

REFLECTIONS ON THE MAIN SCHOOLS OF THE WORLD PSYCHOLOGY IN THE CZECH INTERWAR PSYCHOLOGY

Alena Plháková

Palacký University in Olomouc, Czech Republic

The author deals with the reasons for the different level of acceptance of the three important psychological perspectives (Gestalt psychology, behaviorism, and psychoanalysis) in the Czech interwar psychology. Gestalt psychology was probably the most accepted approach, which was at least partly caused by its founding in the neighboring Germany. It was an academic perspective that was convenient for the professional ambitions of its representatives as well as for their endeavor to establish psychology as a serious scientific discipline. On the contrary, the acceptance of behaviorism was rather negative or indifferent. Czech psychologists perceived it as a predominantly foreign, extraneous school of thinking. They preferred the studies on consciousness and the method of introspection over empirical research. Psychoanalysis also has never taken deeper roots in Czechoslovakia. Some Czech intellectuals accepted the existence of unconsciousness but they criticized Freudian sexual symbolism (Peroutka, Čapek). Negative attitudes of the politicians Masaryk and Beneš also contributed to the cool reception of this school. With sporadic exceptions, the psychoanalytic thinking was developed only in a small Jewish-German-Czech circle.

Keywords: Czech interwar psychology, Gestalt psychology, behaviorism, psychoanalysis, comparative psychology

Three founders of the influential schools of Western psychology were born in Bohemia or Moravia, which belonged to Austria-Hungary at that time. Sigmund Freud was born in the small Moravian town of Freiberg (now Příbor, Czech Republic), Edmund Husserl in Prostějov, and Max Wertheimer in Prague. But the main schools of the world psychology were imported back to Czechoslovakia through foreign contacts or journeys of the Czech and Slovak psychologists. Another important source of information was the study of foreign literature. The Czech interwar psychology usually absorbed new developmental trends with a certain delay.

Gestalt Psychology

German Gestalt psychology was the best-known and the most accepted school of psychological thought in the interwar Czechoslovakia. The other important perspectives, especially behaviorism and psychoanalysis, aroused significantly

Alena Plháková, Department of Psychology, Palacký University in Olomouc, Czech Republic.

The author thanks the anonymous reviewers for their valuable recommendations in earlier stages of the manuscript.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Alena Plháková, Department of Psychology, Philosophical Faculty, UP, Křížkovského 10, 771 80, Olomouc, Czech Republic. E-mail: plhakova1@seznam.cz

weaker interest. This situation was at least partly caused by the foundation of Gestalt psychology in the neighboring Germany and, to a certain extent, in Bohemia itself. The immediate antecedent of Gestalt psychology Christian von Ehrenfels (1859–1932), who described so-called transposition, lectured on philosophy at the Prague's German University. The world-famous founder of the Gestalt school Max Wertheimer (1880–1943) was born in Prague, specifically at the address Rabínská No. 16 (now Maislova) in a well-off Jewish family. After graduation from secondary school, he studied law at the Prague's German University (Hoskovec, Nakonečný, & Sedláková, 2002). He switched to philosophy, attending lectures by Ehrenfels, and later went to the University of Berlin to study philosophy and psychology. He earned his doctoral degree in 1904 at the University of Würzburg under Oswald Külpe (Schultz & Schultz, 1992).

Some Czech psychologists and philosophers studied or lectured at German universities, and they brought the controversy between Wilhelm Wundt and the representatives of Gestalt psychology to Czechoslovakia. This conflict between the “old” elements’ psychology, represented mainly by the philosopher and psychologist František Krejčí (1858–1934), and the “new” Gestalt psychology arose after World War I. In comparison with Germany, this controversy occurred 20 or 30 years later. Gestalt psychology was principally an academic school of thinking what was convenient for the professional ambitions of its Czech representatives as well as for their endeavor to establish psychology as a serious scientific discipline (Förster & Plháková, 2004).

The ideas and principles of Gestalt psychology became established particularly at the Institute of Psychology, Masaryk University in Brno. This institute was founded by Slovenian psychologist Mihaljo Rostohar (1878–1966) in 1926. The most significant Czech representative of Gestalt psychology Ferdinand Kratina (1885–1944) worked here from 1933 until his death. Ludmila Kolářiková (1909–1968) was another notable member of the Brno's Institute of Psychology. In 1946, she founded the Department of Psychology at Palacký University in Olomouc. The pioneer of experimental psychology Vilém Chmelář (1892–1988) and Robert Konečný (1906–1981), who focused on clinical psychology, were the other outstanding members of the Brno's Institute of Psychology (Förster & Plháková, 2004).

Within the theoretical and research fields, Czech psychologists elaborated especially the ideas of the Leipzig school represented by Felix Krueger (1874–1948), Wilhelm Wundt's assistant and then successor at the Psychological Institute of Leipzig University. Krueger divided the mental wholes into two groups: (a) wholes (Gestalts) which are closed and subdivided (geometric shapes, chords, melodies, or rhythms) and (b) nonstructured, nondifferentiated complexes (Ganzheits). The Leipzig school dealt with nonstructured psychological complexes, including experiences of high excitement, fatigue, or primitive thinking that can have a clear wholeness quality (Hoskovec, Nakonečný, & Sedláková, 2002).

The ideas of the Leipzig school were imported to Czechoslovakia by Ferdinand Kratina who had been Krueger's visiting student in Leipzig from 1930 till 1931. Kratina became an important representative of “Ganzheitspsychologie” due to his publications *Studies on Gestalt Psychology* (1932) and *An Introduction to Ganzheit and Gestalt Psychology* (1935). He wrote in them not only about the Leipzig school but also about the theories of Wertheimer, Köhler, Koffka, or

Lewin. Both of these readable books can still serve as a valuable source of information on the origin and development of Gestalt psychology.

Kratina believed that the wholes prevailed over parts in all internal mental states or processes. He summarized his conception of Gestalt psychology like this:

In their main features, the theoretical foundations of Gestalt psychology are elaborated. The basic principle is contained in the theorem on phenomenal and functional dominance of the whole over the parts: the whole and parts are indeed mutually conditioned but always so that the whole and its features prevail over parts This statement is valid for the entire psychic sphere: for the perception, imagination, thinking, and volition. From a developmental point of view, the theorem on genetic dominance of the whole holds generally: also at lower developmental levels (at a child, primitive, or animal) not elements but less differentiated or in general undifferentiated wholes prevail. On the one hand, growing differentiation during the development leads to the wholes' segmentation (to the creation of Gestalts), and on the other hand, to their hierarchy, that is, to their complex order. (Kratina, 1947, p. 48)

Professor Mihajlo Rostohar also followed the ideas of the Leipzig school. In the book *Psychology as a Science of Subjective Reality* he evolved the term psychological structure which he considered to be the basic creative and dynamic principle, oriented toward the formation of psychological wholes (Rostohar, 1950, p. 116).

Gestalt-oriented articles of the Brno's group were mostly released in the journal *Psychology* which was published from 1935 to 1950. It was edited by Mihaljo Rostohar until 1948, during the last two years by Vilém Chmelař. Under the influence of communistic ideology, *Psychology* should be transformed into a Marxist magazine *Reflexology* in the 1950s. But this transformation was not realized and the edition of the journal was ceased (Hoskovec, Nakonečný, & Sedláková, 2002).

Rostohar also participated in the Brno's Society for Research in Child; he became its chairman in 1926. Rostohar was a main organizer of the pedological congresses where members of the Psychological Institute could present their Gestalt oriented studies. In 1933, the Fifth (First Slavic) Congress for Research in Child took place in Brno. Ludmila Kolářková reported here the study on the development of visual image from percept in school age girls (Švancara, 2006). Four years later, Rostohar managed to organize the II Slavic Pedological Congress in Lublaň. The scholars from Yugoslavia, Poland, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia participated in it. Rostohar presented here his research on child's creative fantasy and its relationship to the apperception of new images. Chmelař demonstrated the results of his studies on the optic attention development. Kratina dealt with critical objections against psychoanalytic theory of infantile sexuality, hypothetically derived from memories, dreams, and neurotic symptoms (Chmelař, 1937).

The promising interwar development of the Brno's psychological school was stopped by the Communist seizure of power in February 1948. During the 1950s, Gestalt psychology quickly vanished under the influence of Marxist ideology. Its basic conceptions (e.g., Kratina's theorem on genetic predominance of the whole over its parts) were incompatible with Pavlov's theory of conditional reflexes which became an official doctrine of Czechoslovak psychology at that time.

Brno's group of Gestalt psychologists was disbanded. Ferdinand Kratina died in 1944. Prof. Rostohar returned to Yugoslavia in 1948. Robert Konečný had to leave the Brno's Faculty of Arts in 1950. Ludmila Kolářková continued on her teaching at Masaryk University but her reappointment as an associate professor was refused in 1958. Under the pressure of external circumstances (mainly due to her religious persuasion), she was forced to take a disability retirement in 1960 (Švancara, 2006; Viewegh, 2003). Only Vilém Chmelař, who "did not have enemies," stayed on the faculty but he had to make many compromises. He headed the Institute of Psychology from 1948 to 1963 (Švancara, 2006, p. 16).

Due to these historical conditions, the Czech psychologists' original contributions to the development of Gestalt psychology have been forgotten for a long time. Nowadays, they are mainly the subject of interest in the history of psychology.

Behaviorism

The acceptance of behaviorism in Czechoslovakia was rather negative or indifferent. As a part of the Central European culture, the Czech interwar psychology considerably rejected the American psychology because of its weak philosophical basis and close connection to pragmatism. Czech psychologists and philosophers preferred subjectivism, mental theories of consciousness and cognition as well as the introspective method. The tradition of empirical and experimental research aimed at the most possible objectivity of the outcomes was significantly less developed. The character of thinking in Czech psychology was largely speculative, metaphysical, philosophical, and academic. Thus its representatives perceived behaviorism as a predominantly foreign, extraneous school of thinking. But some pedagogues used its ideas (as well as the ideas of functionalism) for their endeavor to liberalize the Czech school system in which memorizing and drill were prevailing (Förster, 2005).

In spite of this indifferent, unenthusiastic reception of the new psychological school, the excerpts from the John Broadus Watson's book *Behaviorism* (1st edition in the U.S. in 1925) were published in Czechoslovakia already in the years 1927 and 1928 (translated by Josef Schützner). There were also published two books by Edward Lee Thorndike, namely *Individuality* (1911/1926) and *Educational Psychology* (1903/1929), both translated by Václav Příhoda. The translation of the George Amos Dorsey's book *Why We Behave Like Human Beings* was published in 1946. The author, famous American anthropologist, strongly criticized especially the method of introspection which he compared to crystal gazing (Dorsey, 1925/1946).

Václav Příhoda and Vladimír Teyrovský were probably the most important representatives of behaviorism in the Czech interwar psychology.

Václav Příhoda (1889–1979) began his career as a secondary school teacher in Prague. In 1922, after the death of his first wife, he left for a study visit in the United States where he stayed until 1926. He studied pedagogical psychology and experimental pedagogy at the University of Chicago and at Columbia University in New York. Among his teachers there were John Dewey and Edward Lee Thorndike. In 1924, Příhoda married an American Melissa Clark. After returning to Czechoslovakia, he promoted psychology as a science of behavior. In the late

twentieth, Příhoda began to work as a private associate professor of pedagogy at Charles University in Prague. He became a leading figure in the school system reform, emphasizing larger pupils' independence and activity (Förster, 2005).

In 1928, Příhoda published his most significant articles promoting behaviorism called "The Science and Behavior" and "The Correlation between Intelligence and Morality." In the first of these studies Příhoda wrote:

The science of behavior excludes from its research descriptions of the conscious states or processes. It was already some functionalists—as we have shown—who tried to get rid of the term consciousness as an unclear and useless one. James R. Angell, following Dewey, admits that a great deal of psychological life goes on without consciousness. The function of consciousness is to create habits, coordinations suitable for the given situations. Conscious processes arise only in the new situations, ergo in the conditions demanding selective adaptation. The study of habits in psychology of learning has shown very clearly that it was a mistake to limit the subject of the psychological research only to a phenomenon insofar rare and irrelevant as the clear awareness of an activity or a state was. (Příhoda, 1928, p. 4)

Among famous American psychologists Václav Příhoda admired especially Edward Lee Thorndike whom he considered to be his lifelong teacher. Příhoda wrote well-informed prefaces to the Czech translations of the Thorndike's books in which he appreciated the exactness of the author's researches based on observation, measurements, and statistical processing of collected data (in Thorndike, 1903/1929).

From the behaviorist point of view Příhoda also criticized the works of an English psychologist William McDougall (1871–1938) who accepted a teaching position at Harvard in 1920. McDougall developed so called hormic psychology, emphasizing the importance of instincts in regulation over the entire life processes. In the foreword to the Czech translation of McDougall's *Physiological Psychology* (1929) Příhoda said:

Although McDougall tried to adapt to the development of scientific research, his later psychology remains to be the science of consciousness if modernized in terms of "the study of behavior". From the methodical perspective he does not reject introspection, a subjective and unreliable method. With regard to the mentioned content and methodological orientation of McDougall's psychology it is difficult to understand how this researcher could be considered to be a behaviorist in our country. (In McDougall, 1905/1929, p. 6)

The work of Edward Lee Thorndike, namely his famous experiments upon kittens, considerably influenced also the zoologist Vladimír Teyrovský (1898–1980), one of the founders of the Czech comparative psychology and zoo-psychology. Born in Prague, he worked as an associate professor of zoology at Palacký University in Olomouc. In the early 1920s, Teyrovský experimented upon cats. He published the results of this research in his work *Studies on the Cat Intelligence I, II*. Teyrovský argued here against the Thorndike's conclusion that the creation of new connections between a stimulus and the effective response constitutes the essence of learning. He actually agreed with the opinions of Gestalt psychologists, specifically Wolfgang Köhler, who pointed out that the animals can

manifest intelligent behavior only in the conditions which enables them to survey the whole lay-out of the field (Teyrovský, 1924, 1925).

Josef Stavěl (1901–1986), a professor of Charles University in Prague since 1945, also started his career with zoo-psychological studies. In addition to his dissertation “The Problem of Animal Dressage,” he authored an article “Comparative Psychology-I. Psychology of Domestic Fowl” in 1924 (Förster, 2005). In 1937, Stavěl published the outcomes of his monumental research on hunger which was influenced by Pavlov’s physiology of higher nervous activity and by behaviorist theories of learning. In this study, we can find following ideas concerning psychosomatic relationships in the stage of appetite:

The question is how we should imagine the relationship between appetite and secretion of peptic glands, and how the development of these relationships.

Theoretically and schematically, these possibilities are conceivable:

1. Appetite is a precondition of secretion.
2. Secretion is a precondition of appetite.

3. There is a relationship between these two phenomena, indefinable by the stated brief alternatives. In the introduction to the analysis of these questions it should be mentioned that this analysis does not touch the basic psychophysical problem. If we choose for example, the conception that “appetite” is a precondition of secretion of gastric juices and thus—together with Pavlov—we classify this secretion as “a psychic secretion”, it does not say anything about the important relationship between the psychic and somatic processes. (Stavěl, 1937, p. 82)

In 1939, the Stavěl’s student Josef Maria Brožek (1913–2004) left to continue his studies in the United States, first at the University of Pennsylvania and then at the University of Minnesota. In the fall of 1941, Brožek joined the Laboratory of Physiological Hygiene, a research and teaching unit in the School of Public Health of the University of Minnesota, where, as a member of an interdisciplinary research team, he pursued two principal topics: (a) the effects of inadequate nutrition on human behavior and (b) the psychology of aging. According to Jiří Hoskovec, Josef Brožek himself regarded as his most important research contribution the behavioral parts of the two-volume *Biology of Human Starvation*,¹ published in 1950 (Hoskovec, 2004).

After 1948, the Czech psychology was practically reduced to the study of higher nervous activity. During the period of political liberalization in the 1960s, there were opened up certain opportunities for contacts with the world psychology. Edward Lee Thorndike and Burrhus Frederic Skinner became the most popular representatives of behaviorism in Czechoslovakia. The Czech zoo-psychology and comparative psychology went on its developing. The research on sexual behavior in animals carried out by Jaroslav Madlafousek and Josef Lát were reflected on the international level as well as some methodological studies by Václav Břicháček (Hoskovec, Nakonečný, & Sedláková, 2002).

The Czech comparative psychology could be developed thanks to the fact that the research on the ontogeny of animal communication, social and procreative

¹ See Keys, A., Brožek, J., & Henschel, A. (1950). *Biology of human starvation*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

behavior was not burdened with so strong ideological pressures as the research on human behavior.

Psychoanalysis

Psychoanalysis and Czech Culture

Psychoanalysis has never taken deeper roots in Czechoslovakia. Although this approach was largely discussed in almost all important European intellectual circles, the Czech thinkers took an exceptionally reserved and skeptical attitude to it. With sporadic exceptions, the psychoanalytic thinking was initially developed only in a small Jewish-German-Czech group. In spite of it, psychoanalytic theory influenced the Czech literature, fine art, and philosophy (Mahler, 1997).

Albína Dratvová (1892–1969), an associate professor of Charles University in Prague, attempted to present psychoanalysis to the Czech scholarly public in her lecture “On Subconscious States and Freud’s Psychoanalysis.” In 1921, there was published not only Dratvová’s lecture but also the following discussion in which the famous Czech psychiatrist Vladimír Vondráček (1895–1978) said:

Due to the sexual symbolism, exceeding the limits of human reason, Freud’s teaching has not got as widespread as it would deserve for its ingenious concept of the etiology of neuroses. In the teaching on neuroses, the processes going on in subconscious level explain many phenomena otherwise hardly explainable. For example, “escape to illness”. . . —remaining in disease for various advantages brought to the patient who otherwise conscientiously takes care for his recovering. This is proven by war, traumatic, or rental neuroses. Of course, when explaining them we can easily do without the sexual background. But it is important to have cognizance of this patient personality’s split for the therapy of neuroses in general. (In Dratvová, 1921, p. 33)

An important Czech journalist, playwright, and critic Ferdinand Peroutka (1895–1978) also took a predominantly critical attitude to psychoanalysis. In 1924, he published an essay “Dark Eros” in which he speculated about the reasons for the cool reception of psychoanalysis in Czechoslovakia:

In our country, we cannot imagine Freud’s influence well enough for he has been nearly unknown here. There has not been published any Czech book dealing with his teaching. Perhaps it is caused by inflexibility and conservatism of our science which always begins to compile after a certain delay. It may be also due to a certain resistance of the national character to this doctrine. Perhaps the Czech nature indulging in a soft light of reason cannot lose itself in this dark mysticism, this total victory of irrationality where all consideration and volition is totally overcome by each petty or distorted instinct. (Peroutka, 1924, p. 618)

Similarly to Vondráček, Peroutka was not irritated by the presumption of the unconscious phenomena’ existence but by the emphasizing the sexual drive which he considered to be exaggerated. This can be confirmed by the following excerpt from the “Dark Eros”:

You believed you were moving on the whole safely in the well-known world, prodded by the reason and tradition: Freud convinces you that you are nothing else than a hurriedly made float, tossed by waves and that you cannot know what you

will do tomorrow, what degrading and filthy sexual role you will play if some onerous impression from your childhood has stuck in your mind, an impression which you have believed to be forgotten and unable to exert any influence on you. Freud calls into question if you are homosexual or not; he wants to convince you that an astounding number of people really likes their bottom; that you are in hands of something what can easily move you to satisfy your sexual drive in some peculiar and difficult way because as a child you have seen something similar and you cannot get rid of it or because you have not overcome your infantile state. (Peroutka, 1924, p. 619)

Ferdinand Kratina (1885–1944)—one of the founders of the Czech Gestalt psychology (see above)—also sharply criticized Freud’s psychosexual theory, especially in his lecture “Sigmund Freud (For His 80th Birthday).” But it does Kratina’s credit that his reservations were based on a solid knowledge of Freud’s writings. Kratina asked this rhetorical question: “Why does Freud emphasize that what is lowest, the animal in man, why not that what is the highest, drowsing in the Ego?” (p. 8). And he answered himself this way:

The pressure toward ideality is also something primary, nonimposed. It is a really unexplainable why Freud is such a negator of the inner, spontaneous ideality. There is not only the animal in man but also something divine. (Kratina, 1936, p. 9)

In a slightly hostile conclusion of his lecture, Kratina evaluates Freud’s personality as disharmonious and destructive. According to Kratina, Freud is a real “devil’s advocate” (Kratina, 1936, p. 9).

A reserved reception of psychoanalysis in the interwar Czechoslovakia may be partly ascribed to the negative attitudes of the politicians Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk and Edward Beneš to it. The famous Czech writer Karel Čapek (1890–1938), a biographer of the President Masaryk, also did not like psychoanalysis too much. It evoked aversion in him and offended his ideas of a moral purity and an emotional essence of the erotic relationships (Cvekl, 1965).

But it is interesting that at least two short stories contained in the Čapek’s book *The Tales from Two Pockets* were inspired by psychoanalysis or Jung’s analytic psychology. These are “The experiment of Professor Rouss” and “Poet.” In the first one a certain “Harvard professor C. G. Rouss” (a variation of Jung’s name?) with the help of the association experiment easily makes a simple-minded man to confess to murder. In the second short story the dreamy, distraught poet Jaroslav Nerad proved to be a great witness of the car accident. He subconsciously encoded the number of the car whose driver ran over a drunken beggar in the verse “swan neck, breasts, drum and cymbals” (swan neck meant No. 2, breasts No. 3, drum and cymbals No. 5). The brown color of the car was encoded in the verse “we will go to . . . Singapore” (Čapek, 1929/1978, p. 71).

Development of the Psychoanalytic Theory and Practice

The first pioneer of psychoanalysis in Czechoslovakia was psychiatrist Jaroslav Stuchlík (1890–1967) who had attended Freud’s seminars in Vienna during the World War I. In the postwar period he worked in the town of Košice in Slovakia; his students Emanuel Windholz and Jan Frank (who later emigrated to the U.S.) came from Košice to Prague in the early 1930s.

During the 1920s, the first Prague's group of people interested in psychoanalysis was headed by the Russian immigrant, psychoanalyst Nikolaj Jefgrafovič Osipov (1877–1934). His lecture on “Freud's Psychoanalysis of Everyday Life” (presented in 1922) was published as an undated publication in which the author gives a lot of apt examples of the Freudian parapraxis:

I have a “book complex”: I am a bibliophile, I love books and I used to have a quite large bookcase. That goes without saying that I hate lending books, first in view of the fact that people do not take care of them and second because they are not able to finish reading. I suppose that this does not happen deliberately but only because of an unconscious disrespect or insufficient respect for the books. If the book was evidently threatened, I absolutely consciously made up some excuse in refusing to lend it. But I am pleased and willing to lend my books to certain people because I trust them; then I immediately find the wanted book in my bookcase despite all the mess . . . But sometimes it happens that I consider lending the book to be a moral obligation and I am sincerely decided to give it, although I know it is threatened. In such a case it has often happened that I could not find the desired book. But when the dangerous man had left I have found out it in a quite visible place. (Osipov, undated, pp. 7–8)

In 1933, the Prague Psychoanalytical Study Group was established, consisting mainly of German Jewish immigrants. It was led by Frances Deri until 1935, and then by Viennese psychoanalyst Otto Fenichel, who trained and taught in Prague until 1938. This group was officially recognized by the International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA) in 1936. Its existence was interrupted by the World War II. Some analysts managed to emigrate, others died in concentration camps (Šebek, 1993; Šebek, Mahler, & Buriánek, 2003).

In 1938, the Prague group helped Edith Jacobson (1897–1978), one of the founders of the American school of object relations, emigrate to the United States. Jacobson was incarcerated by the Nazis for two and a half years. One of her patients was a government official, and the Gestapo wanted her to divulge information revealed during analytic sessions. Jacobson refused. Feigning illness, she was temporarily released and was smuggled across the Czech border by psychoanalytic colleagues from Prague. She then made her way to New York. Famous psychoanalyst Margaret Mahler obtained her training analysis with Edith Jacobson (Smith, 1999).

Another Russian immigrant Bogodar Dosužkov (1899–1982) came with his wife to Prague in 1921. He cooperated with Osipov and from 1938 to 1939 he participated in the Psychoanalytical Study Group (Šebek, 1997). In 1946, he managed to reestablish the Society for the Study of Psychoanalysis (registered by IPA) to which belonged Ferdinand Knobloch, Otakar Kučera, Josef Mysliveček, Kurt Freund, and others. This group was again officially dissolved in 1948. Under political pressures, many potential students turned away from psychoanalysis. Bogodar Dosužkov with several devotees illegally practiced psychoanalytic training and therapy for the next 40 years. Among the prominent members of this secret group there were Otakar Kučera (1906–1981), Marie Bémová (1908–1987), Zbyněk Havlíček (1922–1969), who was also interested in surrealism, and others (Kocourek, 1997).

A long-time staying of a certain group underground contributes to its cohesion but it does not support its professional growth. The main obstacle to the development of psychoanalysis was the impossibility of publishing the newest litera-

ture. A small group of Czech psychoanalysts managed to translate Freud's fundamental works but the knowledge of development in post-Freudian psychoanalysis was substantially weaker. The psychoanalytic therapy was fully institutionally established² in Czechoslovakia in the late 1980s and early 1990s when many others psychotherapies sharply competed with it. Moreover, the postmodern critic of the psychoanalytic discourse was introduced into Czech Republic³ at the turn of the century (see Vybíral, 2006). Presently a critical or reserved approach to psychoanalysis is prevailing, especially in academic circles.

² An important step for the establishing psychoanalysis in Czechoslovakia was made at the 36th IPA Congress in Rome in 1989: V. Fischelová, J. Kocourek, V. Mikota, M. Šebek, and B. Vacková were recognized as the direct and associate members of the IPA. The Czech Psychoanalytic Society was founded in 1990 (Šebek, 1993; Kocourek, 1997).

³ Czechoslovakia was divided into Czech Republic and Slovak Republic (since 1993).

References

- Čapek, K. (1978). *Povídky z jedné a druhé kapsy* [The tales from two pockets]. Prague, Czechoslovakia: Československý spisovatel. (Original work published 1929)
- Chmelař, V. (1937). II. Slovanský pedologický kongres v Lublani [The II Slavic pedagogical congress in Lublaň]. *Psychologie*, 3, 137–144.
- Cvekl, J. (1965). *Sigmund Freud*. Prague, Czechoslovakia: Orbis.
- Dorsey, G. (1946). *Proč se chováme jako lidské bytosti* [Why we behave like human beings]. Prague, Czechoslovakia: Dělnické nakladatelství. (Original work published 1925)
- Dratková, A. (1921). *O stavech podvědomých a Freudověpsychoanalýze* [On subconscious states and Freud's psychoanalysis]. Prague, Czechoslovakia: B. Kočí.
- Förster, J. (2005). *Behaviorismus a psychoreflexologie v historické tradici československé psychologie* [Behaviorism and psycho-reflexology in the historical tradition of the Czechoslovak psychology]. Prague, Czech Republic: Academia.
- Förster, J., & Plháčková, A. (2004). *Brněnská škola celostní a tvarové psychologie* [Brno's school of Ganzheits and Gestalt psychology]. Olomouc, Czech Republic: Palacký University.
- Hoskovec, J. (2004). Josef Maria Brožek (1913–2004). *History of Psychology*, 7, 297–300.
- Hoskovec, J., Nakonečný, M., & Sedláková, M. (2002). *Psychologie XX. století* [Psychology in the 20th century]. Prague, Czech Republic: Karolinum.
- Kocourek, J. (1997). Psychoanalýza v poválečném Československu [Psychoanalysis in the post-war Czechoslovakia]. In M. Mahler (Ed.), *Psychoanalýza v Čechách* [Psychoanalysis in Bohemia] (pp. 23–30). Praha, Czech Republic: Nakladatelství Franze Kafky.
- Kratina, F. (1932). *Studie z tvarové psychologie* [Studies on Gestalt psychology]. Prague, Czechoslovakia: Orbis.
- Kratina, F. (1935). *Úvod do celostní a tvarové psychologie* [An introduction to Ganzheits and Gestalt psychology]. Brno, Prague, Czechoslovakia: Ústřední spolek jednot učitelských.
- Kratina, F. (1936). Sigmund Freud (K jeho 80. narozeninám) [Sigmund Freud (For his 80th birthday)]. *Psychologie*, 2, 1–9.
- Kratina, F. (1947). *Psychologie* [Psychology]. Brno, Czechoslovakia: Komenium.
- Mahler, M. (1997). Úvodní slovo [Introductory word]. In M. Mahler, (Ed.), *Psychoanalýza v Čechách* [Psychoanalysis in Bohemia] (pp. 5–6). Prague, Czech Republic: Nakladatelství Franze Kafky.

- McDougall, W. (1929). *Fyziologická psychologie* [Physiological psychology]. Prague, Czechoslovakia, Brno: Dědictví Komenského. (Original work published 1905)
- Osipov, N. (undated). *Freudova psychoanalýza všedního života* [Freud's psychoanalysis of everyday life]. Prague, Czechoslovakia.
- Peroutka, F. (1924). Ponurý Eros [Dark Eros]. *Přítomnost*, 1, 618–621.
- Příhoda, V. (1928). *Dvě studie o lidském chování* [Two studies on human behavior]. Prague, Czechoslovakia, Školy vysokoškolských studií.
- Rostohar, M. (1950). *Psychologie jako věda o subjektivní skutečnosti* [Psychology as the science on subjective reality]. Brno, Czechoslovakia: Společnost pedagogického muzea.
- Šebek, M. (1993). Psychoanalysis in Czechoslovakia. *Psychoanalytic Review*, 80, 433–439.
- Šebek, M. (1997). Předválečný vývoj psychoanalýzy v Čechách [The pre-war development of psychoanalysis in Bohemia]. In M. Mahler (Ed.), *Psychoanalýza v Čechách* [Psychoanalysis in Bohemia] (pp. 7–21). Prague, Czech Republic: Nakladatelství Franze Kafky.
- Šebek, M., Mahler, M., & Buriánek, V. (2003). Psychoanalýza a psychoanalytická Psychotherapie [Psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic psychotherapy]. *Česká a slovenská Psychiatrie*, 99, 32–37.
- Švancara, J. (2006). Peripetie v historii Psychologického ústavu Filozofické fakulty Masarykovy univerzity [Peripeteias in the history of the *Institute of Psychology* at the *Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University*]. In P. Humpolíček, M. Jelínek, & M. Svoboda (Eds.), *Sborník příspěvků přednesených k 80. výročí založení Psychologického ústavu Filozofické fakulty Masarykovy univerzity* [Collection of the contributions presented at the 80th anniversary of the establishment of the Institute of Psychology at the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University] (pp. 5–18). Brno, Czech Republic: MSD.
- Schultz, D. P., & Schultz, S. E. (1992). *A history of modern psychology* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Smith, D. L. (1999). *Approaching psychoanalysis: An introductory course*. London, England: Karnac Books.
- Stavěl, J. (1937). *Hlad. Příspěvek k analýze pudu* [Hunger. A contribution to the analysis of the drive]. Bratislava, Czechoslovakia: Komenský University.
- Teyrovský, V. (1924, 1925). *Studie o inteligenci kočky I., II.* [Studies on the cat intelligence I, II]. Brno, Czechoslovakia: Vlastním nákladem.
- Thorndike, E. L. (1929). *Pedagogická psychologie* [Educational psychology]. Prague, Brno, Czechoslovakia: Dědictví Komenského. (Original work published 1903)
- Thorndike, E. L. (1926). *Osobitost* [Individuality]. Brno, Czechoslovakia: Ústřední spolek učitelský. (Original work published 1911)
- Viewegh, J. (2003). *Čtvero vzpomínání* [Four memoirs]. Brno, Czech Republic: Sdružení SCAN.
- Vybíral, Z. (2006). *Psychologie jinak. Současná kritická psychologie* [Psychology otherwise. Contemporary critical psychology]. Prague, Czech Republic: Academia.
- Watson, J. B. (1925/1927–1928). Behaviorismus - psychologie založená na úkonech reflexních [Behaviorism - psychology based on the reflex acts]. *Ruch filosofický*, VII, 1–11, 80–82.

Received September 19, 2007

Revision received September 19, 2007

Accepted July 29, 2008 ■