Summary:

The question that heads this work focuses on the matter of demand for analysis in children: is there a demand as such? Or because this is mediated by adults, it remains embodied in them, and it does not appear or is not registered in children?

Theoretical developments of Melanie Klein, Winnicott and Cecil and Edmond Ortigues are taken into account. While M Klein suggests a high frequency of sessions, D. Winnicott poses a modification on the traditional framing for some cases, suggesting sessions on demand, without frequency indication by the analyst.

Meanwhile, C. and E. Ortigues prioritize on the conditions of installation of psychotherapy for children. These authors suggest that the analyst should not be a prescriptor, but should pave the way for disagreements that had not been able to express.

If the analyst seeks to guide or indicate depending on some ideal, he or she can be located in an authoritarian role.

Analysis indication opposes the rule of abstinence, and these tensions put the analyst in the place of desiring.

Only suffering, anxiety, and symptoms expressed and detected in the analytic setting, through its amendments, may allow to identify demand for analysis in children.
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