was in traditional Freudian psychoanalysis — there was just a tiny pillow and I was stretched straight out. This was, by the middle of the 20th century, pretty standard.

But going back to Freud — Madame Bienveniste, I think was her name, I'm not sure of her first name — eventually, and here the stories vary, Freud thought it might be better if he didn't look at the person at all. In any case it was awkward with one person stretched out comfortably and Freud sitting in a chair facing the couch. At one point, however, he writes in a letter: *"I was getting tired of being looked at all day long."* This was another reason given for using, retaining the couch for everyone and not just Mme. Bienveniste.

Well, then, he thought, I can place myself behind the head of the couch, out of sight. Now I'm not being looked at. And since I'm mostly interested in what the person is saying and not what they look like or what they're doing, something might come of it.

So just what happened isn't entirely clear, but it seems very likely that he took the opportunity to experiment and realized there was something very important about this repositioning of the two people.

And eventually — I've written about this, and I think it's extremely important — when you're not face to face with somebody, many of the social niceties can be bracketed or put to one side. You don't feel the need to say something rather than just sit staring back at somebody. How long can you sit in a room with someone, face to face, without talking? It becomes uncomfortable. You want to fill the silence.

With the analysand in the reclining position and the partners out of sight of each other, silences are more acceptable — and in fact become productive. Not being forced to speak, the analysand can take some time to ruminate, to think over what she wants to say next. And as an analyst, I don't force conversation. One allows silence.

Now, a minute of silence in that position can feel very long. Two minutes can feel very long. Ten minutes of silence? It's happened. It's happened. But generally speaking, after a few hours in which there are long silences, the analysand gets used to the fact — and uses them in the way I just mentioned: to think things over. Silences tend not to be as frequent as you might expect especially as the analysis progresses.

On Freud not wanting to be looked at, I think it's important also to remember that during his prime years he was suffering from jaw cancer. The look of his face — with prosthetic pieces in there, distorted, even though he had a beard — and the odor from his cigar and from the cancer, these then were no longer "in the face" of the analysand.

So my tendency is toward the heroic explanation, that he had an insight based on a chance occurrence (Mme. Bienveniste's bad back and wealth to purchase him a daybed) and not the other one about being stared at all day long, six days a week. I think he simply realized at some point that there was something very important about this arrangement.

And that, of course, is taken over 100% by Boss. Well, let's say 99%, because there are places where Boss says it is not always possible to do this with somebody. The couch may not be appropriate for everyone but it's highly desirable for everyone given the reasons adduced. The auditory sphere overtakes the visual in the analytic setting. It's all about what is said and heard.

So I think that sort of covers the couch. There's more to be said about it, though — like how to set the stage for its use, which I do in the preliminary interview with a potential analysand, or what to do while the person is coming into your room and getting ready to lie on the couch, while you take your position, and when the hour is over and the person gets up to leave.

I'll just add something before we get to dreaming life. I tend not to say very much in those first moments. I welcome the person. He may take off his shoes so as not to scuff the couch — that's pleasant. Most people are polite. That wasn't an issue in my own analysis since there was a plastic covering on the couch where the feet and shoes landed. But I don't pay much attention to the person who has entered. I fuss with my own chair and give the person privacy as he gets on the couch. He's known from the first interview that that's what he'll be doing. So he does it.

I don't say much then. So there's quite a lot of silence after "Hi" until the hour has started. A bit of small talk is OK, though.

At the end, when it's time to get up and leave — we all have to go on with our lives — comes the question of orthodox psychoanalysts, again from the 20th century: Should you say anything? Some said nothing at all, just nodded and opened the door. That was my experience: the woman who had me in analysis, when it was over, she said it was time. I got up, I looked at her, she opened the door, and I went out. She never said a word.

I don't think there's anything wrong with a little small talk afterwards. In fact, I think it eases the transition into real life. Otherwise it's a bit of a shock. If it's raining outside and someone says, "Oh, I forgot an umbrella," I may say, "We didn't expect that, did we? I have an extra one — do you want it?" That little bit of talk is fine. It underscores the difference between the two situations—analysis and real life.

But, again, I don't talk too much. I don't walk the person to the door. The person leaves, opens the door, and goes, the same way they arrived. I leave the door slightly ajar; usually there's a knock, but after a few sessions they just come in, knowing they're welcome. I'm often sitting at my desk when they come in. I stand up, greet.

All of that is to set the stage for using the couch, which has so many advantages we could talk about for a long time.

I'll just mention two more things, then we'll segue into dreaming life.

First: being in that position, your head is literally closer to your heart — in both the figurative and the real sense. You're in a somewhat vulnerable position, stretched out. This is what makes many people resistant at first. But once they find they're safe, and you're not looking at them anyway, they can more fully relax.

Second: the posture simulates lying down to nap or sleep. It eases the transition from talk about waking life to talk about dreaming life, too, and "eases" emphasis on everyday life. One moves from being alert and social to

entering the private world of dreaming life—when appropriate. So there is that further advantage of the couch, too.

The position that the person is in tends to foster that feeling of being able to free associate. Your posture, you know, determines a great deal about how you see the world and how you act in it: upright, sitting, standing, walking, lying down, semi-reclined. And as mentioned dreaming life then becomes more accessible.

And *rêverie*, as the French call it, becomes more likely — and all kinds of states in between: fantasizing in particular, but also meditating in a certain sense. Think of how things change when you lie down to take a nap.

By the way, some analysands close their eyes, some don't. Some are very busy with their hands. I can hear that.

**Rafi:** Since we are speaking about the couch, may I ask something more personal? When you are in the analyst's chair yourself — do you tend to close your eyes, or are you busy with your hands while listening?

**Miles:** I close my eyes sometimes. I don't move much, except if I'm uncomfortable. I stay pretty still. I just move to feel comfortable, but I don't hesitate to scratch, and I cough and sneeze on occasion. I try to be as quiet as possible, so as not to disturb the person who's over there.

And yes, sometimes I do close my eyes to listen better. But it's not a requirement. I don't try to put myself into the same situation that the person is in. I do what feels, at the time, most appropriate. And sometimes it is easier, and a richer experience, to listen with your eyes closed.

In fact, my second analyst — my daseinanalyst — was very much, as I learned, prone to do that. He told me that was very much his style.

The little footage we have of Boss doing a Daseinanalysis with someone shows him with his eyes very wide open and sitting forward in his chair, in fact — attentive, in a very attentive posture. I tend to be more relaxed, but he tended to sit forward. He has his hands on his knees at some points, then he moves back, but he tends to be in a very upright sitting position.

I think that just depends on the person. Most analysts — most psychoanalysts — tend to sit upright; they don't slouch. And I think most daseinanalysts do, too.

So dreaming life is the other issue that you brought up. And I think if the situation encourages a transition to talk about dreaming life, this is another good reason for using the couch. Notice I didn't say for *dreams*, but rather for *dreaming life*. And there's a difference. It was in your two-part question — I can say something about it now.

Boss denies that there are such entities as “dreams.” By the way, I think I didn’t say earlier: he also dispenses with the whole notion of the unconscious and of the psyche as being hypotheses. I mention it now since dreams were said by Freud to be the "royal road" to the unconsciousness. But if there's no place to go to . . . .. Boss talks about *dreaming life* — and becoming part of the dreaming life, looking in on the dreaming life of the analysand.

In other words, for him, unlike Freud, dreams are not discrete episodes — little performances in a private theater, as it were, that can be decoded. (This is another image Freud uses—the dream as a theater where there are performances of dreams.) But dreams are not simply experiences observed by one person, the dreamer, and then reported later to the analyst. And so a dream, in Freud’s sense, is something that can be written down by an individual — whether by the analysand reporting it, sometimes even having been jotted down in the middle of the night or in the morning and brought to analytic hour. That gives you a text. Analysts would carefully record the dreams as little stories. Then there is the famous dream of Irma’s injection, which Freud himself had and was written down as a text. This is the famous "specimen dream" of psychoanalysis. In his book, he goes through it line by line, by line, by line.

There’s a paper that I wrote very, very early on for a journal called *Dreamworks* — it was a new interpretation, a further interpretation of that dream. This was in my psychoanalytic days. It followed others who had revisited the dream — Erik Erikson among the best known analysts to do so. But you see what has happened: an experience that occurred while sleeping is turned into a text to be analyzed, much a literary critics do.

But for Boss, a text is not important. The elements of the dream (a house, a rose, a river) are what interests him. Of even greater importance as we will see is the continuity between waking life and dreaming life — one existence, two modes of existing, continuous, distinguished only by the fact that we fall asleep.

A word about sleep, then, before considering dreaming life. It’s always interesting to remind people: we never remember falling asleep. Of course we remember waking up — whether in the middle of the night to get some water, or to go to the bathroom, or in the morning when we wake to an alarm, or just on our own and see the light and things familiar to you taking shape as the ensemble we call the world.

This matter of not remembering falling asleep led Boss to be fascinated by an old story. I won’t take the time to tell it fully, but essentially it’s about a butterfly. It comes from China — a Chinese story, about the whole question of whether we are dreaming or awake. The upshot is that you don’t know that you've been asleep unless you wake up, so that it’s quite possible that I might be asleep now and I’m having this dream about a conversation with you. Because I’ve met you before, and we know each other, I might well have a dream about having a

dialogue with you, recording a podcast for you. The only assurance that I was asleep is, of course, if I wake up. And we just have to wait to see if that happens. And that seems to have happened to me this morning at 7 am., or a little earlier. But then, as Boss says, one can dream that one is dreaming — and people do report this. What then?

All this is to say that Boss is not suggesting life is a dream, as some have, for example, the great Spanish playwright Calderon, but that the *dreaming life* of a person is existentially as important as the waking life of a person and forms a continuity with it. It should not be dismissed as either a place of disguises — where everything must be seen through by the analyst — or as a place where everything is symbolic and timeless (as Freud thought).

Rather, dreaming life is very much part of the time-making that characterizes and defines human existence — human existing.

The advantage for Boss of focusing on dreaming life, and on reports of dreaming life, is that very often dreaming life — which we all experience — is underpopulated with things and people. It tends to be rather sparse in its elements.

A person dreams about a house, a tree, and a person — and there's not a lot of detail. I'm looking around my office here and there are hundreds and hundreds of things, right? But in a dream, you tend to have a rather small selection of things and people. That is both an advantage and a disadvantage. It has a certain unreality about it because it's so spare, so unfurnished — or furnished only to a limited extent. It *is* very much like a scene from a longer theatrical performance, as Freud thought, but for Boss there is something about dreaming that allows a lot of room—in that space certain phenomena stand out. Boss believes that the stand out in dreaming because they have been overlooked in waking life, given that there's so much else around in waking life.

So what appears in dreaming life are these phenomena. And in talking with the analyst about her dreaming, opportunities arise to go after that small cache of phenomena.

The person may say: *"I'm walking by a house with a red door."* And that's all. Well, there's quite a lot then for the person to say — if you give her time to say whether she goes into the house or whether she just walks by it, whether it is out in the country or along a busy city street, what color it is, does it have windows, and so on.

You can return to these phenomena, which bear a great deal of meaning that has an opportunity to be revealed, laid out, expanded upon. You can return to them again and again. There's room for expansion of dream phenomena.

As I mentioned earlier, Boss rejected the idea of symbolism in dreams. The house is not automatically considered to be an enclosure like a womb, as Freud might have said. If you're walking into a house, his first thought would be: *"You're probably walking into a womb — a womb with a view"* (to play with the title of E.M. Forster's book).

No, for Boss, a house is a house. What does a house mean to this person? A house is not a home. Maybe it's a schoolhouse, maybe a house of worship, maybe a firehouse, as we places where fire engines are kept. This gives the individual the opportunity to develop the phenomenon, to allow it to fill up the dream space.

As analyst, you can return to one of those phenomena if you wish. But in my view, that's always up to the analysand.

So that's just a bit of the interest in dreaming life. I'd stress its continuity with waking life — as being as important as waking life with respect to existence — and as an opportunity to explore things overlooked in waking life because waking life is so busy and full of things.

**Rafi:** Thank you, Miles. This has been quite a lecture, and I listened with eyes wide open. To close, let me ask a practical but important question for students and practitioners today. In your view, is it still important for Daseinanalysts to study Freud? And if yes, which of his works would you recommend as most essential?

**Miles:** Absolutely. I think since he is the source of this whole notion of therapy as we know it — this conversation, this encounter between two human beings — there's a great deal to be learned about what that means, and what is inherent to this really unusual situation, where you put two people in the positions I've described. And Freud has a lot to say about this.

It is so remarkably different from everyday life and from everything else — including medical encounters with people. Which is why it's always important to keep in mind: psychoanalysis is not a branch of psychiatry, not a part of medicine. Nor is Daseinanalysis.

As to what to read of Freud. I'd say everything, chronologically from the beginning, to watch him develop his ideas. He was a fine stylist.

Now, there is a new translation that has replaced the Strachey-edited *Standard Edition* of Freud's works. I haven't read the new edition. To be very honest, I just don't have interest in doing that right now. But it's a massive undertaking that's been completed. Of the writings in the original 23 volumes of the *Standard Edition*, I'd especially recommend the papers on technique. Boss recommended them too — they can be read with a great deal of interest. I would start with those. There several editions of the papers on technique with commentary.

So, read them for what he says *not* to do, not for what he says to do. Because what you should do has to come out of your own personality.

This is why, when people talk about "the Freudian legacy," I always wonder what that really means. It seems to me there was only one Freudian — Freud. Only one Jungian — Jung. And so on.

This didn't prevent psychoanalysis from becoming a kind of cult, particularly in the United States — even to the point of silliness. Psychoanalysts dressed alike: men wore three-piece suits and smoked cigars. The women analysts imitated the most important early woman analyst — not the first, but Freud's daughter, Anna. They dressed like Anna Freud in a very simple print dress, a string of pearls, and that was it.

That kind of silliness, I think, has passed.

There is one important technical idea worth mentioning from Freud. He talks about what he calls *evenly hovering or evenly suspended attention*. I think that image and metaphor are very enlightening. This is also carried over into Daseinanalysis.

Following Freud, too, the analyst ought to be, to the greatest extent possible, free and open. Here you see echoes, in Boss, of Heidegger's notion of openness — this idea of keeping an open space, not settling. Not levitating, but simply not settling on anything as the be all and end all — allowing phenomena to appear on their own, with none given priority.

And I think it follows from this that it is important to be as quiet as possible. Freud was coming from a very different position here, of course. And Boss challenged him in many ways. Interpretations, for example, are rejected; they're interventions. Who am I to figure out what's on somebody's mind or what they're feeling? Who am I to say what the analysand means. Only she can tell us that. I'm interested in making conditions possible for her to liberate herself, to free herself for her own possibilities.

However I do this — whether it's by lightening things up (which I tend to do) . . . literally, lightening things, taking them lightly. I'm a serious person, but very often I find that being lighthearted helps the atmosphere. I'm not telling jokes, mind you, but I may pick up on a pun, or keep the atmosphere buoyant rather than deadly serious, as we say in English.

So there are just a couple of thoughts about reading Freud.

I think there's probably good reason to read the new edition in English since ways of speaking have changed and Strachey introduced some unusual ways of hearing what he thought Freud was saying in German. There have been many translations in other languages — Polish, Spanish, French, and the rest. Read those versions, too, if you can. But **by all means, do read Freud**. Again, read the papers on technique — but keep in mind that Freud threw away some of them. He thought the wrong impression would be given — an impression, I believe, that there was a solid, fixed technique. What was in those papers, of course, we don't know. But we do know he decided not to publish some of them.

So the technique papers would be a good place to start. They cover a number of years, but crucial years, when such advice was being asked for by young psychoanalysts: *"How can we do what you do in order to get the results you get?"*

**Rafi:** Thank you so much, Miles. It is always a real pleasure to share these conversations with you. I find them deeply inspiring, and I hope our listeners and readers will feel the same — not only gaining insights, but also feeling invited to continue the questioning on their own.

If Freud's legacy begins anywhere, perhaps it begins precisely here: in the courage to take human speech seriously, and to let conversation open something rather than close it. For me, that is what truly matters in such dialogues — that something stays alive between us, and that we remain open.