Maintaining a Psychodynamic Perspective in Psychiatry

Jack D. Barchas

As a neurobiologist who was never formally associated with psychoanalysis, I have always had great respect for those who write, teach, and practice or utilize the discipline. From the start of my interest in psychiatry to the present day, I have been encouraged, mentored, and influenced by psychoanalysts at a personal level and such facilitation has continued in my research and administrative roles, as well as in friendships.

EARLY ATTRACTION TO PSYCHIATRY AND RESEARCH

When I was about 16 and told my parents I was interested in psychiatry, my father, a litigator whose avocation was the history of science and ideas, arranged for me to meet one of his friends, a psychoanalyst who practiced in Los Angeles. That gentleman took me to a lovely small French restaurant in Beverly Hills—my first experience with both psychiatry and such a restaurant. Quite dramatic on both counts. He described his palpable enjoyment and satisfaction being in the profession. Even then I knew my personal interests were in biological areas and he encouraged that approach as well. It was a perfect evening.

After completing Pomona College in three years, I spent a year at UCLA working as a research assistant for James Olds, a social psychologist who, in a remarkable burst of creative experimentation, discovered the neurobiological reward system of the brain in the early 1950s. His work is now recognized as one of the great discoveries in neurobiology of the past half century.

As one of his earliest assistants, I implanted electrodes into the brains of animals that would receive small doses of electricity in a Skinner box setup. By applying such stimuli to areas of the brain, he delineated the reward system. Animals would press the bar hundreds or thousands of times throughout the 24-hour cycle for the reward, which took precedence over essentially all functions. My first publication was an abstract on the 24-hour cycle. His work is now known to be relevant for many forms of normal behavior as well as aspects of mental illness and substance abuse. Had Olds not died at an early age, he might well have received the Nobel Prize. He realized the implications of his work for psychodynamic concepts and would talk about his ideas as he paced about his small laboratory while I implanted the electrodes in a room in the UCLA animal facility.

Jack D. Barchas, M.D., is Barklie McKee Henry Professor and chairman of the Department of Psychiatry at Weill Cornell Medical College and psychiatrist-in-chief of Weill Cornell Medical Center of New York–Presbyterian Hospital, including the Payne Whitney Clinic in Manhattan and Westchester.
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Can We Thrive?

Bob Pyles

“Can We Survive?” That is the question posed by the BOPS leadership in their previous TAP column [TAP 48/1, page 5]. It is indeed a critical question. A hostile media, a tight economy, the cost-cutting policies of the insurance industry, and new governmental sponsored health plans are all squeezing the life out of practices and our profession. The Committee on Institutes has estimated that at least 13 of our institutes are in trouble and may very well go out of existence in the near future.

When I ran for president the first time in 1995, I had the specific intent of mobilizing our Association to address these environmental challenges with the same vigor and focus that have long characterized our emphasis on education and science. Now, more than a decade later, we are engaged in the most extensive and energetic programs of public information and advocacy in our organizational history. We can and must persist in these efforts to ensure our survival.

However, these efforts are not enough. When I ran for a second term as president four years ago, I was once again concerned about our survival, not because the external environment was tougher—though it was—but because I felt that our organization had become too rigidly fixed in its ways to adapt successfully to the changing world in which we live. To be clear: Our Association has been plagued by internal organizational problems since our bylaws were written in 1949.

These problems are nothing new. What is different today is not our organization, it is the environment. An environment of mounting challenges demands thoughtfulness and suppleness of adaptation, not a blind attachment to past policies and practices. A rigid adherence to institutional habits may offer solace and the illusion of safety, but it will cripple our capacity to adapt to the world we live in now.

A VERTICAL SPLIT

One enduring feature of our Association has been an artificial separation between education and membership. This separation is a legacy of the original psychoanalytic institute in Berlin, in which all authority and power were vested in those named to be training analysts. This organizational design was institutionalized when our first four institutes (New York, Chicago, Baltimore Washington and Boston) were established in this country.

Our structure as a national Association was formed in the context of an early and very intense conflict between the American Psychoanalytic Association and the International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA) over the training of non-physicians. The resolution of this conflict, which occurred in 1938, included the establishment of our Association as a “regional association” within the IPA. According to this agreement between APsA and the IPA, the IPA granted us an “exclusive franchise” over the development and regulation of psychoanalysis in the United States. We were authorized to accredit our own institutes, regulate our own training programs, and control access to membership in the IPA, all subject, of course, to our adherence to the minimum IPA training standards.

We are now suffering from the consequences of the ideas and attitudes that prevailed among our members at that time. Training was privileged above all other professional functions, and the position of the training analyst was exalted above all other organizational posts and functions. Accordingly, the Board on Professional Standards (BOPS) was formed as the preeminent administrative body of organizational elites, with unparalleled power and authority within our Association. For many years, the Executive Council was assigned the title of a Board of Directors only because BOPS could not legally serve as its own Board of Directors.

THE RIGHTFUL ROLE OF COUNCIL

Over the last 25 years, our Association has been undergoing a difficult but necessary transition, as the Executive Council slowly has assumed its proper role as a Board of Directors, responsible first and foremost to the members it represents. In recent years, this chief responsibility has brought the Executive Council into painful conflict with the Board on Professional Standards.

To address the question posed by the leadership of BOPS, “Can We Survive?”, my answer is that it will be very difficult for our Association to survive, if BOPS continues to operate in the manner it has for the last 60 years. The evidence is clear: Our recruitment is dwindling. Our membership is declining. Our members are divided. And more than a third of our institutes are on a course to fail.

In my view, a core factor in the genesis of our internal problems is the training analyst (TA) system. When, as a candidate, I first became familiar with the training analyst system, it seemed contrary to every principle I was being taught. It seemed profoundly anti-analytic and anti-educational and very close to being unethical.

In addition to analytic and educational considerations, the TA system and the general conservatism and “splendid isolation” that it breeds, has made it increasingly difficult to recruit candidates. It is an undeniable fact that the independent analytic groups with standards comparable to ours, but no TA system, do far better in recruitment than most of our institutes, many of which are seen as hopelessly conservative.

In 1985 I wrote a paper on the TA system, which I distributed privately among colleagues at the Psychoanalytic Institute of New England (PINE). In it, I questioned the TA system and predicted that we at PINE would find it hard to survive as an institute.
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if the TA system remained in place. If this were true of other institutes, as I imagined it must be, the entire edifice of our Association was surely in a state of long-term progressive jeopardy. Unfortunately, events have proven that both predictions were accurate.

PPP PROPOSAL

It was with these concerns in mind that Rick Perlman, Warren Procci, and I introduced the PPP Proposal in September 2011, calling for a reconsideration of the training analyst system. We were joined by Mark Smaller. We had intended that the proposal would be a starting point for discussion.

We had expected that BOPS would establish a task force to consider and discuss the TA system, with input from the Board of Directors and membership, to decide upon a course of action that would remedy the problems that the current system entails.

To our astonishment, none of this happened. I will not burden the reader with an accounting of the many attempts we made to engage the leadership of BOPS, both individually and through committees. Suffice it to say that all were unsuccessful. The sole opportunity that was given to consider the substance of the PPP Proposal was limited to 15 minutes at the June 2012 meeting.

The resulting sense of frustration led the Executive Council the next day to enact an interim resolution calling on BOPS to develop “objective and verifiable” criteria for the selection of training analysts.

In January 2013, seven members of BOPS responded to the enactment of the objective and verifiable proposal by filing a lawsuit against our Association—without warning and without discussion. The reasons for filing the lawsuit were never clear to me. I was told by one of the petitioners that the BOPS group felt they had exhausted all other means of redress. However, from my point of view, they hadn’t tried any other means, and the filing of the lawsuit seemed arbitrary and unnecessary.

To the surprise of many, Judge Schlesinger (who ruled in the lawsuit) found for the BOPS side and indicated if we wanted things to be different we should change our bylaws. Accordingly, Mark Smaller and I took two actions. Working with the newly formed Litigation Committee (consisting of the nationally elected officers), we filed an appeal. Secondly, we formed a Bylaws Task Force to do exactly what Judge Schlesinger had suggested. The news of the appeal was met with indignation by the original filers of the suit, which once again seemed odd to me, for while they had felt free to file the suit, they were angered by our decision to appeal. Currently, we await the results of the Court decision.

However, certain things are clear: This organization will never be the same, regardless of the outcome of the lawsuit. The genie has been let out of the bottle and can never be put back in.

To return once more to the question posed by the BOPS leadership, can we survive? It will be difficult, perhaps impossible, unless our organizational structure is altered to match our educational and membership missions. The crux of the problem is not, as BOPS leaders proclaim, that there has not been enough separation between membership and education. It is that there has been too much.

In reviewing the BOPS minutes over the past several years, I was struck by the fact that BOPS in many ways seems to have gone out of the education business and into the rules business. We have heard there are some institutes planning to split off from APsaA in order to form their own association. This, of course, is completely unnecessary, since any institute can continue to do exactly as it has been doing, even if the PPP Proposal were adopted.

An alternative some have suggested would involve the externalization of BOPS and the credentialing function. To me, an externalized BOPS would be the worst possible solution, since it would enshrine permanently the maladaptive methods of the last 60 years. It would also enable BOPS to continue as is, only now permanently without “checks and balances,” and without having to be responsible to the membership and the Board of Directors.

To justify such a separation, some have imagined a kind of nightmare scenario, with some groups (including the officers) pushing to eliminate any standards at all, and moving to become a psychotherapy organization. Happily, these all seem to be scare tactics that have never been suggested by anyone, as far as I know.

Whatever the fate of the PPP Proposal, we have the opportunity and responsibility to create a very different kind of organization, one that deals with education, with the needs of our members, with the environment—and is not thwarted and constrained by an organizational elite that values rules over reason and privilege over progress.

We have a critical and historic opportunity to form a different kind of Board on Professional Standards. I hope we can do it without any groups splitting off. However if some choose to go their own way, we wish them well. Either way, we will have the opportunity to create a BOPS that embodies a modern educational philosophy, adapting to the needs of the students and adapting to the conditions we encounter now and will in the future. I visualize an educational body that embraces innovation, inclusiveness, and openness and an organization that would welcome new members and new groups with respect, interest, and open arms.

It is embarrassing that after BOPS and the Executive Council agreed to invite the William Alanson White to join our Association, it took nearly a year to extend a formal invitation to this important and vibrant psychoanalytic community. There are other independent groups we could immediately invite into our Association. When I was president previously, Don Rosenblitt was chair of BOPS. We estimated that we could bring in 1100 new members to our group. We failed to bring in any. But now we have a new and golden opportunity.

AN INTERNATIONAL VIEW

In considering change, we have been hampered by the deep belief among some that the training analyst system is synonymous with the survival of psychoanalysis, and that the TA system represents a higher standard.
Reclaiming Certification as a Valued Developmental Educational Process

Harvey Schwartz

The Pre-Graduation Certification Program has been very well received by candidates. Its introduction parallels that of other professions that are increasingly beginning their certification evaluations during the training period. Part I consists of writing up two analytic cases of patients in middle-phase, who can be of the same gender. It also entails presenting process notes from those cases to two interviewers. After graduation, Part II can be taken, which includes writing up a terminated case. The write-ups are studied by the certification committee composed of analysts from around the country who are entirely blind to the identity of the applicant. Unlike local faculty, the entire committee functions free from the inevitable influences of personal familiarity. They do not know the applicant's name; they do not know the applicant's institute; they do not know the applicant's professional degree. Nothing. All they have before them is the clinical work of the candidate analyst.

The Board on Professional Standards is encouraging all our institutes to promote the pre-graduation pathway to certification because it is so consistent with our shared goals for psychoanalytic education and the development of a psychoanalytic identity, confidence and commitment. The pre-graduation pathway also emphasizes the educational value of this process, rather than its value being solely limited to that of a link to training analyst appointment.

I can say a great deal more about this program of which I am very proud. Better though to leave that to the candidates who are taking it. Below is a piece written by Jamie Cromer who took the Part I Pre-Graduation Exam, passed it and then returned this past January to sit for Part II. She wrote about her experience in the most recent Candidate Connection newsletter, and with permission we reproduce it in TAP for all our members.

Consolidating Psychoanalytic Identity

Jamie Cromer

Certainly none of us entered analytic training for the easy road. I decided to become a psychoanalyst after 15 years in private practice and five years after completing New Orleans–Birmingham Psychoanalytic Center’s (NOBPC) two-year Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy Program. I wanted to deepen my understanding of my patients and myself. Entering training and becoming a psychoanalyst has been part of my journey, not its end, and the same holds true in pursuing certification.

During the Candidates’ Council meeting at my first APsaA meeting, I heard Paul Hollinger speak about certification. He described it as an extension of the learning process, a milestone, and presented the Certification Examination Committee as a supportive ally, a dramatic contrast to the fearsome group so many cautionary tales had introduced. Maybe things had changed. I thought, so I decided to pursue certification. I viewed the CEC as wanting us to succeed in this demanding and worthwhile pursuit, and I valued the opportunity for some national review of my work. NOBPC agreed to participate in the Pre-Graduation Certification Program, and since I had passed Mid-Phase Colloquium, I immediately applied.

The climate of certification darkened in the years following my first meeting, and strong public opinions often described certification as an unfair, unnecessary and flawed review of an analyst’s abilities. I realize now that there had been a traumatic legacy, and these narratives were not new. For many, the certification process had delivered a blow.
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leaving unhealed wounds. Despite all this, I wanted the opportunity to consolidate my own thinking, face my fears, and access a blind national review of my work, especially because I was one of only two candidates in a small psychoanalytic center. I wanted as close to impartial evaluation as I could get.

I met with one of our senior analysts, a former CEC member. I arrived confident about my analytic work and skills. I struggled to be concise. He cut me off mid-sentence many times, redirecting my disjointed attempts to tell a cohesive story of the analysis. This interaction definitely fanned fears of any certification interview ahead, but he agreed to be a reader for my certification reports. I spent countless hours over many weeks editing and submitted the final draft to him. He left a voice mail conveying my efforts had missed the mark, having focused too much on the patient rather than on my role as analyst. My disappointment after so much hard work interrupted my progress in the certification process.

In my fifth year of training, I took an elective writing class on the mechanics of writing up a case, an adjunct to the case write-up workshops I had attended at several APsaA meetings. As I prepared my reports, reviewing the work as a whole and writing, editing, and consulting, I discovered and rediscovered important elements of the analyses. I was finally able to tell the story of the analysis, the story of me as an analyst and of my patients’ analytic journeys. I re-applied for the first phase of pre-graduation certification and sent in my reports to be reviewed by the CEC.

I accepted the offer to speak to a mentor who formerly served on the CEC. I wasn’t sure how I would make use of her as a resource, but my fear was growing as the interview date approached, and I needed all the help I could get. I chose to participate in the optional first phase interview for experience since the second phase requires it. I had learned from CEC workshops at the national meetings that the optional interview offers the reviewers opportunity for clarification, and without it, they might otherwise request resubmission.

I spoke to my mentor only once. I told her I felt confident about my writing and my analytic work, but felt increasing worry about the interview. She asked me, “What’s the worst thing that could happen?” I said, “I won’t pass.” She said, “Well, you’ll try again. I didn’t pass the first time, and I made it.” These words helped reassure me. I requested additional consultation as I prepared the materials for the interview. By the time I interviewed in New York, I was as prepared as I could be. Staying calm was my primary hurdle.

Harvey Schwartz, CEC chair, greeted me in the hall outside the interview room with a warm smile, a firm handshake, and a word of encouragement. The interview hour passed quickly. The quick break in the middle gave me time to reflect, but overall I thought it was going well. The two interviewers felt like colleagues, respectful and curious. I answered the questions the CEC as a whole had prepared from their review of my write-ups. I presented process notes, and we discussed my impressions and considered other perspectives. We did not seem to need to agree on everything.

I received a call two days later on the Tuesday night of the 2013 New York meeting as I prepared to walk into the Finance Committee meeting as Candidates’ Council treasurer. I was informed that I had passed. Dean Stein was the first person I told as we walked into the meeting. He announced my good news, and all warmly congratulated me. I felt joy, relief and pride. I graduated from NOBPC in May 2013 and applied for the final phase of certification. My reports on my terminated case were submitted, and my interview was scheduled for January 2014. I hoped I could make it through the second interview as well as the first. I hoped for a similar call on my way into this year’s Finance Committee meeting. But if not, I was determined to try again.

This certification process has been my most challenging professional endeavor and has been essential in consolidating my psychoanalytic understanding and my psychoanalytic identity. I suppose if I did not need certification to eventually pursue becoming a TA, I might have been tempted to avoid the whole process, but I would have missed out on the professional and personal rewards. No matter our profession, we have all been graded, awarded degrees, received honors, and earned licenses, all of which required somebody to evaluate us subjectively. Certification has been a part of my becoming a psychoanalyst, as important as my classes, my supervision, and my personal analysis. My certification experience is a valuable and essential part of my psychoanalytic journey. I hope my experience has encouraged you to participate.
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At the very least, we should be capable of a thorough and serious reevaluation of what one of our Association leaders in the ’50s, called “the central pathogen” of psychoanalytic education.

It is interesting to note that elsewhere in the world of psychoanalysis, there is no separation between membership and education. All educational functions are subsets of committees of the society, which is the main organizational body. It is also worthy of note that among the three recognized educational models approved by the International Psychoanalytical Association, two of the three do not feature any training analyst system at all.

I believe it is time for us to take a lesson from the rest of the analytic world. We can also learn from our own mistakes. We can transform our Association into a living, breathing organization again, eager to innovate, emboldened to experiment, and equipped to adapt intelligently. If we can seize the future by combining a capacity for flexible responsiveness to the needs of students and members with our ever-more vigorous efforts at public information and advocacy, we can not only survive—we can thrive.

---

Significant Discount on Financial Management Fees
Now Available for APsaA Members and Training Centers!

Did that headline catch your attention?
It should because this information could be valuable to you—monetarily valuable.

APsaA, through its financial advisors, is offering Association institutes, societies and members the opportunity to have their invested assets managed by Steinberg Global Asset Management, Ltd. at a reduced fee.

INTRODUCTION
APsaA’s invested assets are now managed by Steinberg Global, a highly respected money management firm. John Schott, M.D., a director of Steinberg Global and chairman of their Investment Committee, is a psychoanalyst, a longtime APsaA member, and a member of APsaA’s Investment Committee. John made it possible for APsaA to secure the services of his firm at a great low rate. Part of our negotiations included making the same rate available for APsaA members and affiliated organizations.

DETAILS OF THE ARRANGEMENT
For any APsaA institute, society, or individual member with assets of $1 million or more to invest, Steinberg Global will offer their complete asset management services for the following fees: .75% for equities and .30% for fixed income and cash. The overall fee would be determined by blending the fee schedule with your asset allocation.

For interested centers, institutes, societies, and members with less than $1 million to invest, Steinberg Global is offering their SG Select service for an all-inclusive fee of 1.35%. SG Select offers a selection of investment strategies in a less actively managed portfolio that still provides a measure of service greater than a typical mutual fund company.

The decision to trust your investments to an asset management company is an important one. John Schott will be happy to answer your questions and discuss Steinberg Global’s services with you. You can reach John at 561-750-0800 or jschott@steinbergglobal.com. You may also reach their chief operations officer, Ken Pritzker, at the same phone number or kpritzker@steinbergglobal.com.

For more information about Steinberg Global, visit their website www.steinbergglobal.com.
Analysts are a passionate breed, caring deeply about their craft and practices. So, it is not surprising that we do not always agree about how best to do things.

The 103rd Annual Meeting has been no exception. Some colleagues felt strongly that APsaA should have only one meeting a year. Others felt that the nature of our work is such that psychoanalysts may need more contact with one another than other professionals and thus should meet twice per year. After much discussion (including several task forces), a resolution was reached to continue the Annual Meeting in June but to schedule the scientific program over two days and over a weekend to minimize disruption to clinical practice. This spring, we will convene in Chicago, from June 6-8, at the Palmer House Hilton, a venue that attendees favor because of its proximity to Chicago’s many attractions (including the Art Institute and Magnificent Mile) and because the hotel offers many spots for old and new friends to gather for informal conversation.

The Program Committee, which I have been delighted to chair these last four years, opted not only to change the schedule of the meeting but also to introduce new formats, in addition to traditional sessions that members appreciate and enjoy.

AN INNOVATIVE FORMAT

We are very pleased to introduce a program of short talks modeled after the wildly popular TED Talks. We call our program *Psychoanalysis Here and Now*. Six psychoanalysts will each speak passionately about psychoanalysis for 12-15 minutes to foster learning, provide inspiration and provoke conversation. Our first *Psychoanalysis Here and Now* speakers will be Aisha Abbasi, Andrew Gerber, Peter Goldberg, Julie Nagel, Sally Weintrobe, and Joan Wheelis. Hans Agrawal will moderate. Following the program, all attendees are invited to a reception with a cash bar and music.

Alfred Margulies will give our inaugural *Clinical Plenary*, offering a sustained reflection on his work as a clinical analyst. His talk, “After the Storm: Living and Dying in Psychoanalysis,” explores the arc of an analysis and the patient’s return years later. Nancy Kulish will chair this plenary session, which unlike other plenaries will include Shelley Orgel and Warren Poland as discussants.

The *University Forum*, for the first time, engages the topic of “climate change” and severe weather, bringing together the work of climate scientists, Rob Nixon and Chris Rapley, and a psychoanalyst, Sally Weintrobe. Stuart Twemlow chairs this session, which will focus on findings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and psychoanalytic perspectives on the disputes about weather changes that persist in some scientific circles and in public conversation.
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**ERNST AND GERTRUDE TIECHO MEMORIAL LECTURE**

Organizational Trauma: Narcissism, Scapegoating, Mourning and the Problem of Succession

Christine C. Kieffer, Ph.D.

Friday, June 6 at 5:15pm

The speaker will highlight the role of unconscious large group dynamics in establishing entrenched organizational problems such as stagnation and decline due to failure to promote succession in leadership. The power of the group upon the individual will be illustrated through the use of brief excerpts from opera choruses and movies.
Leadership consultant and psychoanalytic candidate Stefan Reich joins us from Peru for this June’s Innovations session, where he will share his work engaging “adaptive change” in contexts ranging from finance to educational nonprofits.

MEET-THE-AUTHOR

Members let the Program Committee know they would welcome hearing from more psychoanalytic authors. We listened and have expanded the Meet-The-Author session to include three “One-Hour Engagements.” This June join R. Dennis Shelby to discuss 13 Ways of Looking at a Man with author; Donald Moss, Elizabeth Rottenberg to consider Forgiveness in Intimate Relationships: A Psychoanalytic Perspective with author; Shahrzad Siassi, and Dorothy E. Holmes who will engage Miriam F. Tasini on her memoir of her family’s traumatic displacement and dislocation, Where Are We Going?

Christine Kieffer will be honored, giving the Ernst and Gertrude Ticho Memorial Lecture. Her talk on “Organizational Trauma: Narcissism, Scapegoating, Mourning, and the Problem of Succession” will be followed by a reception, open to all attendees, and sponsored by the Ernst and Gertrude Ticho Charitable Foundation.

Members have consistently requested that the Association devote more of its resources to helping members build their clinical practices and sustain them, especially as the health care environment in the United States shifts with the introduction of the Affordable Care Act. Our June conference features three practice-building workshops; each will be repeated twice over the course of the meeting to maximize the possibility for colleagues to participate in workshops and attend other sessions of interest.

Practice-Building Workshop #1 is focused on “Using Technology in Developing Clinical Practice.” William Braun and Geralyn Lederman, APsaA’s director of public affairs, will focus on helping attendees use websites like APsaA’s “Find-an-Analyst” and Psychology Today’s “Find-A-Therapist” productively. For example, in this hands-on workshop, attendees will write (or revise) a description of themselves and their practices to generate referrals and orient potential patients to psychoanalytic treatment.

Practice-Building Workshop #2 features Stefan Reich offering an interactive immersion in the concepts of “Adaptive Leadership and the Challenges of Exercising Real Leadership” and his way of using these tools to consult with organizations and senior leaders.

Practice-Building Workshop #3 is aimed at “Developing a Footprint as a Public Intellectual: Using Tools from Old and New Media.” Also hands-on, in this workshop, Prudence Gourguechon and Jeffrey Leib, formerly of the Denver Post, will help attendees master the nuts-and-bolts of using Twitter and social media to comment psychoanalytically on issues of broad interest to communities and the public at large. The workshop will also provide guidance and coaching on writing op-eds and magazine articles.

The Program Committee is also pleased to announce an additional new format, Clinical Field Studies in Community Psychoanalysis, a two-session workshop, focused on developing a psychoanalytically sensitive program of community engagement and intervention to address bullying in schools. Stuart Twemlow chairs this new program. Frank Sacco and Mark Smaller will present innovations from several countries that have reduced school bullying. Marie Rudden will discuss their work. Attendees will also focus on the method of developing a study plan to include such work in one’s analytic portfolio.

CLINICAL FOCUS CONTINUES

Our meetings would not be complete without our Discussion Groups. The 103rd Annual Meeting includes 32 Discussion Groups, with programs organized by the groups’ chairs and with content ranging from “Deepening the Treatment” to “Intersubjectivity in the Work of Saul Bellow.” In addition to attending favorite groups, the Program Committee urges you to explore particular interests, whether that includes “Field Theory,” “Shame Dynamics,” or “Women and Leadership.”

The June meeting also spotlights our ever-popular Two-Day Clinical Workshops, which feature Rogelio Sosnik and Navah Kaplan (Irene Cairo, chair); Arnold Goldberg (Sharon Blum, chair); Fredric Busch and Larry Sandberg (Alan Pollack, chair); Robert Michels and Gavin Mullen (Richard Zimmer, chair); Jack Novick and Norka Malberg (Christine Kieffer, chair). We also have an additional new Two-Day Clinical Workshop on Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy with Elizabeth Feldman and Allison Smith (Ann Dart, chair).

Each cohort of the APsaA Fellows’ groups has conceived the program for the Clinical Conference’s Residents, Psychology and Social Work Trainees, and Students. Fellows present clinical material to faculty discussants, which this year include Jane Kite, Charles Amrhein, and Elizabeth Simpson. The content of these sessions (e.g., “This Couch Has Bedbugs!” and “Coercion in Psychotherapy”) take up public sector psychiatry and the role of courts—everyday contexts for psychiatry residents and psychology and social work trainees. While these clinical conference programs are designed for students, all attendees are welcome to join. If you do, you will have a chance to observe firsthand the next generation of clinical talent and the work of young clinicians who may become psychoanalytic candidates down the line.

This Annual Meeting also includes perennial favorites such as the Film Workshop (“The Gambler”) where Kerry Kelly Novick and Bruce Sklarew will explore the psychodynamics of addiction and the role of omnipotence. Two Symposia offerings also bring innovative clinical models to APsaA members. Sandy G. Ansari, Nancy Blieden, and Gilbert W. Kliman, will include video to show the utility of “Reflective Network Therapy” and Neil Altman, Ann Marie Sacramone, and Molly Romer Witten will present a way of working within integrative, systemic psychoanalysis. APsaA committees will also present a full slate of Committee Sponsored Workshops.

Spring revitalizes all of us. The Program Committee invites you to spend a weekend of your spring in Chicago. Join us. Reinvigorate your practice, be a part of the future of psychoanalysis, and share your passion for the career we all share. There is more that unites us than divides us. Come to Chicago, meet at the center of our nation, honor our history, and redraw the map of what it means to be a psychoanalyst.
One hundred years ago poet Carl Sandburg wrote “Come and show me another city with lifted head singing so proud to be alive…” Come to APsaA’s annual meeting in Chicago this June and you can sing along. Chicago has something to suit every taste. Here are some personal recommendations.

MUSIC, THEATER, COMEDY AND DANCE

If you like classical music there’s the Chicago Symphony, which will be performing the Shostakovich Fifth. If you like jazz, check out the Jazz Showcase in the south Loop, where Ravi Coltrane (son of John and Alice) will be playing. Another great jazz venue is the Green Mill, where Al Capone used to hang out in the good old days. If you like blues, pay a visit to Buddy Guy’s (south Loop), Rosa’s Lounge or Kingston Mines (further north).

If you like theater, Chicago Shakespeare Theater will be performing Henry V. There will be productions at the Goodman downtown and by Chicago’s famed Steppenwolf Company. Another good bet is Chicago’s Court Theater, in Hyde Park, where M. Butterfly will be in the last few days of its run. And you cannot go wrong with Million Dollar Quartet, at the Apollo, which puts you in the recording studio with Elvis, Carl Perkins, Johnny Cash and Jerry Lee Lewis on the night they played together in Nashville.

If you like modern dance, check out Hubbard Street Dance Company’s performance at the Harris Theater in Millennium Park. It is a great vibrant Swedish-American flavored Midsommarfestival in Andersonville on the north side, the Belmont-Sheffield Music Festival in Chicago’s Lakeview Neighborhood (local bands, proceed at your own risk) and a tentatively scheduled Turkish Festival at Pioneer Court, where Chicago’s founding father Jean Baptiste Point duSable used to live. Note also that while Chicago may no longer be “Hog butcher for the world,” we do have the Ribfest Chicago festival, where you can have your fill of great barbecue from Friday to Sunday up in Chicago’s Lincoln Square neighborhood.

If you like to laugh, the Chicago Theater is bringing in England’s Eddie Izzard, who will be performing that weekend. But who needs imports? For homegrown talent, there’s Chicago’s Second City, where generations of SNL performers developed their improv chops. Or on the wilder side of improv, check out the Neo-Futurists at the Neo-Futurarium on the north side, where they attempt to perform 30 plays in 60 minutes in their long running Too Much Light Makes the Baby Go Blind.

If you like modern dance, check out Hubbard Street Dance Company’s performance at the Harris Theater in Millennium Park. It is a great vibrant company in a great venue. In June, Chicago’s neighborhoods come alive with weekend festivals. Check out the Printers Row Literary Festival, which is considered the largest free outdoor literary event in the Midwest, drawing more than 150,000 book lovers to the two-day showcase. There’s also the Swedish-American flavored Midsommarfestival in Andersonville on the north side, the Belmont-Sheffield Music Festival in Chicago’s Lakeview Neighborhood (local bands, proceed at your own risk) and a tentatively scheduled Turkish Festival at Pioneer Court, where Chicago’s founding father Jean Baptiste Point duSable used to live. Note also that while Chicago may no longer be “Hog butcher for the world,” we do have the Ribfest Chicago festival, where you can have your fill of great barbecue from Friday to Sunday up in Chicago’s Lincoln Square neighborhood.

VEGETARIANS REPENT

Speaking of food we do have a few restaurants. If your tastes run to fine dining, get your reservations for Alinea or the Girl & the Goat. Or for something more pedestrian, wait in line with the other pedestrians for a hot dog at Hot Doug’s. If you are a meat eater, indulge yourself with a great steak at Dave Burke’s Primehouse, Bavette’s, Morton’s, Michael Jordan’s, Gibson’s, Capital Grille, Gene & George’s, the list goes on and on. (If you are not a meat eater, become one, at least for a day).
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But Chicago’s real culinary strength lies in its ethnic restaurants, which reflect Chicago’s ethnic and cultural diversity. Of course, there is Chicago’s oldest restaurant, the German Berghoff, right downtown. It is worth a trip just to sit at the bar, grab a beer, and people watch. Italian, Mexican, Greek, Chinese, Japanese, Thai, Vietnamese, Ethiopian, Spanish, French, Russian…it’s all here. There is Manny’s Deli for a great corned beef sandwich. I must also make special mention of our local specialty, Chicago pizza, which is the best in the world. Try Lou Malnati’s, Gino’s, or Pizzeria Uno where deep dish pizza was invented.

FOR THE ATHLETICALLY INCLINED

For those who like to be more active—especially after all this eating—grab a Divvy bike (rented by the hour) and take a trip down the Lake Shore bicycle path. Take an architectural walking tour. Or rent a kayak at Urban Kayak and take your own tour down the Chicago River; where you can have a unique experience of the buildings that flank our waterways. Then it is time to relax at one of our riverside outdoor dining establishments with a cool beverage and watch the river flow (Cyrano’s is a good spot).

And finally, let me conclude my picks by recommending an outdoor experience that should not be missed, especially if we get some sun and the temperature climbs above 60. If you have not seen Wrigley Field, it is a little bit of heaven in the city. Did I forget to mention that they play baseball there, too? The Cubs face off against the Marlins, and while I do not think this is going to be our year, for those who like betting on long shots, it just does not get any better than this. You may want to stay an extra week.
National Child and Adolescent Congress

Charles E. Parks

More than 95 participants attended the National Child and Adolescent Congress held in New York on January 13-14, 2014. This congress, sponsored by the American Psychoanalytic Association’s Committee on Child and Adolescent Analysis (COCAA), was convened in response to concerns about the future of child and adolescent psychoanalytic training and practice in this country. A special feature of the congress was the inclusion of child training directors, child supervisors, child faculty, child candidates, adult faculty, and adult candidates from around the country. The impressive nationwide institute representation and the varied child experience encouraged a wide-ranging discussion.

In my opening remarks as chair of the Congress Organizing Committee, I noted that child and adolescent analysts face substantial challenges at every stage in their training and career development. The task of the congress was to further elucidate and define these challenges and begin to develop a plan for responding to them.

IDENTITY, STANDARDS AND CHALLENGES

The topic of developing an identity as a child analyst was central to the general discussion that followed. In this regard, the group considered the sources of passion that child and adolescent analysts have for their work. Child analytic training provides multiple opportunities to work closely with children, adolescents and their parents in ways that meaningfully improve their lives. The nature of the analytic work and training with children and adolescents also enhances one’s flexibility in clinical work and teaching. Openness and curiosity are important aspects of the analytic attitude. A thoughtful approach to training standards that balances flexibility with consistency is most likely to foster such an attitude in our candidates.

Other participants spoke to the anxieties associated with child analysis, including the anxiety generated by the low prestige accorded to professional work with children in our society; by the exposure to raw and intense affects; and by the stimulation of regressive experiences in the analyst and patient. In addition, there continues to be ways adult analysts marginalize child analysts and training programs.

Large group discussions of the issues of supervision of child and adolescent analysis and the potential value of an integrated child, adolescent and adult curriculum were important topics. Small group work sessions were held to enable more focused attention to several areas, including community outreach as a part of building a child practice, teaching and learning about parent work, the “widen ing scope” of child and adolescent analysis, distance learning, child psychoanalytic clinics in local institutes, and the child analyst’s role in consultation, evaluation and case development. In an additional venue, participants met with others at similar points in their analytic careers (i.e., child and adult candidates; adult analysts and faculty; child faculty; child supervisors; and child and adolescent training program directors) to discuss areas of mutual concern.

NEXT STEPS

In the final plenary session, there was general agreement the congress had played an important, vitalizing function by providing the opportunity for analysts from different backgrounds and locales to discuss their work in ways that led to a shared sense of intellectual stimulation and mutual support. This led to the recommendation for developing a listserv for child analysts to connect and continue to discuss issues of mutual interest about children and their treatment. Meetings to build on the momentum developed at the congress were also suggested.

Others suggested developing work groups to focus intensively on specific topics (e.g., training standards, public relations, Internet presence) before reporting on that work at a future meeting.

Efforts supporting institutes in working together to develop shared educational efforts and clinical case seminars, finding additional avenues of financial support for child analytic training, helping child analysts learn about and build relationships with professionals in other modalities (e.g., occupational therapy, special education and psychopharmacology), and exploring ways of collaborating with other child analytic organizations, such as the Academy of Child Psychiatry, were all considered. One important proposal involved creating a National In-Residence Program in Child Psychoanalysis associated with a setting (the Lucy Daniels Center in North Carolina, for example) that would be uniquely situated to provide an intensive child analytic training program for early career child candidates.

A congress follow-up meeting has been scheduled in conjunction with the annual meeting of the American Psychoanalytic Association in Chicago on Tuesday, June 3, from 1:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. The purpose of this meeting will be to further develop plans to build on the momentum from the January congress. This will be an open-ended meeting and all interested analysts and candidates are welcome.
Study Group in Child and Adolescent Analysis 2014

Paula G. Atkeson and Anita G. Schmukler

Our COPE Study Group on Supervision in Child and Adolescent Analysis has been meeting regularly for several years at the National and Annual Meetings of the American Psychoanalytic Association. Our COPE group membership is representative of institutes from various parts of the country; this diversity enriches the sharing of our experiences.

Our discussions of theoretical questions and clinical material are rich and lively as we talk over the particular issues that confront the supervisor of the candidate who is learning how to conduct child and adolescent analysis.

Our COPE Study Group on Supervision in Child and Adolescent Analysis

The chapters in this book are directed toward helping new and experienced supervisors develop their capacities to supervise candidates in their work with child and adolescent patients. The chapters in this book include supervision of assessment, of transfers and countertransfers, of work with parents, of ethical issues, of working with play, fantasies and dreams, and the challenges of termination.

The intent of the new book is to help supervisors develop their own approach to and style of supervision. It is also intended to call attention to the multiple unconscious processes that can potentially interfere with a supervisor’s recognition of issues in clinical material and the invaluable benefit of study groups and consultations for supervisors. Thus, we included chapters on several models of supervision and the special challenges in child and adolescent supervision, which include supervising the widening scope of children and adolescents who seek help.

A WIDENING SCOPE

We supervisors tend to supervise our candidates the way we were supervised as candidates using the supervisory approach we experienced without considering what alternative approaches might also be useful. In the supervision of child and adolescent cases we find there are many dilemmas that confront the supervisor: The children and adolescents who enter analysis today are often more challenging than in the past when candidates tended to treat children and adolescents with neurotic conflicts. Today, the children and adolescents who come for treatment present with more severe difficulties, including organic and developmental issues, such as autism and physical delays, requiring speech, hearing and occupational therapies. They often have problems with executive function and self-regulation. These children are often receiving help with multiple problems. Parents also present with severe difficulties in parenting and in their lives.

These cases confront the supervisor and candidate with the task of considering a “widening scope” of techniques that encompass the particular needs of that child or adolescent. It is important that the supervisor help the candidate not only on the practical level of how to intervene and interpret but also to conceptualize why an interpretation or intervention is chosen at any particular moment in the treatment. This learning includes maintaining an analytic frame while meeting the treatment needs of the child and adolescent. Supervisors and supervisees can learn together in this challenging task of child and adolescent analytic work.
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Paula G. Atkeson and Anita G. Schmukler
Deepening Our Understanding of Psychoanalytic Educational Objectives

Tessa Cochran
Michael Slevin, Editor

By now, many of you will have experienced the American Psychoanalytic Association’s phenomenon: learning objectives. To be an accredited educational organization at the national level, APsaA must comply with the requirement to use specific learning goals in planning and appraising course efficacy. In our institutes and societies, analysts who plan courses for psychotherapy or psychoanalytic training programs must delineate goals of the educational experience. This requirement is true for continuing education programs as well. Whether having to write them for educational programs or having to complete course evaluation forms based on them, they have become part of our lives.

The move toward greater clarity and specificity of purpose follows a period of intense reexamination of psychoanalytic education. The use of pedagogical principles and, in particular, written learning objectives is one of many efforts to improve psychoanalytic training. Guidelines that are available for establishing objectives emphasize formulating outcomes that are observable by the presenter and/or the learner. For example, “the learner will be able to state the development of analytic praxis” is more satisfactory than “the learner will know or understand them.”

Formerly serving as my society’s continuing education (CE) program coordinator, I was responsible for requesting written objectives from instructors and presenters. There was a fair degree of confusion and uncertainty about translating course material into specific objectives. Some analytic educators found it difficult to formulate course content in this new way, especially when speaking of advanced clinical skills. Other colleagues were unsure how many objectives were needed to summarize a course. These reactions are not all that surprising. Often, what we do as analysts and analytic teachers cannot be easily translated into specific goals.

Recently, Deborah Cabaniss, the Columbia Task Force on Progression and Graduation, and the Multi-center Assessment Project, designed to assess the effectiveness of supervision, have endeavored to demystify and systematize psychoanalytic education. These efforts evolved from recognition that there was significant room for improvement in candidate training—a conviction Cabaniss and colleagues have contributed to with articles and institute workshops.

Recognition of the complexity of psychoanalytic praxis has long been a part of the structure of analytic training programs as well as a criterion in the selection of candidates. The combined requirements of coursework, training analysis, and supervision all contribute to a candidate’s growing knowledge. We might say, though, that despite our best teaching efforts, an analyst’s development is a process that progresses at an uneven pace for the trainee. Identification with one’s analyst, supervisors, and teachers, the desire for their approval, the anxiety to feel that one knows something given the clinical responsibility we are taking on all shape the learning process. Even psychotherapy programs, whose goals can be more tightly focused, are subject to the limitations imposed by the complexity of the work and the idiosyncratic nature of the therapist’s development.

It is time to deepen our understanding of the task before us of basing curricula on objectives. The reactions of colleagues that I encountered as CE coordinator are a natural outcome of the nature and complexity of our field. To speak to this, in this article, I offer a historical perspective on the learning objectives movement, outline criticisms and controversies of the movement in the field of education, and introduce two newer taxonomic systems useful in describing goals that may help all of us approaching the task of formulating objectives.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND: ORIGIN OF TAXONOMIES OF LEARNING

While defining preparatory tasks has interested educators for centuries, an effort to do this in a comprehensive, research-based way began in the 1940s. At that time, a group of eminent scholars, among them Ralph Tyler, Benjamin Bloom, and David R. Krathwohl formed a committee to create a common language for educators to use in curriculum planning. They concluded the task could best be accomplished by defining outcomes that were behaviorally observable and thereby measurable psychometrically. The committee’s original plan was for not one but three taxonomies, representing the basic domains of learning: cognitive, affective, and psychomotor.

Continued on page 15
After several years, the committee produced the first publication, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: the Classification of Educational Goals: Handbook I: Cognitive Domain*. This publication came to be known by the first editor’s name, as Bloom’s Taxonomy. The other two, affective capabilities and psychomotor skills, were each dealt with separately in later publications: Krathwohl’s, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: the Classification of Educational Goals: Handbook II: The Affective Domain* (1964) and E. J. Simpson’s *The Classification of Educational Objectives: Psychomotor Domain* (1966).

It is important to note several features of the committee’s original intentions. First, they emphasized that all three domains were to be considered in planning curricula to cover the full array of requisite knowledge and abilities. Second, their efforts were to be considered a work in progress, one that should be revised over time. Third, as Bloom later clarifies: Each major field should have its own taxonomy of objectives in its own language—more detailed, closer to the special language and thinking of its experts.” As psychoanalytic educators, we take that recommendation into consideration as we approach the task of generating our own set of objectives.

**CONTROVERSIES ON APPLYING LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

Although a half-century of research findings demonstrate the usefulness of this approach in educational endeavors, the learning objectives movement has its critics. Even enthusiasts for using them were forthright about their limitations. In this section, I mention some of the arguments made in the field of education as a whole to raise questions as to whether they apply to curriculum planning in our field.

Some scholars raise arguments that not all important learning outcomes can be made explicit or operational. Learning experiences that involve implicit understanding cannot easily be described. In our field, for instance, abstract concepts such as transference, the unconscious, alpha and beta elements, or the analytic third can be difficult to grasp. Take, as an example, internalizing the concept of transference manifestations. Learning this concept involves repeated exposure to clinical material, accompanied by supervisors or teachers pointing out the resemblance between that material and information about the patients’ early relationships. These help but comprehension also involves a cognitive shift from ordinary ways of considering discourse.

In a 1995 *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* article, Jacob Arlow describes this cognitive shift as developing a “working concept of the nature of the psychoanalytic situation.” He adds, “There is a considerable divergence between the articulated understanding of the nature of the psychoanalytic situation and free association, and an unacknowledged, guiding concept that emerges during the actual management of the clinical data.” He expresses this as an important caveat to be addressed in teaching and supervising candidates.

Further, critics of objective-based curricula argue that some learning activities are idiosyncratic and intended to change students in ways defined by the individual alone. Since each of us possesses a unique combination of capabilities, not all learning outcomes can be spelled out. We can speculate that the many new perspectives and innovations in psychoanalytic technique have emerged due in part to the unique talents candidates and analysts bring to bear on the field. Creative responses to patient encounters develop as a result of both what we are taught and what our distinctive combination of our abilities, opinions, and values gives rise to.

Other critics take issue with the emphasis on performance outcome rather than the pleasurable and creative aspects of the learning experience itself. These are exemplified in programs that emphasize the autonomy and self-directed intentions of students to seek what they need. Applying these viewpoints to psychoanalytic education, we might consider further implications of the fact that candidates come to our programs with advanced degrees and therefore bring with them a measure of sophistication as learners.

Continued on page 28
Psychodynamic Perspective
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Leaving Olds to attend Yale Medical School, I had an idea that formed the core of my future work and my life in research: If behavior is important in subsequent mental life—a viewpoint central to psychodynamic approaches and all the multiple ideas of treatment that have evolved from psychodynamics—then behavior must change neurochemistry and neurotransmitters. That behavior can influence brain chemistry mechanisms that in turn can change subsequent behavior now seems obvious; 50 years ago it had not been directly demonstrated. I resolved to study that process at Yale.

Had Olds not died at an early age, he might well have received the Nobel Prize.

While other students were involved in orientation the first week of medical school, I met with almost every person at Yale who worked in what we now call neuroscience. In the great psychiatry department there, then headed by Fritz Redlich, there was only one person doing biological research, Daniel X. Freedman, a young instructor trying to do research but without a laboratory; he borrowed some of the facilities of a pharmacology professor for bioassays of neurotransmitters. Freedman was destined to become one of the great figures as a mentor and administrator of the last half of the 20th century in psychiatry. Freedman, a psychoanalyst who had been analyzed twice and was deeply committed to clinical practice, was an outstanding educator, gifted editor of the Archives of General Psychiatry, and author with Redlich of a superb one-volume text of psychiatry. He was also a warm and loving mentor.

Freedman liked my ideas, including the goal of using newly developed biochemical assays instead of the less reliable and variable bioassays, such as clam hearts, for the neurotransmitters, serotonin and norepinephrine. We knew we could only measure the concentrations of the substances and that the changes could be small but important, thus the need for more sensitive assays. The Department of Psychiatry at Yale, later to become a great power in neurobiology, did not have a pH meter and could not afford to purchase one. We tried without proper equipment to set up the assays.

I was sent to try to convince the Department of Biochemistry to lend us such an instrument—quite beautiful in their maple boxes. Biochemistry had a closet full of such instruments. The department chair refused to lend us a pH meter. He said in effect, “Nothing will happen in neurochemistry for 100 years, if you want to study biochemistry, study the liver.” More discouraging was his response to what I wanted to do with the instrument: “Biochemistry is strong, biochemistry is the locomotive, behavior is weak, like the wind. The wind does not change the locomotive.” We tried our best using European pH paper; it did not work.

Then another event occurred that was both exhilarating and discouraging. Using a clam heart assay for serotonin, Freedman had the first evidence that a hallucinogen, LSD, could change brain serotonin. It was a finding with implications for psychosis. He was scheduled to give his first lecture to the Department of Psychiatry. The room was packed. People were standing or sitting on the floor. His presentation, dramatic and clearly important, was to lead to major work and hundreds of papers in the decades to follow. The first question was from a powerful leader in the department, Professor Theodore Lidz, who asked in a hostile tone: “Where is this work justified in the work of Freud?” Freedman answered strongly with a thorough knowledge of Freud’s writing. He concluded by saying: “If Freud were alive, he would spend his days with me working on topics such as brain serotonin and LSD and his evenings talking with his patients and writing ideas in psychoanalysis.”

It was clear that the “wars in psychiatry” were heated. Nevertheless, during the clinical years on the Yale psychiatry service, I constantly saw the excellence of the analytic perspective as evidenced, for example, by watching a clinician quietly listening to a person with schizophrenia and establishing real contact with that individual.

(I had seen some aspects of the “wars” in my first psychiatry course at Yale, with a young instructor who was to become a major power in American psychiatry, Thomas Detre. When I asked if there could be any biological aspects to the severe psychiatric illnesses, he stated absolutely not. Years later he completely changed his mind and basically took the position that we should all be neurologists. I disagreed with him the first time and disagreed with him the second time.)

After the difficulty trying to move the project ahead and seeing the problems that Freedman was having, I elected to take a year out of medical school and work with Aaron Lerner, the discoverer of melatonin. Through that and subsequent work, I provided evidence that melatonin is a hormone and impacts sleep.

Later, with Freedman, I returned to stress research. I even picked an internship at the University of Chicago where I could (with difficulty) continue the stress studies, sending the brains to him from a then small O’Hare airport late at night on dry ice for chemical assays.

We were ultimately to find that indeed stress does differentially impact neurotransmitters, changing serotonin and norepinephrine in opposite ways—the first such demonstration proving that the wind does impact the locomotive! Today that and similar findings with other neuroregulators is a facet of neurobiology confirmed and extended by hundreds of papers rarely referring to our first demonstration, but still highly satisfying. In later years, my research group at Stanford provided the first demonstration of changes in endorphins in the brain in rats with stress.
and changes in the blood of runners, and worked out many fundamental mechanisms of stress responses.

From my perspective, much of my work and that of my colleagues, even our work demonstrating for the first time genetic controls on the formation of key neurotransmitters, was quietly inspired out of a belief that it tied into theories of psychodynamics and the interplay of mind and brain—that perspective seemed to me to also be the way Freedman saw our work. Freedman sometimes said his work on LSD, our work on stress, and his work on autism were his major scientific contributions.

PSYCHIATRY TRAINING AT STANFORD—PSYCHOANALYSTS’ IMPACT

After two years working on peptides and enzymology in a superb National Heart Institute biochemistry laboratory, I started to search for a residency in psychiatry. There were few persons who we would now call neurobiologists interested in psychiatry, and few places interested in their training. Alfred Stanton at Harvard was one. Another was Milton Rosenbaum at Einstein. Highly encouraging, he graciously offered me a position but advised me to go someplace where my interests would be understood. All roads led to David Hamburg at Stanford, my other great mentor and the person who has had the most impact on me professionally for 50 years, along with Betty Hamburg, in her own right, a great figure in American psychiatry. David was trained as a psychiatrist and psychoanalyst but has crossed more disciplines with understanding and more situations with powerful impacts than any person I have ever known. He and Betty were pioneers in the study of human coping mechanisms. He also facilitated work in anthropology and primatology and was involved in studies of aggression, including his current work on genocide, in which he is acknowledged as the world leader in the study of its prevention. It is a project he worked on for over 10 years in the faculty office closest to mine at Weill Cornell after retiring from the presidency of the Carnegie Corporation. What started as a mentorship became an emotional hybrid equivalent to the closest of friends-family.

David encouraged my interaction and training experiences with serious psychoanalysts, such as William Weber, formerly of New York, Norman Graff, and Maurice Grossman—all of whom I came to revere. Grossman was so serious that some residents were afraid to have him as a supervisor. I found him demanding and incredibly interesting. He would often stop our supervision sessions about 10 minutes early to discuss one or another question. He would ask me, for example, to summarize what we knew about serotonin.

While some of my friends in what we now call neurobiology have complained about how they were treated decades ago during the wars of psychiatry, I have always had the opposite feeling—welcomed, helped, aided, and encouraged. Those three psychoanalysts made a profound impact. Interestingly, Fritz Redlich, who had moved from the chairmanship of psychiatry to become the dean at Yale, visited the Stanford department and noted that it was remarkable as a place that had the full range of intellectual areas but enjoyed the various approaches without conflicts so common elsewhere. That was the culture David Hamburg and a true representation of his values. Later, Hamburg led a group of leading psychiatrists, most from the analytic tradition, in a landmark study for the National Research Council, Psychiatry as a Behavioral Science. It called for broad inclusion of areas of knowledge into psychology.

Another aspect of my connection to psychoanalysts came with the illness of my late wife, Patricia, now viewed as a founder of what is today called social neuroscience, whom I had met and fallen in love with the first hour of the first day I was at Pomona College. She put me through medical school and I put her through a doctorate in sociology that led to her being a faculty member in sociology and psychiatry at Stanford. She had extensive interaction with psychoanalysts through the Yale child psychiatry program as she became the senior teacher at the Ribicoff Center for profoundly ill children. Most of the supervision was by Yale psychoanalysts, and she read a great deal of literature in that field.

When she developed severe headaches in her early forties, she saw many physicians. The two neurologists she saw were convinced her symptoms must be psychological and that she should see a psychiatrist or psychoanalyst. She decided on Norm Graff, a Menninger-trained psychoanalyst of broad intelligence, wide interests, good humor, and marvelous sense. He decided she was one of the healthiest individuals he had ever encountered, said she had a physical problem (which turned out to be a large brain astrocytoma) and followed her episodically for the next 15 years of her life when there were transitions or surgeries. Despite the difficulties, he noted that through the course of her illness she never became depressed. I was proud of my profession and appreciative of wise psychoanalysts.

MY GOAL AT WEILL CORNELL: TO HELP PSYCHIATRY AND THE ANALYTIC COMMUNITY

Although I had been at Stanford for 25 years, I rarely looked at other positions even when approached. The nature of my wife’s illness meant that an offer to become dean for neuroscience at UCLA would be interesting and give me far more time to be with her than other positions.

As I tracked what was happening in American psychiatry, I had become concerned that there was a new form of the wars in psychiatry. Now psychoanalytic approaches were the ones largely being ignored and marginalized, just the opposite of what had happened decades before.

Then came the request from Cornell to consider their position. Bob Michels, the great chair of the department who brought it to its modern form, had become dean. I fantasized that the Cornell community had made a list of neuroscientists and tried to decide who on the list would be sympathetic to what had been developed at Cornell, which included psychoanalytic approaches and much more. My wife, Pat, was bedridden and headed toward what would be a long state of altered consciousness, but she wanted me to look at the position and to accept it if offered. She loved New York and she liked the idea of the department.
Mm Mm Good

Frank M. Lachmann

I attended my first meeting of the American Psychoanalytic Association about 55 years ago, when, as a psychologist, I would only be admitted to meetings with a letter from a member supporting my interest in attending. Fortunately my analyst was a member and he wrote such a letter for me. But, I had to swear I would not reveal my analyst wrote the letter. Although the letter would gain me admission, the fact it was written by my analyst would be seen as counter-transference acting out and would have gotten him kicked out.

I attended the meeting and I remember a paper I heard then. It was Ralph Greenson’s paper; “On the meaning of the sound ‘mm’ as in the Campbell soup ad ‘Mm, mm good.’” The meaning is that this is the only sound a baby can make and keep in all the milk. Interestingly Leonard Bernstein came up with a similar idea many years later and from an entirely different source. He discovered a series of notes in music from different countries around the globe that resembled the “mm” sound. He also related it to the sound a baby can make and not lose any milk. Bernstein even added that the word “mother” in many languages begins with this sound. He also found another series of notes that resembled an “ech” sound, which Bernstein suggested was “spitting out the bad milk.”

I think Bernstein succeeded thereby in bringing together Ralph Greenson and Melanie Klein. All this is of particular interest today, since Beatrice Beebe and I are being made Honorary Members for our work on the relevance of infant research for adult treatment. It seems Ralph Greenson had a similar idea 55 years ago.

Honorary Members

A Phenomenological-Contextualist Psychoanalytic Perspective

Robert D. Stolorow

Intersubjective-systems theory, the name of the post-Cartesian psychoanalytic perspective that my collaborators and I have developed over the course of some four decades, is a phenomenological contextualism.

It is phenomenological in that it investigates and illuminates worlds of emotional experience and the structures that organize them. It is contextual in that it holds that such structures take form, both developmentally and in the psychoanalytic situation, in constitutive intersubjective contexts. Developmentally, recurring patterns of intersubjective transaction within the developmental system give rise to principles (thematic patterns, meaning-structures) that unconsciously organize subsequent emotional and relational experiences. Such organizing principles are unconscious, not in the sense of being repressed but in being prereflective; they ordinarily do not enter the domain of reflective self-awareness.

These intersubjectively derived, prereflective organizing principles are the basic building blocks of personality development, and their totality constitutes one’s character: They show up in the psychoanalytic situation in the form of transference, which intersubjective-systems theory conceptualizes as unconscious organizing activity. The patient’s transference experience is co-constituted by the patient’s prereflective organizing principles and whatever is coming from the analyst that is lending itself to being organized by them.

A parallel statement can be made about the analyst’s transference. The psychological field formed by the interplay of the patient’s transference and the analyst’s transference is an example of what we call an intersubjective system. Psychoanalysis is a dialogical method for bringing this prereflective organizing activity into reflective self-awareness.

Such organizing principles include, importantly, those that dictate what emotional experiences must be prevented from coming into full being—that is, those that must be dynamically repressed—because they are prohibited or too dangerous. Intersubjective-systems theory emphasizes that all such forms of unconsciousness are constituted in relational contexts. Indeed, from an intersubjective-systems perspective, all of the clinical phenomena with which psychoanalysis has been traditionally concerned are seen as taking form within systems of interacting, differently organized, mutually influencing emotional worlds.
Stopping the Cycle of Abuse

Estela Welldon

Although I have lived and worked in Great Britain for most of my professional life, my heart comes from the Americas, both from South America, where I was born and attended medical school, and first learned the rigors of psychoanalytical technique from my earliest mentor Horacio Etchegoyen, but also from North America, where immediately afterwards I undertook my psychiatric residency with Karl Menninger whose links to this organization will be well known to you all.

Menninger, in particular, had a huge impact on my work in the field of forensic psychotherapy and psychoanalysis. Dr. Karl was the first in helping me to learn about the cruel, unconscious hostility we project onto criminals, and how a more humane society can treat even offenders with greater compassion. Thus, my debt to American psychoanalysis is immense.

In the letter bearing official news of this honor, your president paid tribute to the

Estela Welldon, M.D., D.Sc. (Hon), F.R.C.Psych.BPC, is a member of the British Psychotherapy Foundation, founder and lifelong president of the International Association for Forensic Psychotherapy, author of Mother, Madonna, Whore, and consultant forensic psychiatrist, Tavistock & Portman NHS Foundation Trust.

Honorary Members
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Phenomenology led us inexorably to contextualism.

Intersubjective-systems theory gives an account of therapeutic action in which insight through interpretation and the affective bond with the analyst are seen to form an irreducible unity. Interpretive expansion of the patient’s capacity for reflective awareness of old, repetitive organizing principles occurs concomitantly with the affective impact and meanings of ongoing relational experiences with the analyst, and both are indissoluble components of a unitary therapeutic process that establishes the possibility of alternative principles for organizing experience, whereby the patient’s emotional horizons can become widened, enriched, more flexible, and more complex. As the tight grip of old organizing principles becomes loosened, as emotional experiencing thereby expands and becomes increasingly nameable within a context of human understanding, and as what one feels becomes seamlessly woven into the fabric of whom one essentially is, there is an enhancement of one’s very sense of being. That, to my mind, is the essence of therapeutic change.

Therefore I began my quest in listening to these women’s voices of despair and desolation, and from then on my aim was for these women to have not only a voice but also an ear: This led me to the question: What if we start seeing these women themselves as victims?

So, the task was to look at the damaged-damaging mother as the product of at least three generations. If we are able to apply this mental construct, we are then able to apply our understanding, compassion and empathy needed to stop the cycle of abuse.

We have to challenge our strong tendency and assumptions to idealize motherhood to the extent of denying any perverse motivations on becoming a mother or in taking care of babies.

This was all covered in my first book Mother, Madonna, Whore, published in 1988. Initially the book was greeted with some controversy, but eventually the concepts were widely accepted and acknowledged, and since then a number of resources have been created to deal with abuse by mothers.

The fact that this first book has never been out of print does not worry me, because in a way it is an indication that even though these terrible malfunctions have not yet disappeared, at least they are now being acknowledged and discussed.

In 1991, with the aim of changing perceptions and creating an understanding, I founded the International Association for Forensic Psychotherapy, which built a platform and a forum for professionals working around the world in this field to gather once a year to discuss in a frank and honest environment our own difficulties encountered in our daily work dealing with abuse and abusers. With respect to mothers as abusers, Mother, Madonna, Whore was the first to acknowledge this painful and awkward, even “politically incorrect” insight.

Let me be clear; the effects of abuse are terrible and can be long lasting, but condemnation and abhorrence will not change behavior or provide the help those victims need.

Our therapeutic work is hard but it is the only solution. I pay tribute to you all for your precious work.
As a psychiatrist and psychotherapist who accepts some insurance, I am concerned about the impact of current mental health procedural terminology (CPT) codes on psychotherapy—especially their effect on quality of care, payment, access, and privacy.

CODING CHANGES
The January 2013 coding changes are as follows:
1. Most prior mental health evaluation and therapy codes were eliminated.
2. Individual therapy, when concurrent with evaluation and management (E&M) is not billed as the primary service. Treatment is billed with an E&M code plus an add-on psychotherapy code.
3. New individual psychotherapy codes, with and without E&M, cover a range of time instead of a specific time. For example, a 45-minute session is coded for 37–52 minutes, determined by the “CPT time rule.”
4. The E&M codes, with add-on therapy, are based on complexity, not time. We are required to use data points based on a medical model to document care.
5. Psychiatrists and nurse practitioners can bill for just E&M. Time can be used to choose the procedure code for E&M without psychotherapy, if more than half the time is spent in counseling and/or coordinating care.
6. There is a new code for crisis psychotherapy and a new add-on code for interactive complexity, in lieu of a prior “interactive therapy” billing code. Interactive complexity is defined by having to use more complex communication techniques, i.e., an interpreter, third-party informant or manipulatives such as play therapy.

EFFECT ON CARE
These codes devalue psychotherapy, making therapy an add-on procedure, if it takes place with E&M. Billing integrated treatment (therapy with E&M) as two services falsely dichotomizes what would be otherwise seamless, concurrent treatment. Comparably low fees for individual therapy without E&M, crisis psychotherapy and therapy with interactive complexity emphasize psychotherapy’s second-class status in this new reimbursement scheme.

The coding changes will no doubt impact therapeutic process. The new psychotherapy time frames distort the notion of the traditional 50- or 60-minute session, and fit poorly with how we actually practice.

The associated documentation guidelines potentially distract us from attending to patients’ thoughts, feelings, and reactions, as well as our own, because of the necessity to elicit required data. Transference and countertransference, core psychodynamic principles, are pushed to the periphery in this new health care model that detracts from spontaneity and quality.

PAYMENT AND ACCESS
Though total insurance fees for therapy with E&M have increased, the allowable reimbursement for the therapy component has decreased for psychiatrists and advanced practice nurses. Because E&M is more lucrative, psychiatrists and nurses may prefer to code sessions as time-based E&M, provided the work consists of “counseling/coordination of care.” Billing records could spuriously underrepresent integrated psychotherapy and can be expected to endanger insurance coverage for psychotherapy by psychiatrists and advanced practice nurses.

Most insurers, without prior authorization, disallow 60-minute sessions; some pay the same amount for 45- and 60-minute sessions, making longer sessions less economically desirable. Furthermore, because “average times” determine fees, payment will not accurately reflect the actual time spent. The requirement that psychotherapists document the type of psychotherapy may herald decreased reimbursement or reduced insurance coverage for long-term psychoanalytic psychotherapy, in favor of short-term, “cost-effective” treatment modalities. This could endanger the future of psychodynamic psychotherapy.

Continued on page 31
Do Invisible People Still Have to Breathe?

That’s affirmative, no question. I knew a woman invisible for thirty-eight years if you count her time growing up plus most of her marriage. She took many breaths during that time although very quietly.

She learned early to time her breathing to coincide with others so she would not be audible. This matched her skill at dressing to blend with the background and finding a shadow to stand in.

Her parents would cut four pieces of pie when there were five at the table. Teachers had to think hard when they saw her name on an essay. Beggars never asked her for money, dogs never barked when she passed.

Throughout that time she was breathing though concerned she might be using too much air. The trouble started when she grew tired of children on tricycles ramming her legs, store clerks ignoring her, gifts always the wrong size.

She tried hard to put invisibility behind her, began to breathe openly like everyone else, admitted she had opinions. And her husband for the first time looked straight at her and said, You know, you should learn to hold your breath.

—Michael Harty

Unasked

I should have read you like a poem, should have interrogated the silences around your words, found the invitation you would never speak—to ask about a mother’s romance with illness, the hush around her door; to ask about your nightmare of hotel rooms, why you would run to exhaustion in the dark streets while your protector drank himself to sleep. Why no eager schoolmate would know the tender down of your thighs. Why you drove to the store for your mother like the good daughter you were, picked up her prescription then home in your pink bedroom ate a handful, and placed yourself beyond all questions.

Countertransference

Sometimes when you speak I hear my first boss, soft like you, stingy with his help.

Or my fourth-grade teacher who had your hair and wanted boys to be like girls.

Parents, preachers, coaches, cousins: I search for your voice distinct from the chorus of reminders yet after all this time if you grab my collar and scream, I might think you are embracing me.

I may tell you a dozen ignorant lies in pursuit of one truth, and all you can do is try to forgive me, and keep talking.

Sheri Butler is an adult training and consulting analyst and a child consulting 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.
Mozart and Freud Visit Ann Arbor, Michigan

Julie Jaffee Nagel

In the unconscious, there is no such thing as time, place or dates. This became clearly evident when Sigmund Freud and Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart visited Ann Arbor, Michigan, on October 24 while taking a break from their journey in eternity. As you may know, Freud made disclaimers about music, maintaining he could not appreciate it. Mozart countered that he could express himself only through music.

Displaying enough comfort to address each other on a first name basis, the two icons engaged in a lively discussion (with assistance from my original script) about their feelings regarding music and psychoanalysis. This topic is explored in my book, *Melodies of the Mind*.

Mozart could not understand how Freud, developing his theory of the mind at the turn of the 20th century in Vienna, was not curious about how music was a road to the unconscious. Freud could not understand how music was a pathway to mental life without using words to analyze it. The two men also discussed leaving their motherland—Freud left Vienna for London to escape the Nazi invasion and Mozart left his home in Salzburg to travel to Paris with his mother who, sadly, died during their travels.

During their visit to reality, Freud and Mozart were welcomed by Carol Seigel, director of the Freud Museum in London, at a large gathering at the Ann Arbor Jewish Community Center. Freud, in particular, felt at home as Seigel brought objects from the Freud House to share. With the assistance of actors from the University of Michigan’s respected Music Theater Department (Brent Wagner, director), Al Fallick (Freud) and John-Alexander Sakelos (Mozart), we learned about the development of psychoanalysis and about Mozart’s composing his great piano Sonata, K. 310 in A minor. As Freud and Mozart departed and continued their journey back to eternity, the entire sonata was performed by Louis Nagel.

It has been documented that Freud and Mozart have appeared together in other venues around the U.S., and it was rumored they will visit other locations in the future.

Julie Jaffee Nagel, Ph.D., is a graduate of the Juilliard School, University of Michigan, and Michigan Psychoanalytic Institute, where she is also faculty. She is author of *Melodies of the Mind* and in private practice in Ann Arbor. Website: www.julienagel.net
Art and Analysis at Florence International Symposium

Vera J. Camden

This spring, in the birthplace of the Renaissance, Florence, Italy, the city will host another manner of “renaissance” for the intersecting and interdependent fields of psychoanalysis and art. Co-chairs Laurie Wilson and Grazia Magherini will host The Sixth International Symposium on Psychoanalysis and Art to be held on May 15-17, 2014. This conference, “Art/Object: the Artist, the Object, the Patron and the Audience,” brings together leading scholars on art, literature, music, psychoanalysis and neuroscience in sessions to be held at a 14th century cloister, Chiostro del Maglio.

There will be two plenary addresses: The renowned art historian, David Freedberg (The Power of Images), will address “Art, Empathy and Neuroscience,” which will be discussed by Vittorio Gallese, the eminent neuroscientist. Distinguished choral conductor and music director, David Rosenmeyer (Oratorio Society of New York), will present “Mahler: Death and Rebirth in Song,” which will be discussed by musicologist Alexandra Amati-Camperi.

From these two plenary addresses, one can see the interdisciplinary dialogue that informs the vision of this conference.

Indeed, by bringing together the worlds of neuroscience, music and art through the language of psychoanalysis, the cultural field is expanded to position sciences and art in dynamic discussion, reviving Sigmund Freud’s original vision of the “psychoanalytic academy” enunciated in The Question of Lay Analysis, where he invokes “the evolution of human civilization and its major institutions such as art, religion and the social order” as the ultimate forum for the psychoanalytic enterprise. The Florence Interdisciplinary symposium on art and literature is a living tribute to such a vision, which Freud felt would promise a future for psychoanalysis. As outlined in my 2009 paper in the International Journal of Psychoanalysis, the “imbrication [of psychoanalysis] in the full matrix of cultural knowledge” remains crucial to the health, endurance and flourishing of both clinical and cultural psychoanalysis.

The renowned art historian, David Freedberg (The Power of Images), will address “Art, Empathy and Neuroscience,” which will be discussed by Vittorio Gallese, the eminent neuroscientist. Distinguished choral conductor and music director, David Rosenmeyer (Oratorio Society of New York), will present “Mahler: Death and Rebirth in Song,” which will be discussed by musicologist Alexandra Amati-Camperi.

From these two plenary addresses, one can see the interdisciplinary dialogue that informs the vision of this conference.

Indeed, by bringing together the worlds of neuroscience, music and art through the language of psychoanalysis, the cultural field is expanded to position sciences and art in dynamic discussion, reviving Sigmund Freud’s original vision of the “psychoanalytic academy” enunciated in The Question of Lay Analysis, where he invokes “the evolution of human civilization and its major institutions such as art, religion and the social order” as the ultimate forum for the psychoanalytic enterprise. The Florence Interdisciplinary symposium on art and literature is a living tribute to such a vision, which Freud felt would promise a future for psychoanalysis. As outlined in my 2009 paper in the International Journal of Psychoanalysis, the “imbrication [of psychoanalysis] in the full matrix of cultural knowledge” remains crucial to the health, endurance and flourishing of both clinical and cultural psychoanalysis.

The symposium will take up the ways psychoanalysis continues to learn from and continues to illuminate art, visual culture and material culture. For example, Jane McAdam Freud, the sculptor and great-granddaughter of Freud, will present a paper entitled “In the Mould of the Fathers—Objects of Sculpture, Subjects of Legacy,” Donald Kuspit (The Death of Art) will address “Collecting: A Narcissistic Agony,” to which Mary Kay O’Neil will respond with her paper, “The Analyst as Collector.” Gennaro Saragnano, chair of the International Psychoanalytical Association’s Publication Committee, will moderate a roundtable discussion on art and psychoanalytic publications, while other talks will explore art in relation to broad societal issues including “Fashion as Fetish,” by art historian and fashion writer; Amy Fine Collins.

Other interdisciplinary talks will explore art in relation to broad societal issues such as “Belgian Modernism and Imperial Violence in the 1890s,” by art historian Deborah Silverman (Van Gogh and Gauguin: The Search for Sacred Art), to which psychoanalytic and theater consultant Phillip Freeman will respond with a contemporary critique of violence in contemporary theater and virtual culture. Segueing into the contemporary scene, and in a testimony to the enduring capacity of psychoanalysis to invent and reinvent itself through the arts, my own paper, “Alison’s Autographics,” will discuss cartoonist Alison Bechdel’s invocation of D.W. Winnicott, as “muse” to her nascent self. By turning to graphic narrative as an emerging genre in this symposium, we are once again witness to psychoanalysis’s never shying away from any aspect of creativity and culture, a claim to which Adele Tutter will respond with further reflections on “the psychoanalytic muse” as pervasive in modern culture.

This international symposium pays credence to the true power of psychoanalysis. The life that psychoanalysis has found and will continue to find in the arts and humanities contradicts the laments we often hear regarding the diminished interest in psychoanalysis in our fast-paced world. This symposium suggests an ongoing renaissance in the cultural field, placing art where Freud placed it: at the very core of his vision for both clinical and cultural analysis. For as he makes very clear: “the use of analysis for the treatment of the neuroses is only one of its applications; the future will perhaps show that it is not the most important one.”

FLORENCE INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM

Art and Analysis at Florence International Symposium

Vera J. Camden, Ph.D., is professor of English at Kent State University and training and supervising analyst at the Cleveland Psychoanalytic Center. She is a member of the Committee on Research and Special Training and co-editor of American Imago.

SCULPTURE, COLLECTIONS, FASHION AND GRAPHIC ARTS

The symposium will take up the ways psychoanalysis continues to learn from and continues to illuminate art, visual culture and material culture. For example, Jane McAdam Freud, the sculptor and great-granddaughter of Freud, will present a paper entitled “In the Mould of the Fathers—Objects of Sculpture, Subjects of Legacy,” Donald Kuspit (The Death of Art) will address “Collecting: A Narcissistic Agony,” to which Mary Kay O’Neil will respond with her paper, “The Analyst as Collector.” Gennaro Saragnano, chair of the International Psychoanalytical Association’s Publication Committee, will moderate a roundtable discussion on art and psychoanalytic publications, while other talks will explore art in relation to broad societal issues including “Fashion as Fetish,” by art historian and fashion writer; Amy Fine Collins.

Other interdisciplinary talks will explore art in relation to broad societal issues such as “Belgian Modernism and Imperial Violence in the 1890s,” by art historian Deborah Silverman (Van Gogh and Gauguin: The Search for Sacred Art), to which psychoanalytic and theater consultant Phillip Freeman will respond with a contemporary critique of violence in contemporary theater and virtual culture. Segueing into the contemporary scene, and in a testimony to the enduring capacity of psychoanalysis to invent and reinvent itself through the arts, my own paper, “Alison’s Autographics,” will discuss cartoonist Alison Bechdel’s invocation of D.W. Winnicott, as “muse” to her nascent self. By turning to graphic narrative as an emerging genre in this symposium, we are once again witness to psychoanalysis’s never shying away from any aspect of creativity and culture, a claim to which Adele Tutter will respond with further reflections on “the psychoanalytic muse” as pervasive in modern culture.

This international symposium pays credence to the true power of psychoanalysis. The life that psychoanalysis has found and will continue to find in the arts and humanities contradicts the laments we often hear regarding the diminished interest in psychoanalysis in our fast-paced world. This symposium suggests an ongoing renaissance in the cultural field, placing art where Freud placed it: at the very core of his vision for both clinical and cultural analysis. For as he makes very clear: “the use of analysis for the treatment of the neuroses is only one of its applications; the future will perhaps show that it is not the most important one.”

Freed’s challenging prediction suggests that as analysts, artists, critics, patrons, journalists, educators, and audience, we have powerful cultural tools that derive from clinical contexts in a mutually enriching and creative communion of body, mind and spirit. It is our hope and expectation that this gathering in Florence will celebrate such creativity in the spirit of its founder’s vision for psychoanalysis, culture and society. Please join us in Florence. For more information visit http://www.florencepsychoart2014.com/events.
As It Is in Heaven

Allan Gold
Bruce Sklarew, Film Editor

Daniel Dareus, a play on words from the Bible story, (played by Michael Nyqvist) is transformed and transfigured on his journey from world-class conductor to a disguised boy/man in a dangerous return to the dark and cold place of his childhood in northern Sweden. His heart attack triggers past heart-breaks. Daniel’s doctor says, “Your heart is completely worn out.”

We see that Daniel was beaten by the boys of his town while practicing his violin in an open wheat field. Immediately after, he says, “I want to marry you, Mommy,” as the face and voice of his mother comfort him and she promises to take him away to another school. When she comes to hear him play later as a young teen, she is cruelly struck down by a car that he sees impassively from a tower window above the street. In this film, he becomes a generative “Man of Achievement” (Wilfred Bion) through his love for Lena (played by Frida Hallgren), a local, young, unsophisticated and vivacious beauty in the frozen northern Swedish town. We watch as his and the town’s frozen hearts melt and meld together.

How does this happen? This film tells us much about trauma and healing. The prolonged and repeated trauma of being sadistically beaten, rejected, humiliated and terrorized many times by the boys, joins the cruelty of fate that strikes down Daniel’s mother (and where is the father whom we never see?). Daniel’s development freezes on the spot with lightning speed. The boy escapes into music.

Pierre Janet described trauma in the mind as a large zone of inflammation, walled off by surrounding layers of scar tissue, around which an outer rind might mature, rerouting all connections around the frozen center into a rigid or chaotic personality. This cuts off important internal and external experiences that a child would need to develop into a full loving adult. A career in music is a wonderful displacement and compromise, but not a substitute for the buried emotions and energies inside Daniel’s real self. His potential for a full life is encased behind a castle of repression and a garrison of defensive guards.

Continued on page 25
THE JOURNEY BACK

After his heart attack, Daniel returns to the town, for reasons he was not conscious of, to a frozen landscape on a snow buried road. The unconscious seeks wholeness. His life had reached a pinnacle, yet he feels numb. His return to the frozen town of his youth, in the dark of winter, symbolizes the journey that a traumatized person in therapy makes into the dark areas of the mind.

Daniel encounters Connie, now a man, who was the abusive persecutor of his childhood, and Stig, the repressed, tyrannical churchman of the town, who mirror the cruelty of fate, Daniel’s own murderous rage, his identification with the aggressors, external persecutors who embody the internal persecutors that cut him off from human warmth.

He is easily overwhelmed by anxiety, unable to face the intense anger and longings inside or to connect emotionally with people outside. The film articulates a “myth of the hero,” a journey back to connection with Daniel’s deeper self and others.

Lena, her face illuminated in the warm light of the town convenience store, first appears as the angel of Christmas. Her smiles and face recall Daniel’s mother when she comforts Daniel on the night of his beating. Lena shyly and playfully awakens notes of a buried chord in Daniel that vibrates with her sexuality and tenderness. He cannot take his eyes off her beautiful smile, which begins the melting of his heart. Lena’s tender and sexual feelings will combine to reawaken and harmonize Daniel’s connections back to the mother of his childhood and forward in time to his becoming an adult sexual partner.

Lena helps him recover from both the traumas of violent bullying and the violent loss of his mother by providing the mirroring Daniel needs for early reattachment, as we do with our patients. Daniel practices new skills and develops tolerance for emotions and anxiety. Lena smiles as he explores leadership and learns friendship with the choir; using his acquired skills and talent in music to create community in the choir and a community of interconnecting aggressive and loving emotions within.

Daniel regulates his aggression with love as he stands up for the abused and repressed wives of Connie and Stig, both of whom try to murder him in the film for threatening their tyrannical control of their wives. Rescued by the town, he reveals his identity and his childhood trauma as the town rallies around him. He achieves mature sexuality and love culminating in what is likely his first sexual experience, followed by tender sleep, just a few hours before he will die a complete and Authentic Man.

A LARGER CONTEXT

The film reflects multiple Oedipal triangles. However, as Freud also taught, our patients’ lives take place in larger contexts of meaning, history, human culture, art and literature, and myth. The film in story and imagery portrays Daniel as Christ-like and as Daniel in the lion’s den in the Old Testament. Even more central, as in the myth of the hero elaborated by Jung and Joseph Campbell, a broken Daniel leaves the familiar, undergoes a series of trials and perils, and brings wisdom, skill and healing back to his home. Daniel is like Odysseus in his journey back to Penelope or Percival in search of the Holy Grail.

The film also resonates with more recent understandings in psychoanalysis from infant research and neuroscience. Like Lars, in the American/Canadian film Lars and the Real Girl, Daniel is hypervigilant and hypersensitive (emotionally and tactilely). His schizoid and avoidant personality struggles against a hyperaroused nervous system resulting in his avoidant and, at times, odd behavior: Daniel learns through Lena and his encounters at multiple levels with the town to find centers of calm in his personality, his music and his nervous system and to allow increasing amounts of contact.

Continued on page 29
Psychotherapy in Psychoanalytic Organizations

Alan Pollack

The nature of the relationship between psychoanalysis and psychotherapy has bedeviled our field, seemingly eternally. While framed at an intellectual and clinical level, the issue also has organizational repercussions that powerfully affect many psychoanalytic institutions. These forces have been particularly challenging in recent decades when so many societies and institutes, responding to the crisis in institute recruitment, have established psychotherapy training programs. The problematic aspects of the dynamics include these: The analytic institution responds to the new psychotherapy program with concerns about standards, identity, intrusion, cooption and corruption; those involved in the psychotherapy program experience distrust, marginalization and devaluation. Sometimes the tensions are pointed and intense, sometimes subtle and implicit. Over time, as the worst fears prove to be unfounded, tensions diminish, and the strained upstairs-downstairs relationship evolves into a beneficial partnership.

I have been privileged to occupy a ringside seat on these developments, both locally and nationally. I served as director of psychotherapy training at the Boston Psychoanalytic Society and Institute (BPSI) for 24 years. I was also a founding co-chair of APsaA’s Committee on Psychotherapy Training, and most informatively, its Workshop for Directors of Psychotherapy Training Programs. The workshop became a vital support group for those of us struggling with the complex dynamics of representing the value of psychotherapy training within psychoanalytic institutions. Through our discussions, we discovered that similar dynamics affected every psychoanalytic organization that undertook psychotherapy training—with, of course, local flavorings. I would like to share some speculations regarding some sources of these dynamics.

IN THE BEGINNING…

From its earliest years, psychoanalysis was concerned with distinguishing itself from other therapeutic modalities. Freud was particularly eager to distinguish psychoanalysis from suggestion, the use of authority to influence the patient. The relative value he placed on the two modalities is captured by his famous remark to the Fifth International Psycho-Analytical Congress in 1918: “[T]he large-scale application of our therapy will compel us to alloy the pure gold of analysis with the copper of direct suggestion.”

Freud’s hopeful vision of a “large-scale application of our therapy” eventually came to fruition, in the form of psychotherapy. But this successful development triggered a crisis of identity, compelling psychoanalysts to define what distinguishes psychoanalysis proper from psychoanalytic psychotherapy. The struggle begat repeated discussions, debates, panels and reports, all attempting to clarify the issue, but none successfully putting it to rest. (For a history of these matters, see Robert Wallerstein’s book The Talking Cures.)

Why has so much intellectual effort failed to put the question to rest? Why do we repeat the same debates over and over?

In these discussions, commonalities and distinctions between psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic psychotherapy have been mapped carefully and usefully. Yet the question of the relationship between the two never quite ceased to trouble the field. Perhaps these discussions fail to resolve the question because they engage it at only a manifest level. A subterranean level of great emotional power remains unaddressed, resisting resolution by intellectual comparison alone. I have come to think of this level as characterized by projective identification, in which disavowed but inescapable parts of psychoanalytic treatment were consigned to psychotherapy.

Freud described the scope of psychoanalysis, in that same 1918 address, as “to bring to the patient’s knowledge the unconscious, repressed impulses existing in him, and, for that purpose, to uncover the resistances that oppose this extension of his knowledge about himself.” Anything other than providing such insight deviated from “pure” psychoanalysis. By the 1950s, the desire of psychoanalysts for purity had produced an austere and impossible model of treatment. The ideal analyst would limit himself to systematic interpretation designed to facilitate the development and then the resolution of a regressive transference neurosis, through insight alone.

DYNAMICS OF DISAVOWAL

How far we have come from that original ideal is evident in nearly every contemporary psychoanalytic presentation. Almost all analysts now conceptualize insight as meaningful and effective only as part of the relationship between analyst and analysand. And this therapeutic relationship is understood not merely as the catalyst for the development of insight, but as an active, complex force essential in its own right to therapeutic action. If we are correct in this today, how did psychoanalysis deal with this essential force before? I suggest that it dealt with it largely by disavowal. All along the historical route to our contemporary position, psychoanalysis repeatedly rejected proponents of the interpersonal position, consigning them and their work to the realm of not-analysis, that is, to the realm of psychotherapy.

But psychoanalysis could not successfully rid itself of this supposedly non-analytic taint. In one form or another, the interpersonal force kept finding voice, and kept having to be rejected. From our current understanding,
this recurrence was inevitable because of the truth and necessity of the rejected view. Thus psychotherapy held a disavowed but essential part of psychoanalysis. I would like to propose a speculative claim. It is not essential to my observations on institutional dynamics, and I will not try to substantiate it. My speculation is that Freud's conscious and principled disavowal of suggestion was part of a broader disavowal, one less conscious, which was a disavowal of the importance of relationship; and furthermore, that the importance of relationship was disavowed partly because it fell within the realm of the feminine. Freud's patient H.D. recalled that Freud confessed to her, "I do not like to be the mother in transference—it always surprises and shocks me a little. I feel so very masculine." (I am indebted to Boston analyst Lora Tessman for this quotation.)

Insight penetrates, phallicly. Relationship holds, maternally.

Whatever the value of this speculation about Freud's psychology, psychoanalysis disavowed the importance of relationship, I do not intend to consider here the profound implications of this disavowal for psychoanalytic theory and practice, nor the transformation of theory and practice that has resulted from the gradual reincorporation of the importance of relationship into psychoanalysis. That subject has been treated well by many writers (for example, by Stephen Mitchell in *Hope and Dread in Psychoanalysis*). What I wish to consider here are some of the organizational dynamics of the disavowal process.

The dynamics of disavowal are familiar from other forms of group projective identification. On the level of society, one thinks of race, ethnicity, gender or sexual orientation as fault lines across which such projective identifications occur. On one side of the line is the affirmed identity; on the other, the disavowed. Devaluation is a painful consequence for the disavowed, and identity threat is an ever-present anxiety for the disavowing.

FROM COPPER TO LEAD

Anyone involved in psychotherapy within organized psychoanalysis knows this dynamic well. From every psychoanalytic society and institute that has established a psychotherapy training program—or that has even discussed establishing such a program—come reports of upstairs-downstairs dynamics, of devaluation subtle or overt, and of signs of threatened identity in the parent psychoanalytic organization. The French psychoanalyst Paul Israel noted that as Freud's gold/copper analogy was repeatedly quoted and paraphrased over the years, the second metal gradually transmuted from copper to bronze, tin and ultimately lead—an alchemy of urgent disavowal.

Identity threat is not the only cost for the disavowing. Impoverishment, though often consciously unrecognized, may be the greater cost. What is left for dominant culture if irrationality, intuition, creativity, sexuality, softness, vulnerability and other such troublesome attributes are all to be assigned, variably, to blacks, to gays or to women?

Impoverishment leads to a complex response. The affirmed identity, needing elements of vitality assigned to the disavowed, repeatedly must reincorporate aspects of the disavowed. The trick is for the affirmed identity to frame the reincorporations as new developments proper to itself, without acknowledging the source. Yet because each reincorporation diminishes to some degree the distinction between the two identities, identity threat increases, and the distinguishing line has to be drawn and redrawn, over and over and over. (Think of the development of popular music in the 20th century. To begin to internalize the exciting sexuality and rhythmic intensity of black music, white culture needed to invent Elvis, whose dazzling glitter kept the blackness of the music out of view. Later could come Motown, black but not too black.)

The model of pure psychoanalysis became increasingly impoverished as it excluded from its official, affirmed self much that is vital and necessary in the therapeutic process, much that analysts knew and practiced but could not openly value or even acknowledge. The 1950s model, at the time of the field's apogee of worldly power and respect, was austere nearly to the point of sterility. Reincorporation was essential, and it proceeded largely as just discussed, via a series of "new" developments within psychoanalysis proper.

We “discovered” two-person psychology, intersubjectivity, enactments, self-objects, empathic resonance, counter-transference as an active force, and so on, all relational dynamics under new names.

As psychoanalysis has become more relational, many analysts have come to see psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic psychotherapy along a spectrum, rather than divided by a gulf. Disavowal and devaluation have diminished, and psychoanalytic institutions have increasingly embraced psychotherapy training as part of their mission. Market realities have contributed powerfully to this development. The consulting firm that helped guide BPSI’s strategic planning process reported a blunt conclusion from its national research: The institutes around the country that remain strong are those with successful psychotherapy training programs. Yet I suspect market forces alone would have been insufficient to effect change were psychotherapy still so desperately needed as the container of projective identification in the service of supporting the threatened identity of psychoanalysis.

The pendulum in mental health has begun to swing back from its reductionist biological position, and trainees are looking to psychoanalytic institutions to enrich the constricted perspectives offered by their primary training centers. Psychotherapy training is our primary means of connecting with these trainees. At BPSI, we regularly draw about 30 students each year for our first-year psychotherapy program. The energy and enthusiasm are palpable. Things could not have evolved this way had the old split persisted unabated. Internal devaluation and marginalization of psychotherapy hobbled us. But our field is gradually healing the old split in its identity, unleashing new vitality and vibrant possibilities for growth.
NEWER TAXONOMIES OF LEARNING

The accumulation of many years of experience and research with educational objectives has led to revisions of Bloom’s original taxonomy, two of which offer promising systems for organizing psychoanalytic objectives. They are constructed with hierarchical categories from basic to more complex abilities as is Bloom’s system. Yet, these taxonomies attempt to go beyond that early effort by incorporating research findings and updated thinking about learning processes. Both also include new conceptual foci especially pertinent to our field. One of these, called metacognition, pertains to the capacity for self-reflection regarding one’s thought processes. Much of our clinical work depends on being able to observe ourselves, emotionally and cognitively, and to apply that understanding to patient encounters. The second taxonomy emphasizes the importance of the subject matter to the learner as well as his/her motivation to learn. The differences between the two lie in what categories the systems choose as the basic elements of learning.

Loren Anderson and Krathwohl, in 2001, edited A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing that identifies four major types of knowledge present in the cognitive processing of information.

1. Factual—including terminology, specific details and elements
2. Conceptual—incorporating classifications, principles, generalizations, theories and models
3. Procedural—how and when to apply knowledge and methods of inquiry
4. Metacognitive—strategic thinking as well as awareness of one’s own cognition, i.e., the capacity to evaluate one’s own thinking

Robert Marzano and John Kendall published Designing and Assessing Educational Objectives in 2008. They emphasize the levels of cognitive processing of information and also provide a more detailed look at the distinctions between cognitive and metacognitive tasks. Perhaps most important as a model for psychoanalytic education is their highest category, self-system thinking.

The six levels are:
1. Retrieval of information
2. Comprehension of content
3. Analysis—identifying similarities and differences, classifying categories, analyzing errors, and creating new generalizations
4. Knowledge utilization—decision making, problem solving, investigating, and experimenting
5. Metacognition—monitoring process, clarity, and accuracy
6. Self-system thinking—examination of a) importance of the information to the self; b) efficacy of one’s competence or understanding and capacity to improve; c) emotional response to the learning experience or material; d) motivation to improve or understand the information or procedure.

To demonstrate the usefulness of both of these taxonomies, I have selected two learning objectives from the APsaA 2013 National Meeting. Each emphasizes different kinds and levels of learning.

The first, more characteristic of introductory courses, had as its goal that the successful learner could “describe several developmental features of preschool children that make play the preferable therapeutic technique.” This objective would be seen as demonstrating conceptual knowledge, using Anderson and Krathwohl’s categories, since description requires familiarity with developmental stages and tasks as well. It also incorporates procedural knowledge (level 3), concerning the application of the play technique and its particular suitability to preschool aged children.

In Marzano and Kendall’s system, the session planners direct learners toward both content (level 2) as well as analysis (level 3) learning. The content level stresses knowing what developmental tasks are typically accomplished by preschool aged children, what research says concerning the ways preschool children are growing, and the nature of play as a therapeutic approach. Analysis of the information enters into consideration of play as contrasted with other technical interventions and the capacity to state advantages for children of that age group.

A second objective addressed skills required in many advanced clinical courses and relied on previously acquired learning. “Analyze clinical material so as to identify and evaluate the theory underlying the analyst’s work.” This objective assumes the learner already can detail relevant factual information about the case being presented and can also comprehend the content of differing theoretical perspectives. Applying Anderson’s classification, the emphasis is on procedural capabilities, discerning from the material which theoretical perspective is represented. Further, the objective involves the metacognitive skill of evaluating and articulating the usefulness of that particular theoretical perspective as compared with others.

With Marzano and Kendall’s system, it is important to note that they use the term “analysis” in a different way than we do, as analytic teachers. We generally consider it to include investigation and generation of hypotheses (knowledge utilization) as well as consideration of the validity and clarity of our ideas (metacognition). The above objective incorporates both of these and more broadly the consideration of the value of the theoretical perspective to the learner (self-system thinking).

PROGRESS TOWARD CLARITY

We are fortunate to be making progress toward greater clarity of definition in our educational endeavors through the use of learning objectives. Cabaniss and others have demonstrated that there are useful exercises that help students and candidates simulate clinical decision making. In these ways, candidates can practice in vivo skills before applying them.

The groundbreaking efforts to improve psychoanalytic education have contributed to our ability to effectively describe the complex tasks of analytic work.

This is the job we have before us: carving out the higher ground between the pros and cons of educational objectives. Surely, our aim is to use objectives for what they can offer us in enhancing educational efforts, while keeping an eye to the fact that our goals are always larger. We are still on a learning curve.
Terror of contact is desensitized with progressively safe contact experiences. As with our patients, frozen developmental capacities can then unfold, activating calming influences of the parasympathetic nervous system, balancing the fight/flight/freeze feelings of the sympathetic nervous system. This results in a deconditioning of the terror of these sensations while curiosity, interest and a sense of mastery rise, just as our patients in psychoanalysis and psychotherapy talk about and renegotiate the stories of their lives.

MASTERING ANXIETY

Anxiety changes from a dreaded harbinger of overwhelmedness to a signal for more attention to feelings of excitement as body and mind encounter new opportunities for challenge or fulfillment. Daniel in his exuberance in learning about love, riding a bicycle, the joy of childlike play in his work with the choir; emerging sexual and tender love for Lena, spontaneously explores new capacities for sensation and emotional activation in relationships. He learns to manage conflict and sexuality with others through discussion and negotiation, evolved to respond cognitively and emotionally to sound, story, facial expressions, color, patterns and word connotations consciously and unconsciously. Pollak is a sophisticated director who uses these elements to evoke deeper emotional experiences in the viewer. For example, the landscape itself mirrors the theme of transformation. As the snow melts, the river flows, the sun shines longer; as the iceberg melts inside Daniel’s mind and heart, we melt with sympathetic sorrow and joy.

Rivers flow. We actually can feel in our bodies the warmth in Lena’s smile, excitement in her sexuality, liveliness in her childlike expressions of anger and longing. We belly laugh at the antics in the little choir room where the singers romp, play and pile on each other; dancing, drinking and feasting as in an overtly sexualized Dionysian bacchanal. We constrict with terror and hold our breath, as Daniel is facing Connie in the icy river once again having his chest beaten, or Stig with a shotgun plans to kill both Daniel and himself. In the film, the skillful deliberate focus on facial close-ups and musical accompaniments draws us as viewers into empathy and energetic activation patterns.

Bion suggests our minds, awake or asleep, are always working with linkages and analogues in sensation and symbolization, which he calls the alpha process that is the same as in dreaming. He further suggests that our waking lives, psychoanalyses, and dreams are all constructed by processes that bring the ultimate unknowable cosmos into the individual who is open and achieves mature inner development in a relationship with another human being. Daniel’s lifelong goal of unlocking the music in the human heart is linked with his view that it already exists in heaven. Pollak in his emphasis on “no chance encounter” parallels the findings of the attachment researchers, neuroscientists, evolutionary biologists, and infant researchers that there are, inside the core of us, systems, evolved over millennia of astronomical and biological evolution, that suggest we are more transpersonal and intersubjective beings than intrapsychic beings. As Pollak and other mystics would say, there are no chance encounters. We are here to learn to be human... to love each other... on earth as it is in heaven.
Psychodynamic Perspective

Continued from page 17

I made a very fast trip and was totally enchanted by a place that covered much wider areas than most people realized and had a spirit of collegiality, an interest in ideas, a reputation for excellence in its clinical and educational activities, and was a center of outstanding scholarship, with extraordinary full-time and voluntary faculty.

While some of my friends in neurobiology had taken chairmanships and then enforced massive changes, I did not feel that was appropriate for Cornell. Indeed, when offered the position, I felt it was more like a trusteeship for me to preserve and protect its best aspects and build some additional foci that might interact. With Philip Wilner, the exceptional executive vice-chair of the department, it has been possible to undertake such a plan. We have a developmental focus from childhood through geriatrics, a remarkable array of specialized clinical programs and research, and initiatives in many other subjects such as history and social policy. Analysts are involved in all aspects, but so too are persons with quite different interests working together in a cooperative manner.

We have tried to facilitate scholarship in many areas for the department. In terms of psychoanalysis, that has included support for projects such as that of Bob Michels as a coauthor of the new classic edition of the volume on interviewing; Otto Kernberg and his colleagues dealing with psychodynamic treatment and biological aspects of borderline personality disorder; George Makari and his brilliant text on the intellectual history of psychoanalysis; John Barnhill in his able writing on diagnosis and various approaches in psychiatry; Betsy Auchincloss with her coediting of the fascinating dictionary of psychoanalysis; Milt Viederman with a project on interviewing patients in consultation liaison using psychodynamic approaches, and Barbara Milrod with her pioneering projects on anxiety. A number of these projects and volumes have received national and international acclaim. We are proud to have been able to facilitate them as we are of projects in other areas of psychiatry.

Some of our earliest efforts were aided by psychoanalysts, including William Frosch and the late Arnold Cooper; as well as the late Sam Perry, a psychoanalyst who was the vice chair for research in the department and had a magical ability to encourage multiple areas. Later, David Silbersweig, now chair of psychiatry at the Brigham, became the vice chair for research and, while not an analyst, was pleased to be helping those projects and even had a joint project with Otto Kernberg.

Another significant direction was made possible by the Sackler Institute for Developmental Psychobiology; through the wonderful philanthropy of Mortimer Sackler, a psychiatrist interested in both biology and psychoanalysis. Ilene Sackler; one of his daughters and a voluntary faculty member, was particularly interested in the project to which the entire family has contributed. In this case there was also major input from others, all psychoanalysts. Bob Michels was a force for the project, which was also inspired by the late, beloved Dan Stern. Ted Shapiro helped with the development of the project. An individual who made a major difference was the late Ethel Person, who served on the founding board and was an important advisor to me, encouraging the combination of psychodynamic approaches and biology. The institute was first headed by Michael Posner; the pioneering developer of cognitive neuroscience, and is now headed by B.J. Casey, considered one of the best developmental psychobiologists of her generation in the world.

I must admit that one other effort on behalf of psychoanalysis did not work out as I had hoped. When I came to New York 20 years ago, I believed there would be an advantage to a merger of some of the analytic institutes. Toward that end, I met with the leadership of several institutes—all agreed it might be a good idea someday, but “not now.”

Interestingly, while we do have analysts on our staff, most faculty members are not analysts. The difference is that many places now have almost no full-time faculty with such a background—we do. Some have none. A friend told me that at his nationally ranked institution he is happy if his residents have memorized DSM and a textbook of psychopharmacology. That combination would not be satisfactory at Weill Cornell. We want our residents to be able to think about what is in their patients’ heads, how their worlds are constructed. We do not expect our residents to become analysts—some do, most do not. Believing that it is helpful to better understand themselves and that they are part of the instrument of treatment, I urge residents to have personal therapy; a practice common years ago, less so now. I found such therapy helpful both personally and professionally. And I have always been impressed by the wisdom and advice persons with psychodynamic experience can bring to the discussion of issues on any subject, from patients to the arts.

Aaron Beck, the great cognitive behavioral therapist, once told me that when young psychologists ask him for advice about places to take an internship, he often suggests they consider Payne Whitney. They will say, isn’t it just psychoanalysis in its orientation? He tells them it is actually everything—you can do various forms of psychotherapy, or have interests in completely different areas, but the key is to do whatever you do with excellence. I think that describes Weill Cornell quite well. As Francis Lee, a brilliant neurobiologist, now vice chair for research, said when he chose to come here for a faculty position when he was one of the, if not the, hottest prospect of his year on a national basis, “I like the tapestry of the place.” So do I. We are a large clinical program but a smaller research program with few silos, so there are strong natural pressures for people to work together and that encourages collaboration and intellectual interaction, a feature that is relatively rare and is prized by the faculty.

Years ago, one of my mentors, Maurice Grossman, told me, “Someday it (referring to the combination of psychodynamic medicine and biology) will all come together.” I believe we are entering that phase. The result will be good for a renewed understanding of behavior and treatment for patients with a wide range of problems. We will truly be able to have individualized therapy that will take into account factors of which we now have only a faint glimpse. Biology in its various forms will be important, but so, too, will be behavior.
Therapists will increasingly practice “off the grid,” treating patients who can pay out of pocket. Paradoxically, the expanded mental health provision of the Affordable Care Act will be associated with decreased availability of psychotherapy. In the aftermath of atrocities like Newtown, as well as other massacres involving untreated mental illnesses, it is disgraceful that those most in need of treatment will have less access.

PRIVACY

Patients’ records are now created to justify payment, rather than chronicle treatment. The expectation is for records to be audited. Such audits starkly conflict with our professional ethics regarding patient confidentiality and the “minimum necessary” policy, which strictly limits the scope of information that can be disclosed to insurers.

Documenting with “data points” creates an incentive to use computerized templates, because the electronic health record’s “checklist” format saves time. But aside from convenience, using the electronic health record increases the risk of privacy breaches, thereby further eroding the bedrock of trust in the therapist-patient relationship.

The new codes’ impact on quality of care, payment, access and confidentiality could make psychodynamic psychotherapy scarce for patients using their insurance. Psychotherapists should advocate for patients by raising such concerns to professional organizations and patient advocate groups. As professionals, we should demand a clinically sound, fiscally manageable billing infrastructure that will safeguard and sustain the practice of psychodynamic psychotherapy.

We hope that by reaching a wider readership we are helping the supervisors, new and experienced, in the supervision of candidates in their work with child and adolescent analytic cases. We also hope that we have contributed to making the art and science of supervision a subject that will be taught and discussed within the institutes of the American Psychoanalytic Association and other training institutes as well.

While our work is under the general heading of child analysis, many of the areas of study we address are applicable to the work of supervisors of the analysis of adults as well. The study of finding ways to help supervisors work more effectively is clearly not intended exclusively for analysts who treat children and adolescents.
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