

SUMMARY

BETWEEN PSYCHIATRY AND PHILOSOPHY.

The dynamic psychiatry of Eugene Carp (1895–1983)

This study comprises research into the work of E.A.D.E. Carp (1895–1983), professor of psychiatry in Leiden, the Netherlands, from 1930 to 1963. The main aim is to present an overview of Carp's scientific work and to place his work in the context of the era.

Carp was a leading figure in Dutch psychiatry in the period from 1930 to 1963. He and his fellow professors Rümke, Van der Horst and Van der Scheer, were the main players in the field of Dutch psychiatry. The professor's position of leadership put him in a position of authority. Carp published more than his colleagues, particularly in book form. Rümke was better known internationally, also through his presidency of the World Federation for Mental Health. Carp had a closer connection with general practitioners through his articles in the *Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Geneeskunde* (Dutch Medical Journal). Carp also became well known through his textbook. From the 1930s to the 1950s it was the only textbook for psychiatry. In addition to teaching students, Carp dedicated 33 years to training neurologists and psychiatrists, resulting in 52 doctoral theses. Carp will have passed on many of his insights to students and interns. As a clinician, Carp was confronted with the question of how he could relate important problems in clinical psychiatry to the thinking of Sigmund Freud, someone he viewed as one of the most important innovators in psychiatry. Circumstances determined that Carp was mainly involved with the lighter neurotic disorders and psychotherapy.

In chapter 1 the aims of this study are set out and the research questions formulated. Carp worked in a time where the paradigms within psychiatry were changing. The neuroanatomical approach made way for a more psychological orientation, guided by Jaspers' phenomenology and Freud's psychoanalysis. The question is what was Carp's stance in relation to that of Jaspers and Freud and to Kraepelin's psychiatry, which was the accepted approach for classification and diagnostics in twentieth century psychiatry.

This study is based mainly on Carp's considerable scientific work. Yearly reports and interviews have also been used. The division of chapters follows the different time periods that we have implemented. Carp's work in the area of clinical psychiatry, depth psychology, psychotherapy and anthropological psychiatry is then researched successively. The study compares Carp's work to that of his closest colleagues and co-professors Rümke and Van der Horst. We did not study Carp's work in the areas of child psychiatry and forensic psychiatry.

Finally this chapter offers an overview of Carp's oeuvre. His textbook on psychiatry and seven volumes from the Leidse Psychotherapeutic series come to mind.

Chapter 2 offers an insight into the course of Carp's life; little is known about his private life. A bird's eye view of psychiatry in the Netherlands at the beginning of the twentieth century is also presented. Carp worked at the Rhijnegeest sanatorium that functioned as an academic psychiatric clinic and later became the Jelgersma clinic. Rhijnegeest fell under the administration of the neighbouring psychiatric hospital Endegeest in Oegstgeest; Carp's dream of his clinic becoming part of the academic hospital in Leiden was not fulfilled during his lifetime.

We offer a sketch of academic psychiatry in the Netherlands during the period studied, with particular reference to the educational situation in Leiden. Finally, we present a concise outline of the development of psychology in the Netherlands.

Chapter 3 analyses Carp's work relating to clinical psychiatry, the most important of which is found in condensed form in his textbook. Carp's clinical psychiatry is the result of a critical analysis of theory shaping and research, in which the German psychiatric tradition plays a prominent role. After the Second World War the leading role of German-speaking authors comes to an end and the United States starts to lead in the field of psychiatry. We first consider the philosophical background of Carp's work. His interest in the subjective experience of the psychiatrically disturbed is encased in a personalist vision, based on the insights of William Stern, and he remains faithful to this for more or less the whole of his life. Secondly, his thinking about psychiatry also appears to be determined by (neo-) vitalism: life is the source of power, of regeneration and regulation. This vitalistic background can also be seen in Rümke's work.

Carp's ideas about classification and diagnostics are considered against the background of the nosological thinking of Kraepelin and Jelgersma, Carp's teacher. Carp distances himself from Kraepelin's concept of disease; a discussion of the history of the concept of schizophrenia illustrates this. Carp's views on schizophrenia were mainly influenced by Bleuler. We describe Carp's classification of psychoses. A significant characteristic of Carp's psychiatry is that he puts great importance on the personality and on understanding the perception of the psychiatric patient. Psychoanalytical theory is crucial in this point. Carp's psychiatry is both dynamic – assuming life to be the source of vitality and recovery – and psychodynamic.

His distinction between psychosis, neurosis and psychopathy, is more precise than that of earlier psychiatrists. A psychopathic constitution is assumed to be a factor of vulnerability for the development of psychotic or neurotic reactions. Carp's book about psychopathies is considered to be a milestone in the history of Dutch psychiatry. We consider the concept of psychopathy against the background of characterology and the debate about constitution. Finally, a description is given of the development of Carp's neurosis concept and his approach to obsessive-compulsive disorder. We note that Carp was not entirely successful in achieving a synthesis between the tradition of clinical psychiatry and the thinking of Freud. Due to considerable attention to many other problems such as the questions surrounding heredity, Carp's attempt at this stalled halfway.

Chapter 4 is mainly concerned with the reception of depth psychology. Carp considers Freud to be the psychiatric genius of the (twentieth) century and adopts

many of his concepts with few objections. The core of Carp's criticism is related to Freud's world view that in his opinion is both materialistic and biologicistic. He considered the scope of psychoanalysis as a method of treatment to be limited; he himself only applied psychoanalysis as a method for a limited number of years. The resistance shown by established psychoanalysts to Carp's appointment as professor may well have influenced his attitude to psychoanalysis. That it was in fact Carp who attempted to give shape to a psychodynamic psychiatry is one of the ironies of history. Carp did not question the relation between his basic personalist ideas and psychoanalysis. Personalism's concept of the person allows no consideration of the unconscious. According to psychoanalytical theory man is driven by forces of incomprehensible origin, he is essentially divided against himself. It is exactly this notion of man's lack of knowledge of himself that remains an important theme in his later work.

We conclude that psychoanalysis as a theory of the personality and as an explanatory model for psychopathy plays a major role in Carp's thinking, particularly in comparison with Rümke and Van der Horst. The great importance attached to psychoanalytical theory was also evident in daily practice in Leiden, in the training of medical residents and in patient care. The model used was not exclusive, however; other models and forms of psychotherapy were also permitted and used.

In the second part of chapter 4 we consider the influence of Adler and Jung. Carp brought the work of both Adler and Jung into the public eye and was one of the first in the Netherlands to do so. His work regarding Adler resulted in the introduction of a specific therapy that is still practised today. Carp was critical of Adler's theoretical model that explains neurosis from a single factor, the desire for power.

Jung had few followers in the Netherlands, probably due to his dubious leanings during the Second World War. Carp's opinion of his treatment methods is quite clear: impractical and unfeasible. In contrast, the sympathy Carp feels for Jung's psychological view of man has only increased over the years. In his anthropological phase, Carp appreciates Jung's concept of individuation, or 'becoming a personality'.

In chapter 5 we demonstrate how Carp studied various new developments in psychotherapy, not only in theory but also in practice. Essential to this was Carp's research into the foundations of psychotherapy. He saw psychotherapy as a part of all medicine. Added to this he also found it important to take into account the view of the patient and for the therapist to reflect on his own ideology. The therapist himself and his suggestive powers are central to the work of psychotherapy. Carp functioned as an advocate of psychotherapy by analysing many methods and testing them in practice. The need to explore new trends originated from the realisation of the inadequacies of the methodology of psychoanalysis. The notion of the doctor-patient relationship as the most powerful therapeutic instrument is a constant item in Carp's analysis of the various therapeutic trends.

A wide range of therapies became available in his clinic. The most important were the psychagogic method, Adlerian psychotherapy, cathartic therapies, psychodrama, group therapy and sociotherapy. Carp was a methodical eclectic. As a therapist

himself, Carp's preferences would have been for the psychagogical method and the Adlerian method.

Carp's biggest contribution to Dutch psychiatry lies in his creation of a climate in which psychotherapy could develop and in making these new therapies known to a broad medical public. The Leiden school was unique in this area, exemplified in the publication of the 'Leidse Psychotherapeutic series'.

Carp succeeded in being one of the first in Europe to have his psychiatric university clinic described in sociotherapeutic terms. This places him at the beginning of clinical psychotherapy in the Netherlands. Carp's thinking was later elaborated by his student Jongerius who in the 1970s succeeded in turning the Viersprong mental health care institute in Halsteren into an authoritative psychotherapeutic centre. Carp introduced the term sociotherapy, which according to him involved the patient learning that he could be of importance to the other person. His 'doing for the other' had a moralistic overtone. After Carp, sociotherapy came to mean learning and practising in the therapy group, in contact with each other on a daily basis.

Psychotherapy in the Netherlands did not develop greatly until 1960. It was then that behavioural therapy, family therapy and Rogerian psychotherapy started to become popular. Carp was not able to actively experience these developments. Behavioural therapy and systemic therapy in particular would have corresponded less well with his thinking.

In chapter 6 we consider what we have called the anthropological phase. Carp's anthropological thinking should be considered within the context of anthropological medicine and psychiatry. The most well known in the Netherlands were especially the Utrecht school and Van der Horst's anthropological psychiatry. Anthropological medicine had its roots in personalistic movements and tied in perfectly with the Christian humanist tradition. Anthropological psychiatry and the religious climate were also strongly influenced by (existential) phenomenology. Sartre's powerful ideal of freedom helped to determine the zeitgeist, in which emancipation and the shedding of traditional forms of authority were important elements.

One of Carp's most original ideas is to be found in the area of anthropological psychiatry. The notion that man should be considered in connection with his view of himself and the world was elaborated in his idea that psychopathology corresponds with a certain type of world view. In this he provided an extension of Jaspers' *Psychologie der Weltanschauungen*. He connected this concept of anthropological psychopathology to existential themes such as loneliness, death and anxiety. The theme of loneliness was complemented by the 'encounter', leading to a 'true conversation'. Heidegger's influence is visible in Carp's reflections on death; the psychoanalytical notion that death is repressed is also in evidence in his vision.

Another line in Carp's thinking, derived from biology and the theory of evolution, becomes apparent in this phase. In his analyses of anxiety and aggression he was in agreement with the principles of ethology, a notion emerging in that period. He explained violent aggression, which he called 'aggressiveness', as being anxiety-induced. This anxiety was in turn based on existential experiences of futility and boredom. In his explanation of war and revolution he differs strongly to Freud, who

explained aggression as a result of the death drive. Carp rejected the concept of the death drive. Carp holds on to the idea of man as a meaningful being; man is driven to attain the realisation of personal values. This therefore led him to launch the idea of transnihilism: behind the nihilistic criticism lies the desire to attain values.

Carp's analysis of aggression evolves into an analysis of culture. An original view developed in Carp's cultural anthropology is the connection between the thinking of Teilhard de Chardin, Jung and Sartre. He borrows Teilhard de Chardin's idea that biological evolution is extended in a cultural evolution. The idea of the unity of life plays a major role in this. Fundamental features such as socialisation, individualisation and care for the young can be seen in the life of each plant, animal and man. Themes from anthropological psychiatry now return within the wider framework of a theory of evolution. Socialisation and individualisation are fundamental features of particular importance for man and his culture. The interpretation of individualisation stems from Jung's vision on individuation, or becoming a personality. If man can take up his unconscious as well as his harmful aspects into his Self, then he can become a fuller person. The implication is that man gets a grip on his aggression and on similar emotions such as envy. Only well individuated personalities are able to form a real community. Carp finds additional support for these thoughts from (late) Sartre, who saw the truly free man capable of 'être-pour autrui'.

We have attempted to reconstruct Carp's views on knowledge and on the connection between the concept of man and of God. This is relevant because Carp refers to himself as a Christian psychiatrist. For Carp, religion and science are connected. Carp offers a psychology of scientific practice; science is based in Carp's eyes on the desire for certainty. Absolute certainty can only be found in 'faithful knowledge'. According to Carp, the development of science is helped along by the desire for unity. Reason is then complemented by intuition, which in certain terms can be ranked higher. According to Carp, man is a spiritual, meaningful and naturally religious being, the latter is seen in a Jungian sense. Individuation implies reconciliation of internal discrepancies, resulting in a notion of unity. The concept of God then coincides with the notion of the deepest self.

Carp titled his thinking as Christian humanism, although it is hard to discover what makes humanism 'Christian'. All forms of humanism are about values such as freedom, responsibility and love of others. The concept of God that is portrayed in Carp's work can best be seen as the image of the forgiving and benevolent figure of Jesus Christ.

At the end of chapter 6 Carp's thinking is interpreted as a form of neo-Spinozism. We attempt to demonstrate that the idea of unity – a concept in which many different notions came together – falls back on neo-Spinozism, as developed by Carp's brother, the philosopher Johan Herman Carp. Johan Carp provided a spiritualistic interpretation of Spinoza's metaphysics and described Spinozism as an 'eternal mindset'; the thinking of Eugène Carp can be defined as such. E.A.D.E. Carp creates a contemporary synthesis of Jung, Sartre, Teilhard de Chardin and many others using modern scientific insights.

The question arises as to why it was necessary for Carp to conceal his Spinozism. The assumption is that Carp did not wish to be associated with his brother, upon whom silence was imposed due to his conduct during the war.

Chapter 7 is contemplative by nature. We discuss the main principles of Carp's thinking. An important question is that of the unity in his thinking. A constant factor in his work is thinking centred on the person. Over the course of time the personalistic view makes way for an existential-anthropological view. Another constant is the interest in psychotherapy. The therapeutic relationship is for Carp the most important instrument; he first described it in the context of the theory of suggestion, subsequently in the psychoanalytical terminology of transference and finally, in the anthropological phase, he described it as an encounter. There are no fundamental cracks to be found in Carp's work; merely shifts. His later ideas about unity can, in our way of thinking, be understood in the mindset of the above-mentioned neo-Spinozism; this line is not so clear in his earlier work, although no contradictions are apparent either.

Carp was unusually productive. This led us to the hypothesis that he did this to compensate for something, namely the fact that his brother was sworn to silence after being convicted for his national socialist activities. It also explains why Carp could only admit the intellectual connection with his brother upon his retirement. We have some critical comments on the way in which Carp makes use of the insights of other authors and criticise his interpretation of Sartre and Jung.

Carp meant a great deal to Dutch psychiatry through his promotion of a climate in which psychotherapy and, in particular, clinical psychotherapy could flourish. We consider several factors that in our opinion have led to the neglect of Carp's work: the influence of American psychiatry, the position of psychoanalysis in the academic clinics, the influence of anti-psychiatry and the changing intellectual climate of the 1960s and 1970s. Carp's anthropological thinking did not fit well in such an anti-authoritarian, anti-psychiatric and secularised zeitgeist.

Our research has been subject to limitations through lack of biographical material. We have also not made use of sources that give a more precise idea of the daily running of the Jelgersma clinic.

Finally, we emphasise the topical interest of a number of aspects of Carp's work against the background of current psychiatry. Carp's individualising, psychodynamic diagnostics can be of use as an example in today's world, in which diagnostics are all too often aligned with (DSM-IV) classification. The importance of the therapeutic relationship, continuously emphasised by Carp as a proponent of patient-centred psychotherapy, has been confirmed over the course of time by much research into psychotherapy. Carp's awareness of the vision of mankind, of the meaning of life and of spirituality can certainly be considered contemporary. Both dialectical behavioural therapy and mindfulness based cognitive therapy are perceptive of this dimension. In current times there are often votes in favour of giving more attention to existential ideas. Carp's work can offer inspiration for reconsidering these themes.