Where Are We Going?

Miriam Finder Tasini

This book is a semi-memoir that reads like an adventure story as it describes an odyssey halfway around the world of a family escaping from Nazi persecution during WWII. It was a difficult story to write as it is an aggregation of my memories from childhood, which as analysts know are often distorted, and stories told throughout my life by parents, relatives, and friends about the events of WWII.

JOURNEY BACK

I was carried out of Poland on my mother’s lap just ahead of the advancing German army in September 1939. Many years later in 2002, I returned as a member of the IPA New Groups Committee to help establish a new psychoanalytic institute in Warsaw. During those visits I was able to explore some of the history of my family—descendants of the Jews who came to Poland at the invitation of King Kazimierz the Great in the 14th century—that eventually helped me to assemble the book. The part of the story that is, I believe, of interest to psychoanalysts is the incredible strength and resilience exhibited by my parents, my aunt, and uncle as they tried and succeeded in keeping three very small children alive during a three-year, 20-thousand mile journey halfway around the globe.

My parents, Markus and Regina (Rena) Finder, grew up in the comfort of upper-middle-class Jewish families. We lived in an elegant villa, overlooking the river; where I remember holding the leg of the piano my mother was playing.

On the first of September 1939, Germany invaded Poland and our world came apart. After watching a refinery across the river in flames, my mother, with her brother, father-in-law, and two small children went east to escape the bombings. Six harrowing days and 200 miles later on the crowded, bombed road, we arrived in Lvov.

My father stayed behind hoping to maintain the functioning of the family mill and bakeries. A week after the Germans entered Krakow, he was barred from entering his office by German militia as a yellow star was placed on his chest. He carefully planned an escape, emptied a safe where family valuables were kept and headed east hoping to reconnect with the family.

His plans were derailed as Russia invaded from the east and Poland ceased to exist. The border between the occupied territories was the river Bug guarded on one bank by the German army and on the other by the Russian. My father was shot as he tried to cross the river. His injured hand was infected. He developed gangrene and required an amputation of his right hand upon finally reaching Lvov.

Miriam Finder Tasini, M.D., is compensated clinical professor at UCLA Medical School, training and supervising psychoanalyst at the Los Angeles New Center for Psychoanalysis, past president of The American College of Psychoanalysts, and former IPA North America Women’s Committee chair.
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Twilight of the Training Analysis System

Otto F. Kernberg

My Presidential Symposium lecture on “The Twilight of the Training Analysis System” at the recent 2013 APsaA National Meeting focused on two points: 1) the rigidity of psychoanalytic education and their contribution to the present crisis in psychoanalysis, and 2) a proposal for major innovation in the methodology and organization of our educational system. What follows is a summary of these points.

I believe there exists, nowadays, general agreement in our psychoanalytic community regarding major external challenges to psychoanalysis at this time: from neurobiology, psychopharmacology, and cognitive-behavioral psychology; critique of our lack of empirical research; restriction of all sources of funding for long-term, non-empirically validated treatments; and cultural biases regarding psychoanalysis, to name a few. As a consequence, we have fewer patients, fewer candidates, aging professional ranks, and loss of a foothold in university settings.

CONSEQUENCES OF AN AUTHORITARIAN STRUCTURE

We also have significant internal problems, although there is less agreement about this: multiple theories without any methodology to assess their true value, professional isolation, and an uninspiring educational system.

Otto F. Kernberg, M.D., is director of the Personality Disorders Institute, New York Presbyterian Hospital, Westchester Division; professor of psychiatry, Weill Medical College of Cornell University; and training and supervision analyst, Columbia University Center for Psychoanalytic Training and Research.

In earlier analyses, I suggested that while, in our institutes, we aspire to combine the models of a university college and an art academy, our institutes are closer to the combined model of a religious seminary and a professional technical school. A major cause of this development, I proposed, is the authoritarian structure of the training analysis (TA) system, derived from the non-functional appropriation by training analysts of all aspects of institutional life: analysis of candidates, supervision, seminar teaching, and administrative leadership. A non-functional accumulation of power determines the development of authoritarian social structures.

Major consequences of this authoritarian structure include the establishment of a social class structure, with the training analysts as the elitist echelon, the non-training analyst members in a second tier status, and the candidates at the bottom. Symptomatically, this structure fosters idealization, submissiveness, a paranoid atmosphere, splitting mechanisms, rebelliousness, and, above all, interconnection of candidates, dogmatism, fearfulness, and lack of scientific development and creativity. In addition, the authoritarian structure of psychoanalytic education fosters the corruption of power in psychoanalytic institutions, a fearful isolationism with disconnection from the surrounding scientific world, fearfulness over developing new applications of psychoanalytic thinking and derivative psychotherapeutic techniques to expand the realm of therapeutic effectiveness, and a persistent aversion to empirical research.

Historically, the initiation of the training analysis system in the 1920s was functional and progressive. Its deterioration parallels the expansion of its power structure and the destructive development of a two-class social system, in which a large percentage of the graduated professionals are chronically condemned to be considered less than optimal practitioners. The criteria used to select training analysts are subjective and poorly defined. All decisions which affect the culture, curriculum, and progression of candidates are the purview of the training analyst elite. Would such a state of affairs be tolerated in any other professional specialty, say, in cardiology?

Dear Friends and Colleagues,

As I have written elsewhere, there has been a widespread misunderstanding of the PPP Proposal and the Fishkin Initiative as efforts to “democratize” our educational system. Nothing could be further from the truth. What is at issue here are fundamentally different views on how to achieve excellence in psychoanalytic education. Can it be best achieved in a self-perpetuating hierarchical system that operates entirely without oversight, responsible only to itself, and in complete disregard of our membership and our board of directors? Or can it be best achieved, as Kernberg suggests, by a “university model,” open to all elements of our Association, subject to debate, discussion, experimentation, and continuous orderly change?

Because of Kernberg’s well-known writings on this subject, I invited him to give the Presidential Symposium in January. His presentation can only be described as a “smash hit,” with extremely enthusiastic responses from the audience. Because many people did not have the opportunity to hear Kernberg, I have asked him to summarize his comments, as my guest, in my usual presidential column. I think you will enjoy it and be stimulated to reconsider whether our current system of education is the most optimal one for a psychoanalytic association.

Bob Pyles, President

Continued on page 4
Training Analysis System

Continued from page 3

AN INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

The negative reaction of the international psychoanalytic community to this institutional situation has been growing. In France, in Germany, and several Latin American countries conflicts have arisen between the membership of psychoanalytic societies and psychoanalytic institutes’ leadership. In the United States, at this time, an institutional conflict between the Executive Council of APsaA and the Board of Professional Standards (BOPS) reflects these dynamics. Understandably, from their position, BOPS has refused, so far, to accede to the Executive Council’s demands for objective, reliable, and transparent criteria to be established for the appointment of TAs. An enormous amount of time, energy, and resources is funneled into the conflict between internal administrative bodies of psychoanalysis, while serious external challenges confront psychoanalysis with its scientific, academic, and cultural environment.

As one solution to our internal problems, I propose a fundamental reorganization of the educational system of psychoanalysis. What follows are concrete recommendations that apply to APsaA, but the general principles involved should apply to the International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA) as well. In fact, much of the evidence that I presented in my Presidential Symposium lecture reflects my experiences as a former president of the IPA.

A PROPOSED SOLUTION

I propose that we abolish completely the training analysis system. The designation of training analysis should be replaced by an objective, reliable, and transparent set of criteria of professional competence, assessed in a certification process with these same characteristics, open to all graduates of all psychoanalytic institutes within a certain number of years after graduation that provides them with additional clinical experience. This certification would be equivalent to board certifications in medical specialties, and be carried out by an external certifying board established by the national organization, in this case, APsaA with a rotating membership nominated by the membership at large and elected by the Executive Council. This certifying board, which also could serve as a committee for the accreditation of institutes, would function completely autonomously and carry out the certification process on the basis of established standards of competence corresponding to the educational objectives specified by APsaA, to which I shall return. All certified analysts could analyze candidates, and the personal analysis would be carried out completely independently of all the psychoanalytic institutions’ educational functions.

The present Board on Professional Standards would be abolished, and replaced by an Education Committee with a number of highly expert, nationally and internationally recognized educational experts, nominated by the membership and elected by Executive Council. This Education Committee would carry out the task of defining the criteria of professional competence and the major objectives of psychoanalytic education, developing the methodology for achieving these objectives, and defining the criteria for assessing, step by step, the achievement of corresponding competency by psychoanalytic candidates. A Conference of Institute Directors would generate information and proposals to the Education Committee, and, eventually the Education Committee’s major mission would become the ongoing effort to improve the methodology of psychoanalytic education.

In my lecture, I referred to tentative criteria for the evaluation of competence that are already available, namely, psychoanalytic knowledge, technical skills, and analytic attitude. I described organizational arrangements that would assure the autonomy of the Certifying Board, the Education Committee’s ongoing efforts at renovation, and the ultimate responsibility of the democratically elected Executive Council to assure the effectiveness of these structures involved in psychoanalytic education. Finally, I stressed that the simple abolishment of the training analysis system and of the Board on Professional Standards would not solve by itself the problems of rigidity, the authoritarian structure, and the lack of present-day educational objectives, methodology, and functional methods of certification and of accreditation of institutes. Much preliminary work by the proposed Education Committee will become necessary before the other aspects of the proposed new structure are put in place. I trust that this work will end the present stagnation of psychoanalytic education, facilitate a dynamic energizing of the functions of psychoanalytic institutes, and, by providing appropriate, functional criteria of professional competence raise the institutional commitment of APsaA to an engaged and stimulating relationship with our surrounding scientific, professional, academic, and cultural environment.

FROM THE PRESIDENT

APsaA

Psychoanalytic & Psychodynamic Teachers’ Academy

Applications now being accepted through August 15, 2013

For clinical teachers in:
• Psychiatry Residency Programs
• Psychology Graduate Programs
• Social Work Graduate Programs

◆ A professional development program for teachers of psychoanalysis and/or psychodynamic therapy.

◆ Opportunity for reimbursed attendance and participation in a specially designed program at APsaA’s 2014 National Meeting in January.

For more information, visit:
www.apsa.org/TeachersAcademy

APsaA
A Vision for the Future of APsaA

Colleen L. Carney and Lee I. Ascherman

On February 6, 2013, the Supreme Court of New York County, New York, granted an injunction, which temporarily blocked the Fishkin Proposal, which was adopted by Council in January, from being implemented. Until the question of authority over training and educational standards is resolved, the court held, the judge did, however, order that the injunction remain in place until there is a final ruling on this matter.

The purpose of this injunction is to preserve the “status quo” in the sense of preventing irreparable harm to our educational system as a result of having two essentially incompatible sets of criteria for training analyst appointment and, ultimately, two philosophically different understandings of what it means to be a training analyst.

We believe that it was imperative that this injunction be filed. BOPS Fellows and committee chairs, not to mention institutes and psychoanalytic candidates need to know who is authorized to set and implement the standards for education and training. However, it is not true that we want APsaA to return to the status quo of the last 60 years. For more than 60 years, this organization has been marked by organizational dysfunction and internal acrimony leading to a paralyzing inability to move APsaA into the 21st century.

Colleen L. Carney, Ph.D., is chair of the Board on Professional Standards, and Lee I. Ascherman, M.D., is secretary.

The importance of this “time out” is in the opportunity it offers all of us to think about and choose what kind of organization APsaA can and should be.

If you have any doubt that the problems we face go back that far, we refer you to a 1953 article in JAPA (JAPA 1953 Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 310-330) that was brought to our attention by Herbert Wyman, a colleague at NYPSI. Although written 60 years ago, this article could have been written 20 years ago, or yesterday. That is how little we have moved in all that time to truly resolve the structural problems that we have. In fact, we hope that no one wants to return to that status quo and hope instead together to take up the opportunity before us to solve our most fundamental problems. The importance of this “time out” is in the opportunity it offers all of us to think about and choose what kind of organization APsaA can and should be.

Over the past three years we have taken specific steps to initiate the kinds of changes that we believe are necessary and consistent with a long-range vision of what the BOPS, the educational component of APsaA can be. In 2010 we:

1. Appointed two task forces each targeted to study specific opportunities: The Task Force on Child and Adolescent Analysis and the Task Force on University and Medical Center Initiatives. Both will present their Final Reports at the June 2013 Meeting in Washington D.C.

2. Initiated the Psychoanalytic Development Project, which is a series of studies intended to explore psychoanalytic competence at various stages of an analytic career: at admissions, progressions at the third year and graduation, certification, and at training and supervising analyst appointment.
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The family, which included grandfather Jacob, moved into a one-bedroom apartment where my father (refusing to become disabled) spent his days learning to write with his left hand. In March 1940, Russia declared that one and a half million Polish citizens were an undesirable element, and we were imprisoned and sent to the Siberian Gulags.

THE KNOCK ON THE DOOR
I would like to believe that I do not remember the knocking on the door early in the morning in May because I was too young rather than too terrified as we were forced to collect a few belongings and taken to a train station where we were lucky to reunite with my father’s sister, her husband, and daughter. A seven-day trip in a crowded cattle car with 40 other prisoners ended in a prison camp (Gulag Posiowek 45) in Siberia north of Krasnovodsk. Forty huts built by prior prisoners lined the only road in the midst of miles of impenetrable forest where we lived, a family of seven in one room. The prisoners provided cheap labor that sustained the Soviet economy. You worked or you did not eat. My father was unable to cut wood and so became the mailman walking 12 miles each day to the train station. Planted potatoes and cabbage were the main source of nourishment. We survived the arduous winter with six feet of snow and months of temperatures below zero.

Germany invaded Russia in June 1941 and after 14 months of imprisonment we were no longer regarded as enemies and we were able to leave. Paying for train tickets by trading a few remaining pieces of jewelry, we embarked on a journey south to Samarkand in Uzbekistan. Illness and starvation became part of the daily experience. My mother and my uncle nursed their ill spouses.

We starving refugees made another decision and started on another journey, to a desert town, a recruitment center for the Polish army that would be allowed to leave Russia to join the British fight against the Germans. We succeeded through coincidences that might be seen as a fantasy. My father met an old high school friend who made it possible for us to depart to Persia as his adopted family.

ROOTS OF RESILIENCY
After arriving in Persia, my father was hired by the British military to administer food supply distribution and there we experienced a transformation from hunger and poverty to a life of comfort. Disease still prevailed and I was admitted in a coma to a hospital in Teheran with a diagnosis of malaria. I have been asked by many who have read my book to try to explain how I was not only able to survive but to go on to live a productive life, raise a family, and maintain relationships. As an analyst I realized that I was never left alone, and the only time I remember experiencing a true sense of horror was when I was hospitalized in Teheran and placed in a dying children’s ward. My parents were not allowed to visit; they stole me out of the hospital in the middle of the night. My writing this is the testimony to their resourcefulness—they found treatment to keep me alive.

Our final destination was Palestine, at that time part of the British Empire, where Jewish immigration was restricted. Elaborate negotiations between Jewish agencies and the British finally secured our permits. After a journey of four weeks and 4000 miles, sailing across the enemy-submarine infested Indian Ocean, through the Red Sea, and Suez Canal, we arrived in Tel Aviv where I was fortunate to grow up.

A Vision for the Future
Continued from page 5

2. The fellows adopted another motion, which calls for a task force to explore the feasibility of externalizing the accrediting functions of the Committee on Institutes, Committee on Child and Adolescent Analysis, and Committee on New Training Facilities, and to specifically investigate the possibility of establishing a formal relationship with the Accreditation Council for Psychoanalytic Education, Inc. (ACPEinc) to jointly accredit/approve APsaA’s institutes. This would separate the accrediting function of BOPS from the membership organization itself, as it should be. These structural changes would not only bring us more into alignment with other professional organizations, it is our hope that it would all but halt the conflicts around authority over the functions now performed by the BOPS and its committees. No matter what the outcome of the legal question over educational standard-setting authority, this kind of organizational clarity and efficiency is an investment in the future of psychoanalysis.
The coming of age novel that I have written in my spare hours over the past few years is, in many respects, a fictional illustration of my belief, articulated in my paper, “The Adolescent Neurosis,” that, for many people, their late adolescent years have a powerful impact on their personalities, one that can endure for a lifetime.

This is certainly true for me. I often find myself reminiscing about my high school years; about the characters in my class who took bets on ball games in a corner of our Latin class and about the principal, a Dickensian taskmaster, who announced one day when a heavy snowstorm was expected, “For those of you who come to school by subway, I want to say this; if the trains don’t run, you will!” I relive my glory days on the basketball court, greatly exaggerated, no doubt, by the comforts of memory, especially the time our team played and won a championship at Madison Square Garden.

Still in my memory is that day of infamy when Durocher, our nemesis and my personal bete noire, deserted Brooklyn to become manager of the Giants. It is that trauma, still raw after more than half a century, that I have attempted to work through and come to terms with by writing this book.

And I recall with fondness my stint covering the Brooklyn Dodgers for The Daily Worker; and making the trek to Ebbets Field, where I would watch with awe as Leo Durocher, the feisty manager of the Dodgers, took on the plate umpire in what seemed like a daily dust-up. In fact, I was a Giants fan and Mel Ott my hero; actually a tragic hero whose flaws—he could not hit a breaking curve—struck me as being of Macbethian proportions.

It is that trauma, still raw after more than half a century, that I have attempted to work through and come to terms with by writing this book.

But The Year of Durocher is not only about sports, it is about girls and friendship and the betrayal of friendship, and young love and the ambitions, narcissism, crushing disappointments, and triumphs of our adolescent years. And it is about certain truths that we discover in those years; truths not only about friends and family and the wider world, beyond our own, but about ourselves; truths that remain with us as a precious legacy of our adolescent experiences, of those special and memorable years.

Theodore Jacobs, M.D., is clinical professor of psychiatry at Albert Einstein College of Medicine, training and supervising analyst at New York and IPE Psychoanalytic Institutes, and author of The Use of the Self and the forthcoming book, The Possible Profession.
Psychoanalyst as Public Intellectual

Introduction

Michael Slevin

As we tumble into the 21st century, the psychoanalyst in the United States is consigned in the public perception to the role of therapist for the few. The eminence, the bright sun of Sigmund Freud has dimmed. Yet psychoanalysis has the experience of having been a momentous and powerful cultural force. Freud not only created the innovative one-to-one psychotherapeutic relationship but, through his understanding of childhood sexuality, the unconscious, transference, dreams, the structured subjective life, helped lock into place the stage set of Modernism on which a social and historical era played out. Freud wrote extensively on issues of sociology, group behavior, and religion; and in this Freud was influenced by his time. Totem and Taboo could not have been written without the developing discipline of anthropological fieldwork; The Future of an Illusion and Moses and Monotheism existed in the weltanschauung of Modernism, which sought to replace faith and religion with reason and science. Beyond the Pleasure Principle grappled with the carnage of World War I. Can psychoanalysts once again use that wide-angle lens? And, can psychoanalysts speak and be listened to on the issues of public debate? I think we must.

So I inquired of four authors to turn about the crystal of public intellectual in the light of psychoanalysis. Eli Zaretsky brings the historical perspective. Stating that, “I would define psychoanalysis…broadly, to include those with a professional sensitivity to unconscious mental forces, and especially resistance.” Psychoanalysts—narrowly and broadly defined—for decades, engaged with cultural-political issues. Zaretsky offers an answer; at the end of his contribution, to his questions, “Given the role that psychoanalysis played in the 20th century public sphere, how did it come to be marginalized?” And can it regain its influence?

Prudy Gourguechon maintains that every “ordinary analyst” can, if she exercises intellectual and professional discipline, with social media be a public intellectual. Coming at the problem as action on the world stage, Vamik Volkan discusses his third career, as a political psychoanalyst, in which he “headed an interdisciplinary team…that conducted multi-year unofficial diplomatic dialogues between Americans and Soviets, Russians and Estonians, Croats and Bosnian Muslims…and studied post-revolution or postwar societies….”

Sally Weintrobe discusses her work in England on psychoanalysis and climate change, work that produced a conference resulting in an edited book and a lecture hall packed with scientists eager to learn about “the importance of a psychoanalytic perspective on communicating about climate change.”

As public intellectuals, we have a history and a future to consider.

Michael Slevin, M.A., M.S.W., a former TAP editor, graduated as academic associate from the Baltimore Washington Institute for Psychoanalysis, where he trained in the Adult Psychotherapy Training Program. He works at Jewish Community Services and has a private practice.
My Psychopolitical Journey

Vamık D. Volkan

I thank Michael Slevin for asking me to contribute to this special section of TAP and describe my efforts to reach beyond the consulting room into international relations—conducting unofficial dialogues between enemy representatives, working at refugee camps, and examining why humans kill the Other in the name of their large-group identity.

In the psychoanalytic literature, the term “large group” sometimes refers to 30 to 150 individuals who meet in order to deal with a given issue. I use the term “large group” to refer to tens of thousands or millions of people, most of whom will never know or see each other, but who share a feeling of same-ness, a large-group identity. A large-group identity is the end-result of myths and realities of common beginnings, historical continuities, geographical realities, and other shared linguistic, societal, religious, cultural, and political factors. In our daily lives we articulate such identities in terms of commonality, such as “we are Apaches; we are Lithuanian Jews, we are Kurdish; we are Slav; we are Sunni Muslims; we are Taliban brothers; we are communists; we are Northern Ireland Unionists.” Many descriptions of tribal, ethnic, national, or political large groups appear in the literature of history, political science, sociology, anthropology, and philosophy. As psychoanalysts we should pay more attention to the psychodynamic processes that take place within a large group and within its relationships with other large groups, instead of preoccupying ourselves with surface terms defining large-group identity.

Born to Turkish parents on the Mediterranean island of Cyprus, I came to the United States every six months to examine world affairs from a psychopolitical point of view (see: www.internationaldialogueinitiative.com). In short, for over 30 years, I have been examining many psychological “walls” in numerous international contexts and putting my findings in theoretical and practical frames.

Psychoanalytic training does not include politics and international relations. Nevertheless, starting with Sigmund Freud, a number of psychoanalysts have shown interest in large-group human behavior, political leader-follower relationships, political ideologies and religion. Especially after the Holocaust psychoanalysts also began to examine the influence of massive trauma at the hand of the Other and its transgenerational transmission.

My involvement in my third profession was accidental. In 1977, then Egyptian president Anwar el-Sadat stunned the political world by visiting Israel. When he addressed the Israeli Knesset he spoke about a psychological wall between Arabs and Israelis and stated that psychological barriers constitute 70 percent of all problems existing between the two groups. With the blessings of the Egyptian, Israeli, and American governments, the American Psychiatric Association’s Committee on Psychiatry and Foreign Affairs followed up on Sadat’s statements by bringing together influential Israelis, Egyptians, and later Palestinians for a series of unofficial negotiations that took place between 1979 and 1986. My membership in this committee initiated my third profession.

After that project ended, I founded the Center for the Study of Mind and Human Interaction (CSMHI) under the umbrella of the University of Virginia School of Medicine. Through my years at CSMHI I headed its interdisciplinary team (including psychoanalysts, political scientists, former diplomats, and historians) that conducted multi-year unofficial diplomatic dialogues between Americans and Soviets, Russians and Estonians, Croats and Bosnian Muslims, Georgians and South Ossetians, Turks and Greeks and studied post-revolution or post-war societies such as Albania after dictator Enver Hodxa and Kuwait after the Iraqi invasion. I also worked with traumatized people in refugee camps where “we-ness” becomes palpable.

I was honored to be a member of former President Jimmy Carter’s International Negotiation Network for over 10 years starting in the late 1980s. I spent some time with other political or religious leaders, such as former Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, the late Yasser Arafat, Estonian President Arnold Rüütel, Turkish President Abdullah Gül, and Archbishop Desmond Tutu, and observed aspects of leader-follower psychology up close.

Since my retirement from the University of Virginia in 2003, I have joined other psychoanalysts (Lord John Alderdice, Edward Shapiro, Gerard Fromm) and psychoanalytic group therapists in meeting with representatives from the Arab countries, Iran, Israel, Russia, Germany, Turkey, United Kingdom, and United States every six months to examine world affairs from a psychopolitical point of view (see: www.internationaldialogueinitiative.com). In short, for over 30 years, I have been examining many psychological “walls” in numerous international contexts and putting my findings in theoretical and practical frames.

SHARED MOURNING AND ENTITLEMENT IDEOLOGIES

Generally speaking, psychoanalysts have been interested in what a large group means to an individual, but my unusual experiences have taught me that there is a need to expand psychoanalytic investigation of large
Psychoanalysis as Social Intervention: Why Silence Is Not an Option

Sally Weintrobe

Psychoanalysts have a checkered past when it comes to speaking up on social issues. We have been rightly criticized when applying knowledge from “I” to “we” in reductionist or ahistorical ways. Also, I think we have not sufficiently appreciated just how much help the average open and curious person needs to understand our concepts as used today and help to see that psychoanalysis, as social intervention, is absolutely not about suggesting “psychoanalysis for everyone,” a very frequent misconception.

It is vital we engage with the community rather than isolating ourselves from it. It is good for the community, good for us, and also good for the development of our theory. Only by engaging in dialogue with the public and with other disciplines, including disciplines closer to our own, do we bump up against limits to the usefulness of our concepts and ways of seeing. But equally, only through dialogue can we see more clearly where what we have to say is of vital importance.

I have edited a new book, Engaging with Climate Change: Psychoanalytic and Interdisciplinary Perspectives, that strives to be a psychoanalytic intervention. The book is a sustained dialogue between psychoanalysis and other disciplines. All 23 authors worked hard to make the book understandable to the general reader and as jargon free as possible, while doing justice to the complexity of the subject and the ideas. If the book did not reach people at a level they could relate to and could begin to recognize themselves as part of the problem and the solution, it had no potential to be a social intervention.

This interdisciplinary dialogue led to new ways of seeing. Not an application of psychoanalysis, the book enables one to adopt a third position where one can see individual and social side by side, note some commonalities in structure, and in places see more clearly the limits of psychoanalytic understanding. The book led me to conclude that any generalizations about relationships between the I and the we are liable to be misplaced: Rather, the relationships need working out afresh in each study.

My experience with the book has so far left me with some optimism about getting our ideas across to other disciplines and to the public. In our current “anti-mind” culture, many people seem hungry for deeper understanding of themselves and their world, and their ears are wide open.

In our current “anti-mind” culture, many people seem hungry for deeper understanding of themselves and their world, and their ears are wide open.

Only by engaging in dialogue with the public and with other disciplines, including disciplines closer to our own, do we bump up against limits to the usefulness of our concepts and ways of seeing. But equally, only through dialogue can we see more clearly where what we have to say is of vital importance.

I have edited a new book, Engaging with Climate Change: Psychoanalytic and Interdisciplinary Perspectives, that strives to be a psychoanalytic intervention. The book is a sustained dialogue between psychoanalysis and other disciplines. All 23 authors worked hard to make the book understandable to the general reader and as jargon free as possible, while doing justice to the complexity of the subject and the ideas. If the book did not reach people at a level they could relate to and could begin to recognize themselves as part of the problem and the solution, it had no potential to be a social intervention.

This interdisciplinary dialogue led to new ways of seeing. Not an application of psychoanalysis, the book enables one to adopt a third position where one can see individual and social side by side, note some commonalities in structure, and in places see more clearly the limits of psychoanalytic understanding. The book led me to conclude that any generalizations about relationships between the I and the we are liable to be misplaced: Rather, the relationships need working out afresh in each study.

My experience with the book has so far left me with some optimism about getting our ideas across to other disciplines and to the public. In our current “anti-mind” culture, many people seem hungry for deeper understanding of themselves and their world, and their ears are wide open.

An example of that receptivity is that climate scientists and policymakers have tended naively to assume that if you simply tell the public the facts about climate change, they will take them on board. But world renowned climate scientist Chris Rapley, professor of climate science at University College London, has argued in a recent paper in Nature Climate Change that exposure to a psychoanalytic way of understanding has led him to see the inadequacy of this idea. He cites a paper on anxiety in Engaging with Climate Change in making this case to other climate scientists.

Political analyst and activist, Naomi Klein, also focused on this point when she endorsed the book as: “a powerful riposte to the notion that climate communicators have only two options: Relentlessly terrify the public, or try to fool them into action without mentioning the word ‘climate.’”

Rapley and Klein recognize a psychoanalytic way of understanding is an important part of the picture. So does British journalist Anne Karpf. In a review of Engaging with Climate Change in The Guardian newspaper, she said the book helped her understand disavowal and see she was a “climate ignorer” as she put it. Reading her review, I realized we have much to learn from journalists like Karpf about how to put things in simple ways, especially her saying, “…when I hear apocalyptic warnings about global warming, after a few moments of fear I tune out. …The fuse that trips the whole circuit is a sense of helplessness.”

Karpf’s article drew a strong response from the public, as evidenced by comments on the web. People recognized themselves as both ignoring the problem and finding it too much to bear; And, of course, psychoanalysts no less than others get into the state of mind Karpf describes.

Climate change is often thought of as too hard to understand, best left to others. But the book argues most of us have grasped the big simple picture and are in a state of disavowal about it. Disavowal—turning a blind eye to the climate; on greed, climate change disavowal, and our relationship with nature.
Reviving Psychoanalysis in Public Debate

Eli Zaretsky

In 1968, at a convention of Students for a Democratic Society, I spied the title of a pamphlet by Herbert Marcuse on the book table: The Obsolescence of the Freudian Conception of Man. I still remember my shock. It seemed to me inconceivable that a discovery like that of the unconscious could become obsolete. Born in 1940, I had grown up in an immigrant Jewish cultural environment in which Freud’s stature was comparable not only to such modernist giants as Joyce, Kafka, and Proust but also to figures Freud had written about: Goethe, Giants as Joyce, Kafka, and Proust but also to comparable not only to such modernist environment in which Freud’s stature was grown up in an immigrant Jewish cultural could become obsolete. Born in 1940, I had that a discovery like that of the unconscious ber my shock. It seemed to me inconceivable

Eli Zaretsky

As a leftist, I knew that while the analytic profession (mostly doctors then) might be conservative, Freud’s thought was central to radical politics. After all, what defined the New Left, as I understood it, was the understanding that capitalism was not simply an economic system, organized through coercive but rationalistic techniques of exploitation, but also a deeply irrational psychical order, grounded in sexual desire, the family, and what I would now call personal life. At that point it did not seem conceivable to me that America could go back either on the great achievements of the modernist era or on radical politics.

This moment was brought to mind when I began to think about the question Michael Slevin had posed to me: “Has psychoanalysis ever truly produced a public intellectual?” On the one hand, his question made no sense to me. Freud was obviously one of the great public intellectuals of the 20th century, and his works were widely read outside the analytic community, increasingly so as he turned to cultural, historical, and what can only be termed political questions in the late ’20s and ’30s. Furthermore, what can one say about such figures as Melanie Klein, Wil- helm Reich, D.W. Winnicott, Karen Horney, Erich Fromm, Theodor Reik, Herbert Marcuse, Judith Butler, Juliet Mitchell, Marie Langer, Christopher Lasch, or Elisabeth Roudinesco? Every one of them was or is a psychoanalytic public intellectual. Winnicott was a BBC stalwart, Lasch and Fromm best-selling authors, Roudinesco a leading personality in French intellectual life, Mitchell and Horney founders of modern feminism.

From another point of view, however, the question can be restated: Given the fact that between World War I and the ’60s or ’70s psychoanalysis was central to public debate, how did it become so marginal today? To address this question we must first address three prior questions: 1) What do we mean by psychoanalysis? 2) What can psychoanalysis contribute to a democratic society above and beyond psychotherapy? 3) More generally, what if any relation does psychoanalysis have to politics? Let us take these up in turn.

Psychoanalysis as a profession is defined through education and licensing by those who practice analysis in consulting rooms. By contrast, I would define psychoanalysis more broadly to include those with a professional sensitivity to unconscious mental forces, and especially to resistance. In my view, practicing psychoanalysts have special expertise in those areas that revolve around treatment, but psychoanalysis also includes those who study the unconscious in film, literature, politics, symbols, rituals and anthropology, historical materials, biography, autobiography, philosophy, child development, and numerous other areas, including the natural sciences. An analogy might be architecture: Those who build houses have a special expertise and a special role to play, but the field of architecture includes theorists, critics, historians, public sculptors, city planners, acousticians, and others.

Historically, psychoanalysts distinguished the analytic profession from “applied analysis,” meaning education, social work, sex clinics, and the like. This no longer works, partly because the most important “application” of analysis is psychotherapy, and partly because those who practice therapy do not have a monopoly on analytic knowledge. To be sure, this approach raises a host of questions concerning how we gain knowledge of the unconscious, and how we are to understand resistance. However, these questions are difficult in any case and remain unresolved to this day.

BEYOND THE CONSULTING ROOM: ECONOMICS, MEDIA, FUNDAMENTALISM

However we define psychoanalysis, we can ask what it can contribute to public discussion in a democratic society. What uses might it have above and beyond its value as therapy? I suggest that the larger value of analysis has to do with the powerful role that non-rational or irrational forces play in our lives, both individual and collective. Psychoanalysis remains the most developed and comprehensive approach we have that allows us to understand and cope with these forces. Let me illustrate this with three examples: economics, the media, and fundamentalism.

The economic system, as it is presently understood, presumes the rational, self-maximizing individual as its unit, in other words, market economics. In recent years a new field of behavioral economics has opened up, based on neuroscience and cognitive psychology, which tweaks market economics at the margins but does not provide an alternative model. Keynes, however; writing in the wake of Freudianism, located very powerful emotional forces in economic life, such as fear, greed, the gambling mania, the

Continued on page 30
What Me Tweet? The Ordinary Psychoanalyst as Public Intellectual

Prudence L. Gourguechon

I am addressing this to the ordinary, average psychoanalyst, like me, not to the scholar, the author of many books and articles, or the academic. I believe each of us has the potential to develop, as part of our psychoanalytic identities, the persona of the public intellectual.

I am guessing that the other contributors to this section of TAP are true scholars and thinkers who have managed to learn to communicate their ideas outside of what Glen Gabbard has called “the cathedral” of psychoanalysis or the ivory tower of academia. We all are dependent on these thinkers to transmit the value of psychoanalytic ideas to the public.

The term “public intellectual” generally considered to be a Drew Westin or Jonathan Lear.

To be a public intellectual you have to say something intellectual—that is, about ideas. Or ideas about ideas. And it has to be public. UNIQUELY PSYCHOANALYTIC

In the aspects of the public sphere I am going to talk about, one must be brief, sometimes extraordinarily brief, clear, and either jargon free or very good at quickly and clearly defining proprietary concepts or terms of art. Meeting these bars takes practice. But the real challenge, I have found, comes in finding something to say that is psychoanalytic, that is, conveying ideas that essentially only a psychoanalyst would say.

There are a few technical issues to master...and the capacity to tolerate a speck of exhibitionism...

Outside of scholars with a public voice, the iconic public intellectual could be Gore Vidal or Christopher Hitchens writing for The New York Review of Books. Or Jeffrey Toobin explaining the intricacies of the courts in a long essay in The New Yorker. For psychoanalysts, the public intellectual is generally considered to be a Drew Westin or Jonathan Lear.

But I contend that every psychoanalyst who wants to bother can contribute to the public conversation on virtually every concern of people today. I will explain what I mean by “wants to bother” below. There are a few technical issues to master; but none require more than a little attention and the capacity to tolerate a speck of exhibitionism, exposure, criticism, and the occasional frame shift. Once you dive in it is not that hard.

To be a public intellectual you have to say something intellectual—that is, about ideas. Or ideas about ideas. And it has to be public.

Outside of scholars with a public voice, the iconic public intellectual could be Gore Vidal or Christopher Hitchens writing for The New York Review of Books. Or Jeffrey Toobin explaining the intricacies of the courts in a long essay in The New Yorker. For psychoanalysts, the public intellectual is generally considered to be a Drew Westin or Jonathan Lear.

But I contend that every psychoanalyst who wants to bother can contribute to the public conversation on virtually every concern of people today. I will explain what I mean by “wants to bother” below. There are a few technical issues to master; but none require more than a little attention and the capacity to tolerate a speck of exhibitionism, exposure, criticism, and the occasional frame shift. Once you dive in it is not that hard.

To be a public intellectual you have to say something intellectual—that is, about ideas. Or ideas about ideas. And it has to be public.

UNIQUELY PSYCHOANALYTIC

In the aspects of the public sphere I am going to talk about, one must be brief, sometimes extraordinarily brief, clear, and either jargon free or very good at quickly and clearly defining proprietary concepts or terms of art. Meeting these bars takes practice. But the real challenge, I have found, comes in finding something to say that is psychoanalytic, that is, conveying ideas that essentially only a psychoanalyst would say.

Let's take firearm violence as an example. One can say, “There are over 11,000 homicides due to firearm violence each year in this country—this constitutes a public health emergency.” While this is a useful and important statement to make, it could be made by anyone in the health fields. It is much harder to try to say something uniquely psychoanalytic.

I talked to a lot of colleagues about this at the recent APsaA meetings, and we shared a frustration that we could not seem to add, from the unique point of view of psychoanalysis, anything useful to the understanding of, for example, why we tolerate such a high level of violence in this country.

Finally, Jeff Taxman, in one of these conversations, thought of this: Maybe the shocking tolerance of violence in the U.S. is an extension of the dynamics Stuart Twemlow describes as the bully-bystander phenomenon. I was immensely relieved to finally have a psychoanalytic idea to contribute. Perhaps we can offer useful ideas about internal splits, projective identification, affective numbing, and so forth. We still do not know the answers, but Taxman’s light bulb allowed my thought process to become activated. I could start thinking like a psychoanalyst, rather than a helpless, well, bystander.

I consider the psychoanalytic public intellectual to be a person who adds psychoanalytic ideas and concepts to the conversations in “the commons,” that public space where ideas are expressed and exchanged. Ours is an explanatory discipline. Explaining outside the consulting room really is not such a foreign exercise. It should be done, however, with grace and humility.

I have always liked the phrase “the commons.” It conjures for me a public square, or a coffee shop, where ideas are sought, shared, debated, and expanded. You, my friends, must make this leap: The Internet and social media are the commons of today, the public space where people of divergent ideas, divergent intellectual backgrounds exchange ideas. And yes, I mean blogs, Facebook, and Twitter.

I have two websites, three blogs and a Twitter feed. I have also been interviewed by the press and written letters to the editor and op-ed pieces. I use myself as an example and hopefully an inspiration, because I make no pretense of being anything but an ordinary psychoanalyst. I am not trained as a scholar. My only intellectual credential, in fact, is that I am a psychoanalyst.

I use all these corners of the public square to try to talk about human affairs that interest me, using a psychoanalytic perspective. Here, I will explain how just one of those media engages me. I chose Twitter because it is my most recent discovery, and I am in a stage of mild infatuation with it.

I am a tweeter. A member of the twitterverse. It is fun, intriguing, and a great exercise in precision of language. Twitter is the latest in a long line of “modern” developments that
I once swore I would never engage, starting with protestations against e-mail in 1990, moving through websites and blogs, and Facebook. I find I start with a sense of mild revulsion and protest against each of these innovations, and then fall in love with many, and become dependent on others.

JUMPING IN

Though I have been playing with the ideas of psychoanalysts as public intellectuals for some years, I did not join Twitter until last summer when a close and highly respected analyst friend told me he loved it. Startled, I asked why, he explained, and I jumped in.

The idea in Twitter is first to open an account and begin to “follow” other tweeters. That is, your first and I think major task is to read, to expose yourself to others’ ideas. Your account is identified with the “@” symbol followed by your username. I identified myself on twitter as @pgourguechon, and crafted this profile: “Psychoanalyst/writer.”

You can open a Twitter account and never write a tweet. Then you are a passive member of the intellectual commons—not a bad thing. Through the equivalent of word of mouth, you learn to “follow” other people’s Twitter feeds, such as Neil de Grasse Tyson, an astrophysicist. He has 983,028 followers. Tyson writes about science. Here’s an example of one of his recent tweets:

“In 5-billion yrs the Sun will expand & engulf our orbit as the charred ember that was once Earth vaporizes. Have a nice day.” (January 24)

You can follow him on Twitter @neiltyson.

It is a good idea, by the way, to engage as a “coach” a young person in his or her twenties, to help you get started. It was my coach, a brilliant 26-year-old, who knowing of my interest in public intellectuals, introduced me to Neil de Grasse Tyson. There are ways to search out thinkers and resources on Twitter who have interests similar to yours. When you do decide to tweet, you create content with your own ideas, thus actively entering the conversation. There are methods to make you and your ideas more visible in Twitter’s virtual space. I will not explain them here; your young coach and Twitter itself will do it better.

A post on Twitter is called a “tweet.” It is limited to 140 characters, not words, characters. This provides extraordinary practice in intellectual discipline—what few words can communicate an idea. Tweets rely heavily on links to articles, blogs, news reports, whatever. (And one technique you have to learn is how to shorten links so they do not use up all your characters).

MINDCASTING

I avoid posting about personal matters—where I am, where I’m going, how I felt, what I ate. I keep in mind that patients may well be reading my Twitter feed, and that those who use Twitter for self-promotion annoy me. I like the discrimination of Jay Rosen, who teaches journalism at New York University. (By the way, I would not have encountered his ideas but for Twitter). Rosen writes, “I don’t do lifecasting but mindcasting on Twitter.”

I post ideas, links to articles, reactions to events or other ideas. An example of “mindcasting” (good) is “Popularity of @neiltyson suggests heartening survival of human search for meaning.” An example of “lifecasting” (bad) would be “Disgusted by TV news; had pbj”.

When I read a tweet by someone that I think is important I can “retweet” it and it goes out to my followers. Or I can “mention” someone in a tweet. These actions are important because if I retweet or mention someone else’s idea they find out about it, and therefore they might find out about psychoanalysis.

Recently I learned through Twitter that Senator Al Franken was especially interested in increasing the availability of school-based mental health services, an important interest of many of us. I retweeted. I also passed this on to colleagues engaged in psychoanalytic advocacy.

So please follow me on Twitter. I will follow you. Friend me on Facebook (I have just established a professional page there).

As an ordinary psychoanalyst you have a great deal to contribute to the exchange of ideas “out there” in society. And, in doing so, you will contribute to the preservation of our profession. The more we join the conversation in the commons, the more we will be on people’s minds when they need clinical help.
During 2011-12, the Baltimore Washington Center for Psychoanalysis initiated an ongoing Case Conference designed to bring local clinicians together to discuss topics of psychoanalytic interest. We meet once a month in Bethesda, Maryland, and open our discussions with clinical presentations by psychoanalysts. Michael Jasnow and I, both child-adolescent psychoanalysts, titled our March 9, 2012, presentation “Scary Books and Movies—Their Role in Child Development and in the Treatment of Children and Adolescents—Where the Wild Things Really Are.”

MAKING USE OF DISPLACEMENT

This presentation, the first child-adolescent topic for our new conference, drew the largest number of clinicians to date and stimulated a very lively discussion. The attendees included psychiatrists, social workers, psychologists, and even a family practitioner from another country who was visiting grandchildren in suburban DC. I spoke about how our most fruitful work with children and adolescents occurs when they are able to bring their inner lives into the sessions, often in the form of displacements to books they are reading or movies they have seen.

I used the series of Harry Potter books as an example. I based my discussion on the ideas I had expressed in my TAP article (“Harry Potter’s Popularity Rooted in the Emotional Life of Children,” TAP 41/3), explaining how author JK Rowling provides a forum to engage children in stories that capture universal childhood conflicts. I described the Harry Potter novels as modern day fairy tales that can help a child or adolescent master troubling emotions such as jealousy of siblings, death wishes towards rivals, or feelings of helplessness. By fighting the evil wizard Voldemort (a projection of the young person’s unacceptable and dangerous feelings), Harry fights to master his own vulnerabilities and troubling emotions, as the young reader must also do in the process of growing up.

Michael Jasnow spoke about children’s play and fantasy. He described recent neuroscientific findings that update our understanding of the developmental importance of play. He related this to books and movies that our child and adolescent patients bring into our consulting rooms. He then gave three engaging clinical examples, illustrating how he uses his child patients’ displacements to help them master their fears and conflicts.

Several clinicians attending the conference described the challenges they faced treating children and adolescents at local clinics or in their private practices, such as difficulties helping religious parents accept their children’s interest in reading the Harry Potter books, or understanding the raging interest in The Hunger Games among seventh and eighth graders, or engaging children with ADHD in mastering impulsivity through play.

The conference stimulated such interest and lively discussion that we continued our child and adolescent topics during 2012-13. For example, Charles Parks presented “Alterations of Defense in Psychoanalytic Treatment,” describing the three-year analysis of a girl suffering from a traumatic neurosis. And Marc Nemiroff presented and discussed his work with children in the Bombay slums and in a tribal village in India in “Losing Myself and Being Myself in India: Lessons from Working Outside One’s Culture.” During our May 10, 2012, program, Robert Nover discussed “We Are All Living and Dying Every Moment—Psychotherapy with Acutely Ill and Dying Children and Adults: Principles and Practice.”

Child and Adolescent Psychoanalysts in the Community: SCARY Books and Movies

Judith Chertoff

Judith Chertoff, M.D., practices adult and child psychoanalysis and psychotherapy in North Bethesda, Maryland. She teaches, trains, and supervises at Baltimore Washington Institute, George Washington and Georgetown Universities. Her 2009 JAPA paper focused on work with a traumatized child.
Freedom Writers: The Film’s Impact on a Group of Viewers

Elisabeth P. Waugaman, Richard M. Waugaman, and Bruce Sklarew

Freedom Writers is the gripping 2007 film that tells the true story of Erin Gruwell, an idealistic English teacher who helped turn around the lives of students who were traumatized by gang violence that pervaded their Los Angeles communities. There is a special affective power in films that are based on true stories.

Fourteen people, including eight psychoanalysts, got together to watch and informally discuss this film at the Waugaman’s home in February 2013. Our guest of honor, Ashton Palmer, is a local middle-school English teacher and chair of her department. Her teaching career began at the sort of inner-city school that is depicted in the film.

With its deft directing by Richard LaGravernese (who also wrote the screenplay), the film constantly shifts the viewer’s perspective among those of the students, their respective ethnic groups, and that of the teacher. Shifting camera angles from close-ups of individual faces to small groups and fractured crowds create a sense of instability and incoherence that mirrors a major theme of the film: The students’ lives are unstable from many different perspectives—societal, familial, and psychological. Watching this film with a group is a much more powerful emotional experience than viewing it alone. Unconsciously, the group of viewers identifies with the group on the screen, expanding one’s range of empathy for the various subjectivities reflected in the film and the true story it dramatizes.

THE POWER OF ONE

Ashton Palmer commented:

Erin Gruwell’s story is so inspiring because she demonstrates that one person can make an enormous impact on the lives of those who many people think are beyond help and without value. However, her success and the difference she made in the lives of her students came at great personal sacrifice. Erin only teaches at that school for four years, and she lasts only two years teaching ninth and tenth grade, which is where she initially made such a dramatic impact on the lives of her students. Erin discovers the only materials available for her students are tattered copies of low level books, sad materials that symbolize the way the world sees them and how they think of themselves as tattered, “low,” unintelligent, beyond hope. Erin works a second, and then a third job, to provide the materials the students need. Working late hours, she neglects her marriage, which ends in divorce. As inspiring as it is, the film is also a warning to society. We cannot leave students like Erin’s to the Erins of the world because there simply aren’t enough Erins to go around. They get burned out and leave the teaching profession, or keep teaching, with even more problematic results.

Continued on page 16
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Erin looked shocked, overwhelmed, and afraid in her first classes. She perseveres with extraordinary determination and the desire not to fail her father’s altruism. The plot turns and hope appears, ironically, when the teacher discovers a racist drawing depicting one of her African-American students, and Erin angrily compares it to Nazi caricatures of Jews. Erin, a Jew, calls the various gangs in her students’ communities “rank amateurs,” compared to “the biggest gang” in the 20th century, the Nazis.

Her students have never heard of the Holocaust, or of the Nazis who perpetrated it. The honor and respect gang members claim is worthless because it is based on hate, prejudice, and vulnerability. The students suddenly realize they have not reached bottom. Paradoxically, with this unexpected realization, hope is found. Things could be worse. Once there is hope, change is possible.

TILTING THE MIRROR

Comparing their world to that of Hitler’s is effective. She also tilts the mirror so that they can simultaneously see people persecuted just like they are, but even more so—the Jews, well educated, successful, and white, everything the students are not. Discrimination has no racial borders. Sensing the opportunity, Erin buys copies of The Diary of Anne Frank for all her students. The book changes their lives. They can now see both sides, that “sadness comes out as anger. Anger makes the sadness go away. Doing something [acting out the anger] always works.”

Unmourned losses and trauma lead to a threatening abyss of helplessness and depression that is acted out aggressively, including sexually, or by self-medicating with drugs. Sklarew connected another moment in the film with Joseph Noshpitz’s discussion of the negative ego ideal, a central self-destructive dynamic that shapes the lives of those who suffered so much from trauma, abandonment, or neglect.

In closing, Ashton Palmer commented, “Often the suggested answer is to pay teachers more, but teachers aren’t in it for the money. Giving teachers the materials that the students deserve, giving them manageable class sizes and class loads, and staffing schools with enough guidance counselors to support the students would go a long way to preventing good teachers from leaving and preventing effective teachers from becoming ineffective.”

Erin Gruwell continues her inspiring work with the Freedom Writers’ Foundation. The foundation provides a Freedom Writers Institute, an outreach program, and curriculum (www.freedomwritersfoundation.org). Palmer said, “It’s not just writing….it’s transformative education. Through the Freedom Writer methodology students significantly alter their self-images and understandings of society and culture…This is not just education, it is a personal odyssey.”
Kansas City Psychoanalytic Affiliates with Department of Psychiatry

Richard M. Zeitner

In the fall of 2008 the Greater Kansas City Psychoanalytic Institute (GKCPI), at that time an APsaA provisional institute, was faced like many institutes with concerns about its small size, financial limitations, an expensive lease for its headquarters, and the isolation of psychoanalysis from other academic disciplines and institutions. To address these challenges, GKCPI embarked upon a long-range plan to establish a relationship with an institution of higher learning. Considering the practical concerns, as well as the concept that psychoanalysis is not only a clinical discipline but also an academic discipline, I shared my vision with several other members of GKCPI’s Executive Committee that psychoanalysis has a great deal to offer not only to psychotherapy trainees and psychoanalytic candidates but to psychiatric residents, psychology interns, and postdoctoral trainees, as well as to the larger academic world.

Furthermore, I reasoned, GKCPI, a new and not yet fully approved institute must now become more proactive in its mission—a mission to increase the visibility of psychoanalysis and the institute itself, to create an outreach movement, and, most important, to establish an affiliation with an already well-established academic institution like a medical school department of psychiatry with a residency program and a post-doctoral program for psychologists, that could provide a pipeline for trainees to enter psychoanalytic training.

Kansas City, situated on the border of Kansas and Missouri with a metropolitan population of approximately two million, supports three medical schools: the University of Kansas School of Medicine in Kansas City, Kansas (KU); the University of Missouri Kansas City School of Medicine in Kansas City, Missouri (UMKC); and the Kansas City University of Health Sciences, an osteopathic medical college in Missouri. In addition, there are a number of private and public colleges and universities, with the main campus of the University of Kansas in Lawrence 40 miles to the west and the main campus of the University of Missouri in Columbia 125 miles east of the city. While Kansas City is rich in academic resources, these institutions have had limited psychoanalytic interest and teaching.

Historically, it was well known within GKCPI that the University of Kansas Department of Psychiatry had harbored an anti-analytic bias dating back 40 years, when a prominent analyst in Kansas City reluctantly resigned his half-time teaching position at the University of Kansas Medical School because the new chair of the Department of Psychiatry and initiator of the surge of the biological psychiatric movement at KU Med, issued a proclamation that all positions must now be full time. Following the analyst’s resignation no analysts were ever again hired as teaching faculty; it was later inferred that the proclamation had most likely been a ruse, at least partially designed to purge psychoanalysts from the teaching faculty.

ONE PHONE CALL

Interestingly, while the University of Kansas School of Medicine over the years has maintained its biological stronghold, with no analysts on its faculty, the University of Missouri Kansas City has demonstrated an eclecticism in its teaching of residents, psychology interns, and postdoctoral residents. Fortified with this history, and with the support of the GKCPI Executive Committee, I made phone calls to Salomon Alfie and Walter Ricci, training and supervising analysts and senior members of GKCPI, as well as past faculty members of the Department of Psychiatry at UMKC. Both agreed that the possibility of an affiliation was an intriguing venture that might provide a tremendous opportunity for both UMKC and GKCPI. Alfie paved the way for a meeting between Stuart Munro, the chair of psychiatry at UMKC and me, along with Bonnie Buchele, the director of the GKCPI at that time.

A series of meetings subsequently ensued between Munro and me. Importantly and fortuitously, Munro, although not an analyst, had been trained at the University of Virginia when it had a strong analytic presence, which he explained, had remained with him throughout his career as a psychiatric educator. Munro informed me about the history of psychoanalytic contributors and contributions at the Western Missouri Mental Health Center, the former name of the training hospital for residents and postdocs of the University of Missouri Kansas City, now known as the Center for Behavioral Medicine.

Initially, Munro and I were the main enthusiasts for the affiliation. Both of us saw the possibilities, and we were united in principle that psychoanalysis is a clinical discipline that should also be a fundamental tool in both understanding the structure of psychopathology and providing treatment possibilities for...
all forms of mental illness and emotional suffering, whether or not medications or other psychotherapeutic strategies are employed.

A SET OF CONDITIONS

We agreed that certain conditions would have to be met. One, GKCPI would remain an independent institute with its own administration, and not a department or administrative component of either UMKC or the Center for Behavioral Medicine.

Two, the institute would relocate its administrative offices into the Center for Behavioral Medicine where GKCPI would now have the opportunity to collaborate with UMKC psychiatric and psychology faculty and administrative staff. Institute classes would be taught in spacious, well-equipped, and modern classrooms within the Center for Behavioral Medicine, where we would have access to video conferencing equipment, enabling us to participate in distance education throughout the world.

Three, the GKCPI library would have its own section, but housed within the psychiatric library of the Center for Behavioral Medicine.

Four, in turn, institute faculty would provide a series of lectures on psychoanalytic topics over the course of 12 to 20 weeks, one 90-minute weekly session, initially to second-year residents, and eventually to fourth-year psychiatric residents and psychology postdocs. Academic appointments at the level of clinical assistant professor would be awarded to those who taught with consistency (other criteria to be determined). GKCPI would be granted a five-year affiliation agreement with the Center for Behavioral Medicine, with no rent charged to the institute. With such an affiliation, representatives of both groups would continue to meet periodically to insure ongoing communication between the two organizations.

After three years of many discussions, including meetings held within the Center for Behavioral Medicine, the Missouri Department of Mental Health, the University of Missouri Kansas City, and the Greater Kansas City Psychoanalytic Institute, as well as meetings between the Department of Psychiatry, GKCPI, and its attorneys, in June of 2011, the organizations finalized an agreement that was eventually acceptable.

FROM COUNTRY CLUB PLAZA TO HOSPITAL HILL

Throughout the years of negotiations, the decision for GKCPI to affiliate and move its headquarters and teaching venue into the Department of Psychiatry was not at first without internal hesitation and some tensions within and among certain members. Although most were highly enthusiastic and could foresee the benefits, some were reluctant. Many meetings were held, including an all-institute/center retreat where key concerns were raised, discussed, and eventually resolved to the point where the Education Committee of GKCPI could finally put the proposal to a vote.

During these meetings questions were raised, for example, about the implications of affiliating with one medical institution and its effect on candidate recruitment from other training facilities and universities. Others were concerned about affiliating so closely with psychiatry and the implications for psychologist, counselor, and social work candidacy recruitment. And finally, there were some who were concerned about moving the institute’s home from the prestigious, albeit expensive, Country Club Plaza where the institute had been housed for several years into a medical school psychiatric facility located in an area of the city known as “hospital hill,” an area less glamorous and less logistically accessible. Nonetheless, eventually the advantages of affiliating with a medical school department of psychiatry that highly valued psychoanalysis as a discipline, a profession, and a fundamental teaching tool eventually held sway over other issues. The Education Committee finally voted overwhelmingly in favor of the affiliation and the relocation of the institute.

After a year and a half, although the affiliation is still young, both groups, the Greater Kansas City Psychoanalytic Institute, now a fully approved APsaA institute, and the Department of Psychiatry of the University of Missouri Kansas City agree that the affiliation has been working well. The financial advantage for GKCPI is significant, and the institute has established a new home that has afforded other advantages.

The institute is now poised to establish academic connections with other departments within the university system. As director of GKCPI, I have recently appointed a chairperson within the institute to establish a Committee for Medical School and University Relations for the purpose of establishing other potential routes for analytic teaching or consultation with other departments within the University of Missouri educational system, including arts and sciences, as well as the UMKC School of Law and the College of Dentistry.

Although it is too early to provide a progress report, it is noteworthy that during this past year the number of inquiries into psychoanalytic and psychotherapeutic training at GKCPI has substantially increased. Furthermore, GKCPI has admitted a new class of eight candidates, a combination of psychoanalytic and psychotherapeutic candidates in a pilot program to combine psychotherapy and psychoanalytic didactic training for the first two years. We look forward to writing a positive report after more time has passed for GKCPI to continue its evaluation of the advantages and/or disadvantages of the affiliation between a psychoanalytic institute and a medical university.
Social Media for Psychoanalysts: Look Before You Leap

Stephanie Newman

Psychoanalysts who use social media must navigate unfamiliar and difficult terrain. Public electronic communications can breed intense transfers and exert pressure on professional boundaries. Analysts should be aware of the potential for conflicts, boundary issues, and tensions between public and clinical personae.

TWITTER 101

I will confine my remarks to Twitter, which has come to be used with some frequency by organizations such as the American Psychoanalytic Association @apsafeed, the Division of Psychoanalysis of the American Psychological Association (APA Division 39), the New York State Psychological Association (NYSPA), by several analytic institutes, and by a growing number of clinicians in private practice. For those who don’t already know, here is how it works: Anyone can open an account. Users write a short descriptive paragraph and pair it with a photo or avatar. Tweets are similar to e-mail except they are limited to 140 characters, and most importantly, they are not private; anyone who follows an account can view a user’s messages. Tweets can be directed to a particular environment by using a “hashtag,” the designated symbol “#,” followed by the desired electronic location (for example, #psychoanalysis).

But that is just the nuts and bolts; it does not explain why analysts might want to use social media—especially since engaging in public interactions seems to contradict the private nature of our practice. Despite their apparent risks, the sites do have some benefits. They offer a way to reach many people very quickly, build networks, serve as potential sources of referrals, and they provide a means of promoting publications and boosting one’s professional image. Of course, social media situations can also present challenges to the analyst’s maintenance of a professional role and demeanor. What an analyst says and does potentially affects both individuals encountered on Twitter and patients treated in private practice. What works in one setting does not necessarily work in the other.

Traditional standards of practice do not delineate how the analyst should interact on Twitter. If we are trained to listen, and listen deeply, for remnants of what has gone on in the past, to tune into how its artifacts remain alive in the present, and to pay attention to whatever might be going on in the room at any given moment with a patient, that is certainly not how we engage on Twitter: Helping others to develop insight into their psychologies and come to a place of acceptance of all aspects of the self is often a jointly held goal in work with patients, and our interactions reflect this mutual expectation and clinical arrangement. But what must we do, for example, when approached for advice or counsel, or when confronted publicly with an electronic acquaintance’s feelings via social networks?

Is it acceptable to be playful in a public forum? Do we seem cavalier if we discuss mental health issues at all, and does public discourse about weighty matters open up a Pandora’s box of potential harm to patients and the public? What happens when people ask us for advice or help; how should we respond in a public forum? And how should we hear complaints? I will offer some guidelines, but first, a note about transfers and that may arise when acquaintances interact via social media.

TWITTER AND TRANSFERENCE

To define “transference,” I borrow from Willie Hoffer’s 1956 article on “Transference and Transference Neurosis.”

The term transference refers to the generally agreed fact that people when entering into any form of object-relationship…transfer upon their objects those images which they encountered in the course of previous infantile experiences…

The term transference, stressing an aspect of the influence our childhood has on our life as a whole, thus refers to those observations in which people in their contacts with objects, which may be real or imaginary, positive, negative, or ambivalent, transfer their memories of significant previous experiences and thus “change the reality” of their objects, invest them with qualities from the past.

On Twitter I am frequently invested with qualities from the past in ways Hoffer could never have envisioned in 1956. I am sometimes approached by people who are apparently in treatment with other mental health professionals, many of whom seek to play something out or push the envelope with me. For example, recently a woman tweeted in the middle of the night asking for advice about a troubled relationship. I suspected she was enacting with me a fantasy of having a 24/7 caregiver; a mother with ever-flowing milk. I did not answer (especially not in the middle of the night). But her request gave me pause.

Continued on page 20

Stephanie Newman Ph.D., is a faculty member at IPE, the author of Mad Men on the Couch: Analyzing the Minds of the Men and Women of the Hit TV Show, and co-editor of Money Talks: In Therapy, Society, and Life.
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As I thought about how to respond, it seemed clear that my usual ways of comporting myself with patients did not seem to govern my interactions on Twitter. In the consulting room I listen in the here and now for the transference, past and present, and its derivatives as a way to understand unconscious fantasy and work towards increased insight into and acceptance of all parts of the self. But on Twitter I am at a loss. In this example described above, someone was communicating something to me, but I was not her analyst or therapist. I was not in a position to do clinical work with her. Nor am I able to be in constant contact with my followers on Twitter. When this woman attempted to get in touch, I wanted to set a respectful limit and show empathy, while remaining professional. But, all of that was easier said than done.

The challenge of dealing publicly with those who have not engaged my services but have displayed some need for me seems a millennial permutation of Hans Loewald’s 1960 formulation, taken loosely, about patients using the object in a different way. Some might want something from me, even if I cannot give it to them or analyze their wishes. So, I had to deal with being a new object by crafting the persona of a psychoanalyst on Twitter—and if that were not difficult enough, I had to make it up as I went along.

In the example just given, I could see that the woman who wrote asking for relationship guidance was in emotional pain and needed to talk to someone. While I would normally have interpreted a late night phone call from a patient, I was not in a therapeutic relationship with this individual. At some point the following day, I tweeted that I could not give advice over the Internet and asked if she had a therapist. Not surprisingly, she did, and she noted that she had already made an appointment. There have been no more late night tweets or requests for advice from her.

As this vignette illustrates, it is sometimes difficult to know exactly how to respond when social media acquaintances communicate in ways that might be meaningful in treatment but might represent harmless interactions outside of the consulting room. One challenge of being a psychoanalyst on Twitter is to figure out how to retain a professional demeanor but not act intrusively or callously. In other words how to engage in an authentic manner without making interpretations or doing harm by hurting feelings, causing offense, or giving specific advice.

I have come up with the following guidelines for myself and other psychoanalysts and psychotherapists who use social media networks:

- I do not tweet with my patients.
- I do not discuss clinical issues in a public forum, nor do I offer advice on Twitter or any similar outlet; rather, I suggest making contact with a licensed mental health professional.
- When people I encounter on Twitter ask personal questions, I do not give information about myself, my family, or my private life.

When this woman attempted to get in touch, I wanted to set a respectful limit and show empathy, while remaining professional. But, all of that was easier said than done.

- I am careful never to criticize or mock those with emotional problems. While this sounds obvious, social media and snark go hand in hand; many who use social networks adopt irreverent personae, and may do so in good fun.
- When composing a tweet (or writing for any publication, especially those read online), I ask myself: Would I be comfortable if a patient or a colleague read this?

EFFECT ON PATIENTS

The problem of how analysts should interact is not just limited to encounters on Twitter. It is hard to know what, if any, possible spillover effects might be experienced by actual patients whose analysts use social media.

In her seminal book, Writing about Patients, Judy Kantrowitz cautions that the most important thing for the analyst is to have put on Twitter—though I expect my personal comfort level and guidelines will continue to be challenged as new situations arise. When they do, I will act as I have always done: attempt to analyze and understand what it all means to the patient.

If only it could be as simple as it sounds. As for what I Tweet about and how that comes across: My comments are largely confined to topics of general interest, such as teens’ reliance on technology or the psychology of fictional characters. Sometimes I pass along news stories or articles of note. And, I do that in a light way, always using a respectful tone. I try to maintain the persona of a kind, well-intentioned, and empathic analyst who adheres to a professional demeanor and boundaries. I try to write as though I were giving a talk to other professionals or to persons in the community.

Continued on page 21
Given the tensions and difficulties I have discussed, it seems clear that many analysts and other mental health professionals will continue to shy away from social media avenues and will remain skeptical about how to best use them. It is not always easy or straightforward, but it can be done. Twitter can be a useful tool for those wishing to build a practice, expand referral networks, or promote academic and other kinds of writing. The trick is to figure out how to best navigate its murky waters.

I would like to thank Claudia Lament and Rita Clark for reading and providing helpful suggestions about the content and scope of this article.
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Family Practitioner’s Sexual Relationship with Patient May Be Malpractice

John C. West

FACTS
Kristin Dupree sought treatment from James Giugliano, a family medicine specialist for, among other things, depression and panic attacks, starting in January 2000. He prescribed medication and also engaged in “talk therapy” with Dupree. He referred her to a psychiatrist, but she did not immediately act on the referral. In June 2001, while she was still a patient of Giugliano’s, the two of them entered into a consensual sexual relationship, which lasted for approximately nine months. The affair ended by mutual consent. Dupree would later admit that the affair had not been part of her therapy.

She had, at some point, entered into therapy with the psychiatrist that Giugliano recommended, but did not tell him about the affair. Dupree did later tell her husband about the affair, and her marriage ended in divorce. Dupree alleged she suffered psychological injury as a result of the affair.

Dupree filed suit against Giugliano for medical malpractice. The suit went to trial and she received a verdict for civil damages of $334,000; the jury found that Giugliano was at fault for 75 percent of the damages. The jury also awarded Dupree $166,000 in punitive damages, for a total award of $416,500. Giugliano appealed the verdict of the trial court.

ANALYSIS
The Appellate Division noted that the rule in New York is that a physician may only be liable for medical malpractice for acts or omissions that occur within the course of medical practice. It noted that there is an exception to this rule for mental health therapists: A mental health therapist can be held liable for engaging in a sexual relationship with a patient, whether or not the sexual relationship was part of the treatment regimen. In this case, although Giugliano was not technically or certified as a mental health therapist, since he engaged in “talk therapy,” a form of mental health therapy, he assumed the role of mental health therapist for the purposes of medical malpractice liability.

Accordingly, the court affirmed the jury verdict in Dupree’s favor.

RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS
Sexual relationships between mental health practitioners and their patients are particularly problematic. The relationship between mental health practitioner and patient is not an equal relationship. The practitioner is dominant by virtue of role, education, and status, and potentially capable of exerting undue influence on the patient. Thus, it is widely accepted that a sexual relationship between a mental health practitioner and his/her patient is inappropriate because it cannot truly be consensual. Indeed, this has been the basis for successful civil lawsuits as well as license revocations. While transference and countertransference may be regularly encountered in therapy, the clinician must manage these phenomena carefully.

The American Medical Association has stated:

If a physician has reason to believe that nonsexual contact with a patient may be perceived as or may lead to sexual contact, then he or she should avoid the nonsexual contact. At a minimum, a physician’s ethical duties include terminating the physician-patient relationship before initiating a dating, romantic, or sexual relationship with a patient. Sexual or romantic relationships between a physician and a former patient may be unduly influenced by the previous physician-patient relationship. Sexual or romantic relationships with former patients are unethical if the physician uses or exploits trust, knowledge, emotions, or influence derived from the previous professional relationship.


This case reinforces the need for careful consideration of boundary issues when treating patients with mental health issues to avoid any impropriety. Even if the therapist believes that there is no mental health practitioner-patient relationship, there still may be such a relationship for the purposes of malpractice. Many states have specific guidelines regarding the engaging in social relationships with patients, including the length of time that is required for a “cooling off” period after the termination of the provider-patient relationship. The failure to follow any such state guidelines or the guidelines of the AMA can lead to liability.

Dupree v. Giugliano,
2011 NY Slip Op. 06471,
87 A. D. 3d 975 (NY App. Div. 2011)
I reported in the previous edition of TAP (47/1) that APsaA counsel, Jim Pyles, successfully lobbied for the inclusion of the following in the HIPAA/HITECH Omnibus Rule, “Final Rule, section 164.5229(a)(1)(vi): “A covered entity must agree to the request of an individual to restrict disclosure” of personal health information to a health plan if the individual “has paid the covered entity in full.” This regulation implements a similar statutory provision that APsaA worked with Congressman Ed Markey (D-MA) to be included in the HITECH Act (2009).

This means that covered entities, including mental health practitioners under HIPAA, can protect their patients’ right to privacy, excluding Medicare patients, and have a right to pay privately for treatment without running afoul of federal regulations. It also means that any electronic health information system on a national level must have the capability to honor a patient’s wishes about privacy with respect to information about a health care service. APsaA will have to fight hard to maintain this ground, because technology vendors and a number of mental health groups are arguing that this provision will unduly delay the implementation of a national health IT system. Hence, these groups are trying to get the right to pay privately weakened or removed before the compliance date of the Final Rule on September 23, 2013.

In addition to assuring protection of the therapist-patient relationship, Pyles has indicated that the organization was successful in obtaining several significant refinements of the Final Rule. The Final Rule eliminates a “harm standard” that was in the Interim Final Rule, (2009). That standard allowed covered entities to avoid notifying the patients and HHS of breaches if they concluded that the breach was unlikely to cause patients “harm.” Under the revised rule, it is likely that fewer breaches will go unreported.

The Final Rule underscores that psychotherapy notes can only be disclosed (absent a requirement in law) with the authorization of the patient. It also provides that authorizations for disclosure of psychotherapy notes cannot be combined with authorizations for disclosure of other types of health information for treatment and research. Additionally, APsaA argued that privacy protections in HIPAA should extend beyond 50 years. The Final Rule retains the 50-year limitation on HIPAA privacy protections, but provides that protections over a longer period of time can be provided by states and by “the professional responsibilities of mental health or other providers.” The continued deference to professional ethics under HIPAA allows professional organizations, like APsaA, to uphold principles necessary to the practice of our profession.

CLASS-ACTION SUIT AGAINST IRS

A recent case that illustrates the dangers of breaches involves the Internal Revenue Service. A class-action suit filed by John Doe Company against 15 John Doe IRS agents by
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Robert E. Barnes on March 11, 2011, alleges that IRS agents illegally confiscated the medical records of 10 million patients, of which one million were California patients, including “intimate medical records of every state judge in California.” Plaintiffs, who are covered entities, maintain that the IRS did this without a search warrant, without a subpoena, and against HIPAA regulations. The IRS allegedly maintains possession of these records to this day. This class action seeks $25,000 in compensatory damages and punitive damages for each patient whose record was breached. A request has been made “to protect the private proprietary and privileged information of the medical records seized,” and compelling the IRS to return all removed records.

Jim Pyles, on behalf of APsaA, defends confidentiality of our patients and has successfully advocated for both patients and clinicians who contract privately; Robert E. Barnes, counsel for plaintiffs, has filed a class-action suit against the IRS for wrongfully breaching and confiscating medical records; and yet another attorney, Meiram Bendat, has filed a class-action suit involving questions of parity. As many know, besides being an attorney, Bendat is a psychoanalyst and a contributing member of CGRI. These lawyers have been courageous and successful in fighting for principles that are basic to our rights as patients and clinicians.

CLASS-ACTION SUIT AGAINST INSURANCE COMPANIES

Bendat, founder of Psych-Appeal, recently filed a nationwide class-action complaint against United Healthcare (including United Behavioral Health and OptumHealth) in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (Manhattan) on behalf of the New York State Psychiatric Association and employees of The State University of New York, CBS, and SYSCO.

New York State Psychiatric Association vs. United Health Group alleges mass violations of state and federal anti-discrimination laws protecting the rights of most, if not all, of United’s beneficiaries throughout the country. There are over one million United Healthcare subscribers of the Empire Plan, covering New York State employees and their dependents; and that number is dwarfed by beneficiaries receiving benefits through private employers who contract with United. This insurer covers an astounding 70 million patients, 25 percent of all insured patients in our country.

Bendat announced:

The class-action suit alleges violations of the Paul Wellstone and Pete Domenici Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act of 2008 (MHPAEA), as well as New York’s Timothy’s Law and California’s Mental Health Parity Act, requiring insurers to administer and reimburse mental health and substance abuse benefits in parity with medical/surgical benefits. The suit further alleges class-wide violations of the Affordable Care Act that requires insurers to adjudicate claims fully and fairly, provide for independent appeals, and ensure continued payment for treatment pending appeals. Further, the suit alleges class-wide unlawful and deceptive business practices by United in New York and California.

Bendat advocates for dialogue about access to mental health treatment and “rampant abuses of the insurance industry’s most disenfranchised subscribers.”

Over the next year there will be promising opportunities to influence health care policies and the law with regard to private practice, confidentiality, and parity enforcement. CGRI will keep APsaA members informed about these events and invites your participation.

To review Bendat’s complaint to the United States District Court Southern District of New York:


To report unfair denials of care and possible parity violations, American Psychiatric Association members can go to:

APAMemberparityviolations@psych.org

Non-APA APsaA members can go to:

NonMemberparityviolations@psych.org
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January 27, 2013

Irwin H. Marill, M.D.
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William Kingsley
Weatherly, Jr., M.D.
August 5, 2012

Thomas S. Szasz, M.D.
September 8, 2012

Hugo J. Zee, M.D.
August 23, 2012

Leon Wallace, M.D.
January 24, 2010

Joan J. Zilbach, M.D.
November 1, 2010
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From the Unconscious

Sheri Butler Hunt

This poem was written by Oscar Romero, training and supervising analyst at the Seattle Psychoanalytic Society and Institute, as a tribute to comrade and fellow analyst, Robert Prosser. Bob was an enthusiastic outdoorsman and mountaineer, and we lost him in a tragic climbing accident on January 13, 2013. He was passionate about his work in both adult and child analysis, and he is deeply missed.

The poem embodies the warm embrace in which our institute holds our memories of Bob and our profound sadness at losing him. The title of the poem, He said, “I guess I did,” is a reference to Bob’s humble response when a colleague congratulated him on receiving credit for a child psychoanalytic case just a few days prior to his death. We feel grateful to have had Bob Prosser as part of our lives and our institute, and mourn his loss.

He said, “I guess I did”

To Bob Prosser
In Memoriam

He drank the nectar of the gods on the rocks
Icy roads melted under his warm foot
Not this time
Nature,
Hear my protest
Why so cruel with one of your best children?
Bob
Yes, you did
Thanks for staying with us
With your shy smile,
For playing with us in our internal worlds…
Forever
Gracias, Bob
Thank you, friend

—Oscar Romero

Sheri Butler Hunt, M.D., is an adult training and consulting analyst and a child supervising analyst in the child division at the Seattle Psychoanalytic Society and Institute. A published poet and member of TAP’s editorial board, she welcomes readers’ comments, suggestions, and poetry submissions at annseattle1@gmail.com.
Silence Is Not an Option
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eye—is identified in the book as the most prevalent current form of climate change denial. I think the disavowal operates in similar ways to how white South Africans distanced themselves from knowing about the apartheid regime and their collusion with it. The issue is how to remain undisturbed by a way of life that deep down one knows is unsustainable and morally wrong. Fudge the arithmetic? Shift the blame? Paint a rosier picture? All of these and more?

But bringing in morality may also, in Karpf’s imagery, blow a fuse that can trip our mental circuitry as it stirs feelings of anxiety, guilt, and shame. Which of us wants to see ourselves as colluding with something destructive to life itself? A key psychoanalytic point is that with disavowal the more we push reality to the eye—is identified in the book as the most prevalent current form of climate change denial. I think the disavowal operates in similar ways to how white South Africans distanced themselves from knowing about the apartheid regime and their collusion with it. The issue is how to remain undisturbed by a way of life that deep down one knows is unsustainable and morally wrong. Fudge the arithmetic? Shift the blame? Paint a rosier picture? All of these and more?

But bringing in morality may also, in Karpf’s imagery, blow a fuse that can trip our mental circuitry as it stirs feelings of anxiety, guilt, and shame. Which of us wants to see ourselves as colluding with something destructive to life itself? A key psychoanalytic point is that with disavowal the more we push reality to the margins the more our underlying anxieties about survival, about guilt, of both depressive and paranoid schizophrenic kinds, build up, leading us potentially to resort to further disavowal. As I argue in a chapter in the book on our anxieties about climate change, disavowal defends against anxieties but also exacerbates them.

A chapter by Paul Hoggett goes into how our disavowal of climate change is best understood not in individual terms but as part of a perverse culture of disavowal, one that is organized, underpinned by instrumental values, and based on fraudulent and “as if” thinking. Disavowal within a perverse culture enables people to split off their compassion and concern and remain morally undisturbed by this. It enables people not to count the true cost of their actions. An example of “as if” thinking on climate change discussed by Hoggett is the way governments set targets for carbon emissions they have little intention of keeping to. Hoggett draws on psychoanalytic ideas on perverse organizations and on Susan Long’s 2008 analysis of Enron as a perverse organization in making his case.

John Steiner in his discussion of Hoggett’s paper says it left him feeling depressed. He situates his depression within a Kleinian framework as the realization that our attempts to protect what we love have been too feeble and that we are faced with real damage. He argues for knowing as much as possible about the perverse culture and our collusion with it. As psychoanalysts, we are well placed to help people think about what internal factors may fuel the disavowal.

It is as individuals that we suffer when we face the truth about climate change, particularly with how to keep a sense of proportion about how much we individually are to blame. A chapter by Renee Lertzman argues our apparent apathy is less a sign of our not caring about environmental damage and more of our caring too much and of our being in a state that might be diagnosed as suffering a collective underlying environmental melancholia. As psychoanalysts we know that in melancholic states we can be stuck in “a pass the parcel” between “none of my fault” and “all my fault,” where a sense of proportion, of ordinary mea culpa, may be lost.

The awful legacy of the perverse culture and of denialism (the active, often industry funded, sowing of obfuscation and doubt in the mainstream media) is that in offering such support to our disavowal, its underlying aim, it fosters conditions that make it more and more difficult for us to bear the truth about climate change. However, for psychic well-being and emotional resilience as well as literal survival, we cannot do without the truth.

As we become less able to remain undisturbed by mounting evidence of climate change, we may succumb to fatalistic propaganda that it is all too late—another possible blowing of Karpf’s emotional fuse—and end up feeling hopeless, concluding we might as well now adjust to the new tough situation of climate instability while carrying on with perverse business as usual. More disavowal. It is true that it is by now too late to prevent significant damage. It has happened. But it is not too late to take action to mitigate further damage, and this could make all the difference to our lives and the lives of our children and their children.

As psychoanalysts, we have vital know-how and a unique perspective to offer about many aspects of our response to climate change. This includes our difficulty in accepting damage we are implicated in, particularly when it is irreparable; how excessive guilt makes repair difficult, and how this can lead us, worryingly, to attempts at manic restitution rather than making real but limited repairs.

We know that to bear profoundly difficult truths, we need nonjudgmental understanding, support, and containment of anxiety. With climate change we need this support from our community leaders. And, here we run up against a further problem. Most research on how to communicate about climate change used by policymakers bypasses people altogether, people, that is, conflict driven and ambivalent, and with interiority, mind, subjective experience, hopes, anxieties, and moral quandaries. Most studies have focused only on behavior and on opinion polls. Psychoanalysis can be ignored because its findings cannot be easily measured, and it is in this context that to find a paper on anxiety cited in Nature Climate Change is so heartening.

I will end on another optimistic note. In November 2012 the Energy Unit at University College London sponsored a lecture by Renee Lertzman on the importance of a psychoanalytic perspective on communicating about climate science. The audience of mainly climate scientists, human geographers, and meteorologists nearly filled the 350-seat hall. People are listening and are open to what we have to say.
Psychopolitical Journey

Continued from page 9

Groups and to consider large-group psychology in its own right. What does this mean? There are echoes of individual psychology in large-group psychology shared by tens of thousands or millions of persons, but large groups do not have one brain to think with or two eyes to cry. The multitudes of people in a large group share a psychological journey, such as complicated mourning after major shared losses at the hand of the Other, or when they use the same psychological mechanism such as “externalization,” making the Other a shared target. These journeys become sustained social, cultural, political, or ideological processes that are specific for the large group under study.

Considering large-group psychology in its own right means making formulations as to a large group’s conscious and unconscious shared psychological experiences and motivations that initiate specific social, cultural, political, or ideological processes that influence this large group’s internal and external affairs. This is the same process psychoanalysts follow in their clinical practice when they make formulations about the internal worlds of their patients in order to summarize what their diagnoses and treatments will be.

One example: Complications of shared mourning of the many members of a large group may create what I call entitlement ideologies. This refers to a shared sense of entitlement to recover what was lost in reality and fantasy during a collective trauma at the hand of the Other. Entitlement ideologies can also refer to the mythologized birth of a large group, a process that later generations idealize. Later generations deny the difficulties and losses that had occurred at the time, and imagine their large group as if it were composed of persons belonging to a superior species. Holding on to an entitlement ideology primarily reflects a complication in large-group mourning, an attempt both to deny losses as well as a wish to recover them, a narcissistic reorganization accompanied by “bad” prejudice toward the Other.

Each large group’s entitlement ideology is specific. Some entitlement ideologies are specifically named in the literature: what Italians call “irredentism” (related to Italia Irredenta), what Greeks call “Megali Idea” (Great Idea), the Turks’ “Pan-Turanism,” the Serbs’ “Christoslavism,” and what extreme religious Islamists of today call “the return of an Islamic Empire.” The American entitlement ideology, usually called “American exceptionalism,” was inflamed after September 11, 2001. Such ideologies may last for centuries and may disappear and reappear when historical circumstances change.

Like an individual reactivating childhood traumas in his or her regression, during its disorganization following a current tragic event at the hand of the Other, members of a large group reactivate the shared mental representation of a specific ancestral trauma at the hand of the Other—what I call a “chosen trauma.” This exaggerates the large-group’s entitlement ideology and may lead to new tragedies.

There are echoes of individual psychology in large-group psychology shared by tens of thousands or millions of persons, but large groups do not have one brain to think with or two eyes to cry.

For example, after the collapse of the former Yugoslavia, the Serbian chosen trauma, the centuries-old shared mental representation of the Battle of Kosovo, was reactivated and was linked to Christoslavism. Reactivation creates a time collapse: when feelings, thoughts, and perceptions about ancestors’ trauma become intertwined with feelings, thoughts, and perceptions of current issues, magnifying danger and even leading to genocidal acts.

EXPANDING THE FREUDIAN CONCEPT

I began to think of the classical Freudian theory of large groups by visualizing people arranged around a gigantic maypole, which represents the group leader. Individuals in the large group dance around the pole/leader, identifying with each other and idealizing and supporting the leader. I have expanded this metaphor by imagining a canvas extending from the pole over tens of thousands or millions of people, forming a kind of gigantic tent. In this revised metaphor, the people still surround the pole/leader and support it—especially when there is a conflict with those living under another tent—determined to keep it upright, but their underlying concern is to keep the canvas taut so it can form a protective overarching cover.

The cloth of the canvas of this metaphorical tent represents large-group identity and its border.

I have come to the conclusion that essential large-group activities center around maintaining the shared narcissistic investment in the large-group’s identity and its integrity, but leader-follower interactions are only one element of this effort. Wars, war-like situations, terrorism, diplomatic efforts,
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drive for security, “animal spirits,” and the like. He thereby sought to draw a line between macroeconomic (governmental) processes, which we could collectively manage, and market forces, whose driven character we had best respect. Keynes brought rationality and planning into economics by demonstrating their limits. In the long run, I do not think it is possible to have a serious discussion of the world’s economic problems without including a similarly robust sense of depth psychology.

The conditions of human life have been transformed by the role of images. The philosopher Theodor Adorno called mass culture “psychoanalysis in reverse,” meaning that instead of interpreting our dreams we were living them out. Psychoanalysis has a useful concept that can help us understand this: narcissism. We live in a time marked by a great validation of narcissistic urges and drives, and we need a language that can help us evaluate what is positive and what is negative in this shift.

In earlier times this language came from religion and from political philosophy, but this is no longer enough due to the psychological revolution of the 20th century, which I have termed the rise of personal life. Since the ‘60s, cognitive psychology, neuroscience, brain physiology, artificial intelligence, the behavioral sciences and so forth have been put forth to fill this need, but there is a difference between the neurological unconscious and the unconscious mind. Because of that difference, we need a psychology that is our psychology, one that speaks to the modern individual’s need for subjective self-expression and self-knowledge, and not just external, objective, natural sciences.

Fundamentalism offers a third example of a subject that would benefit from psychoanalytic understanding. One thing that made Freud compelling was that psychoanalysis spoke to the irrationality of fascism in a way that few other disciplines could. Today we see again the rise of great fundamentalist religions, in Judaism, Christianity, Islam, and Hinduism, but also in such forms as market dogmatism, scientific reductionism, and political correctness.

While there are important non-analytic concepts, such as charisma and the sacred, to discuss these phenomena, psychoanalysis adds something extra: the analytic attitude, by which I mean the capacity to look at one’s own experiences objectively, without moral judgment, at least in the first instance. The hope is that the encouragement that psychoanalysis gives to individuals to be reflective and non-defensive, may eventually translate into democratic public culture as well.

Psychopolitical Journey
Continued from page 29

As I write this brief paper my new book, “Enemies on the Couch: A Psychopolitical Journey Through War and Peace,” is ready to be published. My hope is that it will interest psychoanalytic colleagues in finding ways to investigate world affairs further. The future of psychoanalysis, its value and influence, I am convinced, will be supported significantly if psychoanalysts contribute more to large-group psychology in its own right and their findings become crucial in understanding the new civilization that is being ushered in through modern globalization and incredible communication technology.

Tens of thousands or millions of individuals sharing a metaphorical garment are analogous to individuals who are not constantly aware of their breathing; but if they find themselves in a smoke-filled room or develop pneumonia, they notice every breath they take. Similarly, when a large group is under stress and the large-group identity is injured or threatened or when a large-group kills in the name of identity, the people who belong to such large groups become keenly aware of their “we-ness” and quickly and definitively separate their large-group identity from the identity of the Other, the “enemy” large group. Under certain circumstances many individuals behave not according to their individualized personality organizations, but according to the influence of their large-group psychology. This is often just as true of those who come to negotiation tables and face enemy representatives as it is of ordinary people on the street. It is also true for terrorists.

...we need a psychology that is our psychology, one that speaks to the modern individual’s need for subjective self-expression and self-knowledge, and not just external, objective, natural sciences.

Editor’s Note:
Volkan’s new book Enemies on the Couch: A Psychopolitical Journey Through War and Peace, can be pre-ordered at www.amazon.com as this issue goes to press.
What relation does analytic attitude or an analytic culture have to politics? Certainly, there is good reason to protect the idea of the analyst’s “neutrality,” when it comes to respecting the autonomy of the individual in analytic practice. But this is not to say that the field of psychotherapy is “apolitical,” as we have learned from the successes of bringing feminism, gay liberation, multiculturalism, awareness of poverty, internal democracy, and the like into psychoanalytic education and training, as well as into theoretical investigation.

There are also cases where analysts cannot avoid taking a political stand. In 1933 Freud exclaimed “Free me from [Wilhelm] Reich,” because Reich wanted to organize sex-clinics against the Nazis, and Freud feared this endangered the psychoanalytic institutes. I regard Reich as a hero for seeing the need to organize against the Nazis, and I see a tragic flaw in Freud for his deluded hope that psychoanalysis could survive in Nazi Germany, even after the expulsion of the Jewish analysts. This is, of course, an extreme case, but there are many other examples of the involvement of analysts with politics.

The sad truth, in fact, is that when one studies the matter historically, analysts have collaborated with fascist, authoritarian, and other repressive regimes far more than with insurgent and leftist movements. Yet the psychoanalytic engagement with the left has produced great classics, such as Frantz Fanon’s *Black Skin, White Masks* (1952), and Juliet Mitchell’s *Psychoanalysis and Feminism* (1974), whereas the collaboration of psychoanalysts with McCarthyism or with the dictators in Latin America has produced only regrets.

**Marginalization**

This brings us to our final question: Given the role that psychoanalysis played in the 20th century public sphere, how did it come to be marginalized? This is a profound and complex problem, with roots in the ’60s. To begin with, there was an underlying problem in psychoanalysis, namely that it often did not work as a method of treatment. In Freud’s day this was a problem addressed within analysis itself, above all through the development of ego psychology. However, with the emigration to the United States, and with the general crisis of World War II, American analysts claimed to possess a “true” science, based on experiment and prediction, and created a defensive, ultra-authoritarian and sexist culture to protect it. As a result, psychoanalysis was already in decline when the attacks by the New Left and by feminists and advocates of gay liberation occurred in the early ’70s.

We can understand the effect of those attacks under three rubrics: the sense in which they preserved psychoanalysis, the sense in which they negated psychoanalysis, and the sense in which they transcended psychoanalysis or, as I believe, failed to do so. As I think is widely recognized now, feminism, gay liberation, and the emancipatory culture of the ’60s in general saved American psychoanalysis by encouraging a less authoritarian and more democratic culture, and by encouraging a more enlightened view of both gender and homosexuality, subjects at the center of psychoanalysis. One can only welcome the modesty and respect that contemporary analysts show their patients, when compared to the old-world authoritarianism of classical Freudianism.

At the same time, the attacks negated psychoanalysis insofar as they substituted a sociological and political account for the study of the unconscious. Whereas classical psychoanalysis understood bisexuality as ambivalence over sexual object choice, today’s meaning has shifted to a choice to sleep with both sexes. Whereas homosexuality meant a sexual current common to both sexes, today it refers to an identity derived from the choice of an object. Likewise gender, a sociological concept based on power differential, has largely displaced the analytic focus on the psychology of sexual difference. More generally, the quality of “distance” that made classical psychoanalysis problematic also enabled the creation of a scientific discipline based on the study of the unconscious, distinct from its social and political surround.

The upheavals of the ’60s and ’70s, however, did not make possible the transcendence of the older analytic model, in the sense of creating a new model and a new culture that preserved what was strong while overcoming what was weak. The reason for this failure is that neither of the two main forces contending for psychoanalysis in the ’70s actually grasped the value of the idea of the unconscious at the depth required to mount an effective defense. On the one hand, the feminists held that Freud was an arch-sexist, whereas they were emancipated on the sexual question, while on the other hand, the old-line analysts held that Freud had a pre-professional, personalistic attitude to psychoanalysis, which American medicine and scientific norms transcended.

Both groups were much more interested in explaining how far they had advanced beyond Freud than in explaining what they had taken from him. As a result, the defenders of the analytic tradition opened the path for today’s redefinition of psychological problems as behavioral problems to be understood in terms of “results-oriented” research and, its kissing cousin, neoliberal cost accounting, as well as for the utterly benighted and tendentious view of Freud and of analysis, which remains predominant in the public sphere today, although it is so untenable that it is probably finally crumbling.

In the end, the place of psychoanalysis in the public sphere can only be discussed in the context of a broad sense of the overall historical situation. What made the Freudian moment so indelible was the widespread sense of crisis and decline that characterized the ’20s and ’30s, along with the powerful hopes for leftist reform and revolution. Similarly the reduction of psychoanalysis to neurobiology and pharmacology in the ’70s was part of a larger neoliberal counterrevolution that included the return to neoclassical economics, the rational choice revolution in political science and sociology, and the postmodern attack on subjectivity. If, as seems likely today, history sees a revival of radical thought, it is also likely that an understanding of the unconscious, and of the power of resistance, will also return to public debate.

**Editor’s Note:**

Eli Zaretsky’s forthcoming work is tentatively entitled *Political Freud.*
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