

(1990). *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, **7(4)**:475-485

### **One Person and Two Person Psychologies and the Method of Psychoanalysis**

*Lewis Aron, Ph.D.* 

The distinction between a monadic theory of mind (a one-person psychology) and a relational theory of mind (a two-person psychology) is crucial in understanding psychoanalytic concepts. However, some psychoanalytic theorists see these two models as essentially complementary whereas others see them as contradictory and irreconcilable.

I argue that the artificial distinction between clinical theory and metapsychology obscures the recognition that the most fundamental psychoanalytic clinical concepts and procedures were formulated and historically understood as one-person phenomena. Transference was not conceptualized as an interpersonal event occurring between two people but was rather understood as a process occurring within the mind of the analysand.

The article attempts to extricate fundamental clinical concepts from the quasibiological drive theory that has dominated both our metapsychology and our clinical theory, and to reexamine the value of these clinical concepts within a relational, contextual, and intersubjective framework. The article examines the method of free association in order to illustrate the different implications of one-person and two-person psychologies. I propose that a two-person or relational field theory does not need to neglect or minimize the intrapsychic, the importance of fantasy, psychic reality, or the centrality of bodily and childhood experience.

---

Requests for reprints should be sent to Lewis Aron, PhD, 243 West End Avenue, Apartment 310, New York, NY 10023.

In his 1950 review of changing aims and techniques in psychoanalysis, Balint argued that because of Freud's "physiological or biological bias," he unnecessarily limited his theory by formulating the basic concepts and aims of psychoanalysis in terms of the individual mind. Balint pointed out that in the psychoanalytic situation, relations to an object are of overwhelming importance, and he therefore proposed that classical psychoanalytic theory be supplemented by a theory of object relations.

Rickman wrote: "The whole region of psychology may be divided into areas of research according to the number of persons concerned. Thus we may speak of One-Body Psychology, Two-Body, Three-Body, Four-Body and MultiBody Psychology" (cited in **Balint, 1950**, p. 123). Balint borrowed Rickman's terms to make the point that the clinical psychoanalytic situation was a twobody experience and that it could not be adequately conceptualized in terms of classical theory that hardly went beyond the domain of one-body psychology. A two-body or object relations theory was needed to describe events that occurred between people.

The theory of instinctual drives is the cornerstone of Freud's metapsychology, and Freud's fundamental conceptualizations are formulated with drive theory as an underlying assumption. Implicit in drive theory is a view of the human being as a biologically closed system seeking to discharge energy in order to maintain homeostasis. From the perspective of classical psychoanalytic theory, the fundamental unit of study is the individual, and therefore all that is interpersonal must ultimately be traced back to the vicissitudes of drive and defense, to the intrapsychic, and to the realm of a one-person psychology.

**Modell (1984)** proposed that the traditional intrapsychic context of psychoanalysis was complementary to a two-person intersubjective psychology, and he suggested that psychoanalysis needs both theories. By limiting itself to the study of the mind, conceptualized as residing inside the person, Freudian theory is forced to explain interpersonal events by referring back to the mind of the individual through the use of concepts such as internalization and representation. Just as Balint had seen the one-body theory as an inevitable outcome of Freud's physiological or biological bias, Modell also believed that the focus on the individual's mind inevitably followed from Freud's early neurological investigations and his commitment to materialist natural science ideals.

In *Object Relations and Psychoanalytic Theory*, **Greenberg and Mitchell (1983)** distinguished between the drive model that "establishes individual pleasure seeking and drive discharge as the bedrock of human existence" (p. 404), and the relational model that establishes relational configurations as the bedrock of existence. **Mitchell (1988)** argued that this distinction between a monadic theory of mind (a one-person psychology) and an interactional relational theory of mind (a two-person psychology) is crucial in understanding psychoanalytic concepts. According to Greenberg and Mitchell, the two models

are each all encompassing theoretical structures, each of which is independently capable of explaining all of the data generated by the psychoanalytic method. Each model is a complete and comprehensive account of human experience. They rest on fundamentally different and incompatible premises, and neither theory is reducible to the other. Ultimately, Greenberg and Mitchell believed it is a matter of personal choice as to which model is more appealing and which vision of human nature more compelling.

The question regarding the complementary versus contradictory nature of the one-person and two-person paradigms in psychoanalysis has been heatedly debated in the literature. Recently, **Ghent (1989)** described the history of psychoanalysis as constituted by dialectical shifts between one-person and two-person psychologies. He put forth his own belief in the need for an enlarged theory that encompasses an integration of both one-person and two-person psychologies.

Contemporary relational psychologies may rightfully be traced back to the technical experiments of the Hungarian psychoanalyst, Sandor Ferenczi, as well as, of course, to many of Freud's own ideas. Balint, Ferenczi's student, elaborated on Ferenczi's work in his notion of a "two-body psychology," and this played an important role in the development of British object relations theory. Ferenczi also had a major impact on American interpersonal theory, particularly through his influence on Clara Thompson, whom he analyzed. Harry Stack Sullivan's development of an interpersonal theory and the later elaborations of this theory into an interpersonal psychoanalysis by Clara Thompson, Erich Fromm, and Frieda Fromm-Reichmann was the earliest attempt to construct a two-person or field theory as the basis for psychoanalysis. **Modell (1984)** acknowledged Sullivan's priority in this but was dismissive of interpersonal contributions as remaining essentially "outside of psychoanalysis" (p. 1). I believe that it is a serious mistake to discard a whole school of contemporary psychoanalytic thought on what seems to me purely a political basis. I agree with **Gill (1984)** who acknowledged the historical and conceptual link between what Sullivan called interpersonal and what is today often referred to as intersubjective. In a variety of different ways, all relational theories (British object relations theory, American interpersonal theory, self-psychology, and currents within contemporary Freudian theory) arose in reaction to the one-person psychology which classical theory implied.

Many analysts mistakenly believe that whereas Freudian metapsychology is based on a one-person psychology, the clinical theory has always been a two-person theory. How could it be otherwise when there has always been so much emphasis in the clinical theory on transference and the importance of the analyst as an object? Thus, Modell suggested that "transference and countertransference phenomena have never been considered anything but events occurring within a two-person context" (1984; p. 3). In my view, this artificial distinction between the clinical theory and the metapsychology obscures the

recognition that the most fundamental psychoanalytic clinical concepts and procedures were formulated and historically understood as one-person phenomena. Transference was not conceptualized as an interpersonal event occurring between two people but was rather understood as a process occurring within the mind of the analysand. Transference was thought to be determined by the patient's developmental history and was viewed in terms of displacements from the past. It was thought that if the analyst was analyzing correctly, being technically neutral and anonymous, then the transference would spontaneously unfold and would not be distorted by the personality of the analyst. This is clearly a one-person conceptualization of the nature of transference. I believe it could be easily demonstrated that all of our fundamental clinical notions have been conceptualized as intrapsychic events, explicable in terms of the psychology of one person.

In a recent exchange regarding this topic, Donald Kaplan objected to my portrayal of classical psychoanalysis as a “one-person psychology.” He wrote:

I barely recognize your version of so-called classical psychoanalysis. I have only the faintest idea, for example, what you mean by a one-person psychology, since I always read Freud even before 1914, as a three-variable psychology and always think of the clinical situation as an oedipal triangle—the patient, the analyst, and the profession to which the analyst is married, a marriage creating primal scene issues for the patient. (D. Kaplan, personal communication, 1988)

Kaplan's argument is essentially that because the clinical situation is always understood as recreating an oedipal triangle, it does not make any sense to refer to psychoanalysis as a one-person psychology. The problem with this line of reasoning is the same as that just encountered in discussing transference. Yes, transference has always clearly involved both patient and analyst in the consulting room; but our theory refers the process back to the mind of the individual patient. Similarly, Kaplan's oedipal understanding of the primal scene issues created by the analytic situation refers back to the oedipal dynamics of the patient. Let me illustrate:

An analyst ends a session at the correct time. The patient experiences this as an oedipal defeat, a reenactment of the exclusion from the primal scene. The analyst, wedded to his or her profession, is more committed to Freud than to the patient. So the patient is thrown out of the room because of the analyst's devotion to another.

What would be emphasized in the interpretation is how the patient's mind works to create oedipal scenarios out of whatever experience is available.

Although I am impressed with the value of searching for oedipal meanings in the patient's material, it seems to me that a two-person or relational position

would have to push the inquiry further. In hearing this material, I would be interested not only in the patient's oedipal dynamics and genetic history, but also in the following questions: What is the nature, extent, and quality of this particular analyst's marriage to his or her theory? Is this particular analyst rigidly attached to a theory that really does interfere with a deeper engagement with the patient? What has the patient observed about the analyst's commitments, values, rigidities, and attachments? If the patient views the analyst as married to his or her profession, then what does the patient observe about the quality of that marriage? In what ways could the patient plausibly construe that he or she has been rejected, slighted, cut-off, or excluded by the analyst?

My point is that it is not enough for the content of the analysis to be concerned with three psychological variables. The analyst may always be thinking in terms of three psychological variables as well as focusing on transference and even countertransference issues, but all of these can be referred back to the mind of the subject, as if the environmental context were irrelevant, or at most served as a hook on which to hang the contents of intrapsychic projections. Central to a relational, two-person model is the notion that the seemingly infantile wishes and conflicts revealed in the patient's associations are not only or mainly remnants from the past, artificially imposed onto the therapeutic field, but are rather reflections of the actual interactions and encounters with the unique, individual analyst with all of his or her idiosyncratic, particularistic features. The implication of a two-person psychology is that who the analyst is, not only how he or she works, but his or her very character, makes a real difference for the analysand. It affects not only the therapeutic alliance or the so-called "real relationship," but the nature of the transference itself. From the perspective of a two-person psychology, the impact of the analyst needs to be examined systematically as an intrinsic part of the transference.

The method of free association, the fundamental rule of psychoanalysis, provides a particularly clear example of the very different implications of one-person and two-person psychologies, and therefore I use it as my focal point in the rest of this article to highlight some salient issues. (For a more thorough discussion of the free association method, see [Aron, 1990](#).) The classical approach views free associations as determined by unconscious dynamic conflict that in the absence of interference from the analyst or resistances, from within would spontaneously unfold. A major proponent of the classical approach is Arlow, for whom free associations reveal the conflicting forces of the mind, and past efforts to resolve these conflicts are repeated in the present. He wrote that "the stream of the patient's free associations is the record of the vicissitudes of the analysand's intrapsychic conflicts" ([Arlow, 1987](#), p. 70). The associations reflect the patient's intrapsychic experience, derived from the past, and how this inner experience intrudes on the present.

For [Arlow \(1980\)](#), the function of the psychoanalytic situation, and in

particular of free association, “is to ensure that what emerges into the patient's consciousness is as far as possible endogenously determined” (p. 193). It is as if the patient's developmental history of conflict between drive and defense spontaneously emerges and can be studied through the flow of the free associations. The associations are not seen as largely or predominantly determined by the current interpersonal relationship with the analyst, if the analyst is analyzing correctly.

For Arlow and other classical theorists, the use of the free association method is conceptually dependent on the metapsychological foundation of drive theory. The analyst wants to study the workings of the patient's mind, endogenously determined, and thought to be constituted by drive and defense. The psychoanalytic situation in general, and the free association method specifically, are both thought to represent “a standard, experimental set of conditions” (Arlow, 1987, p. 76) whose purpose is to minimize external stimuli so as to allow the spontaneous unfolding, from within, of derivatives of drive and defense.

Sullivan (1953), who worked with severely disturbed patients and introduced a field theory or two-person conceptualization of the analytic process, restricted the use of free association and substituted a detailed inquiry. Early in his career, Sullivan (1938) wrote that the method of free association was “the technique *par excellence* for the study of the subjective sequence of events” (p. 138). Although he never abandoned the technique of free association (Mullahy, 1970), he later became more reserved in its use because he felt that it encouraged patient and analyst to indulge in “parallel autistic reveries” that interfered with genuine communication. Following Sullivan's lead, interpersonalists tended to emphasize the ways that free association can be used to conceal and obscure.

For most interpersonalists, an emphasis on gaining information through the exploration of the interaction replaced the free association method. From an interpersonal point of view, it was not possible to conceive of associations that were independent of the ongoing interaction. It was essential in Sullivan's thought that the patient's behavior was not seen as the result of internal, intrapsychic events occurring in a closed system, but rather was viewed as occurring in an open-ended transactional field. Explicating Sullivanian thought, Chrzanowski (1977) wrote that “free association is not an internal phenomenon independent of its own workings and its interpersonal setting. Internal as well as external components connected with the associative process have a decisive effect on the associations produced” (p. 37).

Free association as a method is based on and embedded in the historical, classical model of the mind. With a view of the mind as a closed system, contained within one person, relatively impervious to outside influence, and constituted by drive and defense, it makes sense to picture associations as spontaneously unfolding from within the patient, and it also follows that the

analyst should remain neutral, outside of the field, and not interfering with this self-contained process. The analyst then intervenes only to keep the process going when it gets stuck.

However, with a model of mind as an open system, always in interaction with others, always responsive to the nature of the relationship with the other, comes a very different model of the analytic relationship. In the relational or two-person model, the analytic relationship and the transference are always contributed to by both participants in the interaction. One can no longer think of associations as solely emerging from within the patient; all associations are responsive to the analytic interaction, even if the analyst remains silent, hidden, or neutral. The traditional notions of anonymity and neutrality are intended to enable the transference, free associations, and other aspects of the analysand's psychological life to make their appearance in the analysis without interference. **Wachtel (1982)** argued that the language of “emerging” and “unfolding” is a verbal sleight of hand that obscures the realization that psychological events are never just a function of inner structures and forces, but are always derivative of interaction with others.

In my view, free association for the patient, and its counterpart, free-floating attention in the analyst, are among Freud's most ingenious contributions. Free associations were intended to be free of conscious control; there was never any doubt that they were unconsciously determined. But a relational view of transference, a heightened sensitivity to the interactional elements in the analytic situation, and a radical critique of the blank screen model of the analyst's functioning (**Hoffman, 1983**), all point to the interactional component in each of the patient's associations. Not only is transference a joint creation of patient and analyst, but each of the patient's associations can be seen as determined by their mutual interaction. Freud developed a methodology and created a setting, the psychoanalytic situation, which was exquisitely suited to being able to listen open-endedly and fully to another person. But the free association method does not provide the objectivity or freedom from personal bias that he hoped it would. Even those who advocate disciplined use of the free association method, abstinence, neutrality, and a blank screen model must at some point make decisions about how to organize the patient's material. In organizing the material, the analyst imposes his or her biases and personality on the patient's functioning in the analysis. The point is that the free association method may be of immense clinical value, but in no way does it eliminate the influence of the analyst or minimize the effect of the ongoing interaction on the associative process. My objection to those who believe that the analytic situation can represent “a standard, experimental set of conditions” (**Arlow, 1987**, p. 76) is that the method of free association continues to be used as a rubric under which to hide the extent that the analyst affects every aspect of the patient's associations. That is, the two-person nature of the analytic situation is obscured.

All theoretical systems have their limitations and each psychoanalytic school lends itself to some forms of abuse. If the classical tradition lends itself to disregarding the contributions of the analyst's individuality, the interpersonal-interactional tradition explicated by **Levenson (1983)** and **Gill (1982)**, while exquisitely sensitive to the nuances of the therapeutic interaction, is problematic in other ways. A theoretical commitment to the priority of interactional material and to the near exclusive focus on transference as the therapeutic factor in psychoanalysis, may lead to an intense and exhilarating exploration of the therapeutic relationship in the here and now. However, an exclusively interpersonal focus, by making the analyst continually present and in the foreground of the analysis, may prohibit or interfere in the establishment of an analytic "space" and in the patient's capacity to feel "left alone." This active focus on the relationship in the here and now may preclude the curative aspects of regression that can only occur when the patient feels safe enough to voluntarily become disorganized and less intact. Whereas the patient's need to be alone in the presence of the analyst (Winnicott, 1958/**1965a**) is a form of relatedness that ultimately requires analysis in terms of the interaction, I am arguing against cutting this experience short by a premature need to interpret all aspects of the relationship. A two-person relational, or interpersonal theory does not dictate an interactive behavioral stance on the part of the analyst (**Bromberg, 1979**).

To put this differently, while I am advocating the theoretical position that the transference should always be regarded as responsive to the current stimulus of the individual analyst, I believe it would be a technical mistake to focus exclusively on the analyst's contribution to the transference. We must allow patients, whose narcissistic viewpoints may reject a one-person psychology, to "play" in an analytic space where our existence does not intrude and is not forced upon them. If we impose "object usage" (**Winnicott, 1969**) on a patient who is only capable of "object relating," then we run the risk of systematically and meticulously engaging and analyzing "false self," leaving "true self" untouched (Winnicott, 1960/**1965b**).

Toward the end of his career, in his critique of Kleinian technique, **Rosenfeld (1986)** put forth a similar argument. He observed that in the case of traumatized patients, the analyst's repeated here-and-now transference interpretations were likely to be harmful. This is because the patient experienced the analyst as repeating the behavior of the self-centered parent who had demanded to be the exclusive center of attention.

Free association has declined in importance, in the thinking of some analysts, precisely because it has been tied to a one-person view of mind, that is, it has been tied to drive theory. Is there a place for the free association method in the practice of a analyst who conceptualizes the psychoanalytic process, as a two-person phenomenon? The clinical stance that I am advocating makes use of the free association method as a framework within which the analyst's personality and theoretical biases become subject to the psychoanalytic process.

The method of free association provides a fundamental context within which the analyst struggles with the paradoxical clinical demand that he or she be open to what the patient is saying, to what is new, to surprise, while also being guided by prior experience and theoretical models. Free association provides the methodological structure in which the analyst struggles to maintain a balance between participation and observation, and between focusing on past, current life, and transference. Free association is a method that enables patients to unite the task of exploring their inner world and the workings of their mind, with the interpersonal relation to the analyst. The method presupposes that everything the patient says can be meaningfully tied together and shown to belong to the continual stream of psychic life; it is a reminder to psychoanalysts of the priority of following the patient's lead in seeking to construct meaning.

My argument for a two-person or relational field theory is not to be confused with an attempt to eliminate the intrapsychic, to deny the importance of fantasy and psychic reality or the centrality of bodily and childhood experience. Nor is it an argument for a more active, interactional, or self-revelatory technique. My aim is to extract fundamental clinical concepts from the quasibiological drive theory that has dominated both our metapsychology and our clinical theory and to reexamine the value of these clinical concepts within a relational, contextual, and intersubjective framework.

Although Freud can be easily quoted to support almost any position, I end with a citation from his introduction to *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*, not to justify any argument, but simply out of love and fascination with his anticipation of all psychoanalytic ideas and controversies. **Freud (1921)** wrote:

The contrast between individual psychology and social or group psychology, which at first glance seems to be full of significance, loses a great deal of its sharpness when it is examined more closely. It is true that individual psychology is concerned with the individual man and explores the paths by which he seeks to find satisfaction for his instinctual impulses; but only rarely and under certain exceptional conditions is individual psychology in a position to disregard the relations of this individual to others. In the individual's mental life someone else is invariably involved, as a model, as an object, as a helper, as an opponent; and so from the very first individual psychology, in this extended but entirely justifiable sense of the words, is at the same time social psychology as well. (p. 69)

### **Acknowledgments**

On the basis of this article, Lewis Aron was presented with the Postdoctoral Award by the American Psychological Association, Division of Psychoanalysis, August, 1989. The article was originally presented as part of a panel

entitled “One-Person and Two-Person Psychologies—Complementary or Contradictory?” at the Spring Meeting of the Division of Psychoanalysis, American Psychological Association, April 8, 1989.

I thank the other members of the panel and the discussants of the article, Drs. Emmanuel Ghent, Stephen Mitchell, and Jessica Benjamin.

## References

- Arlow, J. A. (1980) The genesis of interpretation. In H. P. Blum (Ed.), *Psychoanalytic explorations of technique: Discourse on the theory* (pp. 193-206). New York: International Universities Press [→]
- Arlow, J. A. (1987). The Dynamics of Interpretation. *Psychoanal Q.* 56:68-87 [→]
- Aron, J. A. (1990). Free association and changing models of mind. *J. Am. Acad. Psychoanal. Dyn. Psychiatr.*, 18. 439-459. [→]
- Balint, M. (1950). Changing Therapeutical Aims and Techniques in Psycho-Analysis. *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.* 31:117-124 [→]
- Bromberg, P. M. (1979). Interpersonal Psychoanalysis and Regression. *Contemp. Psychoanal.* 15:647-655 [→]
- Chrzanowski, G. (1977). *Interpersonal approach to psychoanalysis: Contemporary view of Harry Stack Sullivan*. New York: Gardner. [→]
- Freud, S. (1921). Group psychology and the analysis of the ego. *S.E.*, 18, 65-143. [→]
- Ghent, E. (1989). Credo—The Dialectics of One-Person and Two-Person Psychologies. *Contemp. Psychoanal.* 25:169-211 [→]
- Gill, M. M. (1982). *Analysis of transference: Vol. 1., Theory and technique*. Psychological Issues (Monograph No. 53). New York: International Universities Press.
- Gill, M. M. (1984). Transference: A Change in Conception or Only in Emphasis? *Psychoanal. Inq.* 4:489-523 [→]
- Greenberg, J. R., & Mitchell, S. A. (1983). *Object relations in psychoanalytic theory*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press. [→]
- Hoffman, I. Z. (1983). The Patient as Interpreter of the Analyst's Experience. *Contemp. Psychoanal.* 19:389-422 [→]
- Levenson, E. (1983) *The ambiguity of change*. New York: Basic Books.
- Mitchell, S. A. (1988). *Relational concepts in psychoanalysis: An integration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Modell, A. H. (1984). *Psychoanalysis in a new context*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Mullahy, P. (1970). *Psychoanalysis and interpersonal psychiatry: The contributions of Harry Stack Sullivan*. New York: Science House.
- Rosenfeld, H. (1986, April 30). *Transference-countertransference distortions and other problems in the analysis of traumatized patients*. Unpublished talk given to the Kleinian analysts of the British Psycho-Analytical Society, London.
- Sullivan, H. S. (1938). Editorial. *Psychiatry*, I, 135-143.
- Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The interpersonal theory of psychiatry*. New York: Norton.
- Wachtel, P. L. (1982). Vicious Circles:—The Self and the Rhetoric of Emerging and Unfolding. *Contemp. Psychoanal.* 18:259-273 [→]
- Winnicott, D. W. (1965a). The capacity to be alone. In *The maturational processes and the facilitating environment* (pp. 29-36). New York: International Universities Press. (Original work published 1958) [Related→]

- Winnicott, D. W. (1965b). Ego distortions in terms of true and false self. In *The maturational processes and the facilitating environment* (pp. 140-152). New York: International Universities Press. (Original work published 1960) [\[→\]](#)
- Winnicott, D. W. (1969). The Use of an Object. *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.* 50:711-716 [\[→\]](#)

**Article Citation** [\[Who Cited This?\]](#)

**Aron, L.** (1990). One Person and Two Person Psychologies and the Method of Psychoanalysis. *Psychoanal. Psychol.*, 7(4):475-485

## PEP-Web Copyright

**Copyright.** The PEP-Web Archive is protected by United States copyright laws and international treaty provisions.

1. All copyright (electronic and other) of the text, images, and photographs of the publications appearing on PEP-Web is retained by the original publishers of the Journals, Books, and Videos. Saving the exceptions noted below, no portion of any of the text, images, photographs, or videos may be reproduced or stored in any form without prior permission of the Copyright owners.
2. Authorized Uses. Authorized Users may make all use of the Licensed Materials as is consistent with the Fair Use Provisions of United States and international law. Nothing in this Agreement is intended to limit in any way whatsoever any Authorized User's rights under the Fair Use provisions of United States or international law to use the Licensed Materials.
3. During the term of any subscription the Licensed Materials may be used for purposes of research, education or other non-commercial use as follows:
  - a. Digitally Copy. Authorized Users may download and digitally copy a reasonable portion of the Licensed Materials for their own use only.
  - b. Print Copy. Authorized Users may print (one copy per user) reasonable portions of the Licensed Materials for their own use only.

**Copyright Warranty.** Licensor warrants that it has the right to license the rights granted under this Agreement to use Licensed Materials, that it has obtained any and all necessary permissions from third parties to license the Licensed Materials, and that use of the Licensed Materials by Authorized Users in accordance with the terms of this Agreement shall not infringe the copyright of any third party. The Licensor shall indemnify and hold Licensee and Authorized Users harmless for any losses, claims, damages, awards, penalties, or injuries incurred, including reasonable attorney's fees, which arise from any claim by any third party of an alleged infringement of copyright or any other property right arising out of the use of the Licensed Materials by the Licensee or any Authorized User in accordance with the terms of this Agreement. This indemnity shall survive the termination of this agreement. NO LIMITATION OF LIABILITY SET FORTH ELSEWHERE IN THIS AGREEMENT IS APPLICABLE TO THIS INDEMNIFICATION.

**Commercial reproduction.** No purchaser or user shall use any portion of the contents of PEP-Web in any form of commercial exploitation, including, but not limited to, commercial print or broadcast media, and no purchaser or user shall reproduce it as its own any material contained herein.