Reflections on the Supreme Court and Free Speech

Robert D. Goldstein

A “paradox is involved which needs to be accepted, tolerated, and not resolved,” Winnicott explains of transitional objects in Playing and Reality. Mothers and fathers intuitively understand this, as they do not question the infant’s treating an external object as within his sphere of omnipotence. But it has bedeviled the Supreme Court as it has tried to comprehend the symbolic nature of the American flag in no fewer than eight First Amendment cases involving honoring and desecrating the flag. After reviewing these cases and the Court’s theory of freedom of speech, this article will consider whether the Court’s free speech doctrine, from the point of view of Winnicott and Bion, strains the relationship among speakers that underlies mature communication.

THE SUPREME COURT AND THE AMERICAN FLAG

In 1907, the Court upheld Nebraska’s ban on using the flag for commercial advertising, observing that throughout history “banners, standards, and ensigns have been adopted as symbols of the power and history of the peoples who bore them”; accordingly, Nebraska may “encourage its people to love the Union with which [it] is indissolubly connected.” In 1940, the Court refused to exempt Jehovah’s Witnesses from a public school’s mandatory flag salute and pledge. “We live by symbols,” the Court taught, and the “flag is the symbol of our national unity, transcending all internal differences….” Because the “ultimate foundation of a free society is the binding tie of cohesive sentiment,” the state can foster what are “almost unconscious feelings:” … “all those agencies of the mind and spirit which may serve to gather up the traditions of a people, transmit them from generation to generation, and thereby create that continuity of a treasured common life…..” Without adopting any one “psychological dogma,” the Court concluded, a legislature could reasonably believe that “the minds” of school age children are at an especially “receptive period of development” for “assimilation” of patriotic sentiments through a “common experience” like the flag salute.

Yet, in 1943, the Court reversed itself and exempted objecting children from the same mandatory salute. This time it offered a deeper view of this symbol: A “flag …is a shortcut
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Challenges of ONE APsaA

Mark D. Smaller

While listening to the two plenaries in New York during our recent January meeting, or while chairing the Joint Meetings of our Executive Council and Board on Professional Standards, I could not help but think that APsaA and psychoanalysis are moving into a new “golden” era of psychoanalysis.

Scientific Meetings and Education

Don Moss, willing to share some of the most private details of his personal and clinical experiences in front of a ballroom of colleagues, received a standing ovation. My friend and colleague Dorothy Holmes received an equal ovation later the same day, eloquently speaking openly and decisively about race and the challenge to move APsaA and psychoanalysis toward genuine diversity. Her presentation as a plenary was itself a huge step in that direction, along with Dionne Powell’s powerful introduction of her mentor: Diversity is about inclusion of those individuals, cultures and ideas that have for too long been marginalized in our field. Diversity is about enriching and enlivening psychoanalysis.

After traveling the last three years to international meetings on behalf of APsaA, from Basel for the European Federation for Psychoanalysis (EPF) to Buenos Aires for the Federation of Psychoanalysis in Latin American (FEPAL) to Stockholm for EPF, and to Boston for the International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA) last summer, I have come to the conclusion that our scientific meetings probably highlight the most comprehensive psychoanalytic perspectives in the world. Our Program Committee, ably led by Christine Kieffer, provides us with presentations, plenaries, discussion groups and symposia to challenge any new or veteran “student” of psychoanalysis to learn.

ONE APsaA

ONE APsaA is about presenting an entire range of perspectives within our field. Contrast today with, for example, a time in the 1970s when Heinz Kohut, a former APsaA president, sometimes referred to as “Mr. Psychoanalysis,” offered new ideas about narcissism, self experience, and ultimately self psychology. Sadly, he was confronted with severe ridicule, dismissal and temporary but painful professional isolation.

And what about the blatant and subtle sexism and gender bias, racism, classism and arrogance that is a part of our past?

ONE APsaA emerges as we now transform, continuing to address these past and present issues. One APsaA is about welcoming innovation in clinical practice and theory, education, standards, research and advocacy. Our scientific meetings and educational institutions must continue creating an engaging and welcoming atmosphere for all psychoanalytic clinicians, regardless of practice, theory, frequency of sessions, settings and culture. We must continue to attract psychotherapists to our local groups, to our national meetings and to serve on our APsaA committees. Even more integration of all psychoanalytic clinicians is essential for our Association and field to continue to grow and thrive.

Governance

ONE APsaA emerged during our meetings in New York that offered even greater support for the Six Point Plan and its implementation. Highlights include local institute choice regarding standards of education beyond IPA guidelines and requirements, a choice regarding certification for training analyst appointment and accreditation beyond APsaA approval for those institutes seeking accreditation outside of APsaA. The plan also includes an Institute Requirements and Review Committee to review new institutes seeking APsaA approval. A new Department of Psychoanalytic Education and an Executive Council self-assessment process is under way with our consultant, Beth Fletcher of Fletcher Consulting, and the Wagner School of Public Service at New York University.

The Joint Meetings of the Executive Council and the Board on Professional Standards proved constructive. With support of the Executive Council and BOPS, the Executive Committee will continue its efforts with the Six Point Plan Work Groups, creating proposed bylaw amendments to implement the Six Point Plan. Those proposals of appropriate bylaw changes will be discussed during our June meeting in Chicago and presented to the membership for final approval and a vote.

The day after the successful Joint Meetings, we learned the proposed bylaw amendment giving the Executive Council final authority over all matters of the Association, including education, passed by a 69 percent majority, beyond the two-thirds required for a bylaw change. Clearly the membership voiced support for ONE APsaA and a way to move forward, and provided an even stronger mandate toward implementing the Six Point Plan. The Executive Committee will continue meeting weekly and in retreats when needed to hammer out details for implementation of the Six Point Plan, as we have been encouraged to do by the Executive Council and BOPS.

Is it possible we would no longer be the Executive Council, BOPS, TA, non-TA, certified, not certified? Maybe we could be ONE APsaA.

American Institute for Psychoanalysis

One APsaA is about the historical and long overdue approval of the American Institute for Psychoanalysis (AIP), formerly the Homey Institute, which opened its doors in 1941. APsaA finally welcomed AIP and its members, and looks forward to their contributions to APsaA and our field. Following last year’s approval of the William Alanson White Institute, the approval of AIP is one more significant step in welcoming new institutes, societies and members with fresh ideas regarding treatment, education, research and advocacy.

Advocacy

One APsaA is about our efforts in Washington, D.C., and must include not only issues of practice and health care, but also social issues about which psychoanalysis can offer unique psychoanalytic perspectives to legislators interested in what we have to offer. Issues of community violence and trauma, as well as sexual,
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racial and economic inequality are psychoanalytic issues. Research has proved that poverty and racism take a toll on the mental health of our citizens, and we must continue to remind policy makers of that fact while offering psychoanalytic perspectives toward solutions. Advocacy in APsaA is addressing issues outside of psychoanalysis, but also advocating on behalf of a membership with diverse political and social points of view. Our Committee on Government Relations and Insurance (CGRI) in liaison with the Social Issues Department will continue addressing these vital issues that should concern every member.

CONCLUSIONS
As I remarked during the second Joint Meeting, the Executive Committee has never been so naive as to think that changing various APsaA structures will solve all our difficulties and the many challenges facing psychoanalytic practice and education today. During a meeting with the IPA Board, a representative shared her view that prospective psychoanalysts are selected for candidacy with a focus on their personality and skills in working one on one with another person in the context of a very private enterprise: psychoanalysis. Functioning as “organizational” individuals is not necessarily a part of who most of us are and may be our greatest limitation beyond any organizational structures we create.

As Don Moss reminded us, we are “beasts,” at heart, even with our executive and self reflective capacities. Dorothy Holmes pointed out our fear of the “other” who is different from us, and how this fear still creates the impulse to exclude, if not hurt.

That being said, psychoanalysis is about freedom—of associations, thoughts, feelings, ambitions and values—in the context of a productive meaningful life in love and work. Psychoanalytic education and clinical work is about the freedom to explore different theories and techniques, tied together by the wish to help another human being in the best and most humane way. I would hope ONE APsaA facilitates that kind of freedom, even with inevitable and inherent difficulties.

As Winston Churchill said to Parliament in 1947: “No one pretends that democracy is perfect or all-wise. Indeed it has been said that democracy is the worst form of government except for all those other forms that have been tried from time to time…."

Making our organization more democratic and in the end, more responsive to the needs of all our members, is yet another, “impossible profession.” Yet, as I frequently thought in New York, just consider the possibilities.
External Accreditation: The American Association for Psychoanalytic Education

Lee I. Ascherman, Elizabeth Brett, Dwarakanath G. Rao and Dionne Powell

The three educational essentials of APsaA’s Six Point Plan for structural reform are:

- The externalization of regulatory functions now situated within the Board on Professional Standards.
- Institute autonomy regarding the use of the external credentialing of individuals (certification) and the use of external accreditation for educational programs.
- The sunsetting of the Board on Professional Standards and the establishment of the Department of Psychoanalytic Education for discussion of educational issues and institute needs within APsaA.

Professional regulatory functions refer to the credentialing of individuals (certification) and the accreditation of educational programs. These functions will be externalized from APsaA to be accessed electively by any individual who wants certification, and by any institute that desires to have external accreditation. Credentialing (certification) has already been externalized to the American Board of Psychoanalysis (ABP). The externalized entity to facilitate accreditation for those institutes that choose to pursue accreditation will be the American Association for Psychoanalytic Education (AAPE). This article is devoted to providing APsaA members with information about the American Association for Psychoanalytic Education as they begin discussion about the future of their institutes.

The AAPE will provide a forum for psychoanalytic institutes that aspire to shared standards in psychoanalytic education and wish to address common challenges related to the achievement of these standards. The initial educational standards of the AAPE will be the existing educational standards of the American Psychoanalytic Association. Institutes affiliated with the AAPE will, by virtue of AAPE recognition, also meet the requirements of the Accreditation Council for Psychoanalytic Education, Inc. (ACPEinc). Hence, recognition by the AAPE will provide simultaneous accreditation by the ACPEinc. The ACPEinc will grandfather as ACPEinc accredited any institute that is recognized by the AAPE. This recognition attests to the public, state and federal government agencies, and insurers that the institute participates in appropriate oversight to ensure the standards in psychoanalytic education represented by the AAPE are met. Participation in the AAPE is entirely voluntary. APsaA institutes that affiliate with the AAPE may remain in APsaA, and in fact are encouraged to do so.

In modern parlance, “accreditation” means that an educational program has been reviewed by an independent agency through correspondence and some direct observation (site visit), rather than just by acceptance of a written attestation of what that educational program says it does. Hence, accreditation holds much more significance to the public and government agencies than approval through written correspondence only. The spirit of oversight is to assist programs through self-assessment and consultation in order to maintain and improve the quality of the educational program they offer. Oversight also helps the profession maintain sufficient common educational practices so that both applicants for training and the public have an adequate understanding of what these educational programs signify. Some accrediting agencies will recognize exceptional educational practices with a note of distinction, and they will share these practices with other affiliate programs.

Affiliation with the AAPE also provides protection for candidates and faculty if disputes regarding admissions, faculty appointments, promotion and financial decisions emerge. Without an external entity available to oversee fair application of policies, individuals can be left without any external recourse to address internal disputes or dissatisfaction. In such situations, the integrity and functioning of the local program can be jeopardized.

Modern accreditation of professional educational programs is based on core principles outlined by the U.S. Department of Education, which explicitly require that professional accrediting entities have “a voluntary membership of institutions of higher education” and are “separate and independent” of membership organizations. This means the pursuit of accreditation by any program is strictly elective. Input and representation from the public and the profession are required. Candidates will provide input to the AAPE through a Candidate Advisory and Liaison Committee. Accrediting entities are also expected to be “separate and independent” from membership organizations in order to protect against decisions that place the interests of individual members of the profession ahead of educational policies and ultimately, the protection of the public. The AAPE meets these expectations in spirit and policy. Participating institutes are attesting to their commitment to the principle of “protection of the public.”

AAPE institutes will be listed on the AAPE website with information for potential candidates, the public, state and federal agencies, as well as insurers about what AAPE recognition represents. By arrangement with the ACPEinc, AAPE recognition will also provide simultaneous accreditation by ACPEinc. This in turn will provide the benefit of U.S. Department of Education recognition when issued. Any APsaA institute currently in good standing can by request be grandfathered to become an AAPE institute. Participating institutes will subsequently be invited by AAPE to take part in the future development of education standards.
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I am delighted this evening to accept this honorary membership in the American Psychoanalytic Association. It is, indeed, an honor and a great pleasure, as well.

When it comes to developing a professional identity, training is essential. But two other ways of further developing that professional identity are through professional affiliation, with institutes and associations, and/or through lineage. Being an outsider all my life has naturally made me incline less toward belonging and more toward lineage. As I like to put it, psychoanalysis is a human tradition passed on from one generation to the next and tonight I find myself thinking of my mentor, Nathan Adler, a psychoanalyst in San Francisco who studied outside the formal institute under Siegfried Bernfeld. And Bernfeld, of course, was an analyst in Vienna who also studied outside the formal institute, under Sigmund Freud.

It was during my five years of clinical supervision with Adler that I became interested in the early history of psychoanalysis in San Francisco. Hearing his stories of Siegfried and Suzanne Bernfeld and the other emigre analysts arriving in San Francisco in the 1930s piqued my curiosity and the next thing I knew I was under the spell of a powerful fascination for the topic. I conducted 80 plus interviews, wrote a number of articles on the topic and analyzed my fascination for the early history of psychoanalysis in San Francisco. What I discovered is that when my mother was pregnant with me, my father’s father, Nissim Benveniste, died. He was 61 years old—my age today—and he had been sick for ten years. He was a good, kind and generous man, beloved by all and his early death left everyone in the family grieving in silence. So I came into the world surrounded not only by the warmth of my family but also in the shadow of this rather significant absent other about whom no one could utter a word. I consequently became fascinated with everything that happened long ago. Imagine my surprise then, when I later discovered my grandfather was born in 1891 and Bernfeld in 1892 and they both died in 1953.

This interest in hearing about what happened long ago was further stoked when W. Ernest Freud, the fort-da baby and the only Freud grandson to become a psychoanalyst, asked me to write his biography. There I was in Heidelberg emotionally motivated by a curiosity about my Grandpa Nissim, while listening to W. Ernest Freud telling me about his Grandpa Sigmund, his Grosspapa.

As Ernest spoke of his grandfather teaching his Aunt Anna about psychoanalysis and his Aunt Anna teaching him about psychoanalysis, I thought of my own lineage from Freud to Bernfeld to Nathan Adler to me. And so it is, that in these ways and many others psychoanalysis is passed on from one generation to the next.
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I think it is probably very possible to become an outstanding dentist without knowing the history of dentistry but when it comes to psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic psychotherapy, one’s theory and technique will always broaden and deepen with a greater understanding of the history of psychoanalysis.

The history of psychoanalysis is full of useful lessons for contemporary challenges. I have, for example, a list of 13 major contributors to psychoanalysis who all met Freud, began their training or even finished their training before the age of 29—that’s not 49 or 59—that’s 29! Many people read Freud when they are teenagers or in their early 20s but when no one is there to discuss their concerns, their passions may naturally cool and they may move on to other fields. I think it will serve psychoanalysis if institutes and associations can find ways to invite young people, teenagers and those in their early 20s, to join in the psychoanalytic dialogue and let these young spirits infuse psychoanalysis with their natural curiosity and vibrant creativity.

Another useful lesson from the history of psychoanalysis is the fact that many early psychoanalysts such as Freud, Adler, Deutsch, Fromm, Menninger, Erikson and others all wrote for the public. These days most analysts only write for other analysts, while the public has no other source of information other than the Freud bashers who introduce their misconceptions and denigrations of Freud and psychoanalysis to one generation after another.

If we can write for the public and draw younger people into the field, we will strengthen our discipline and be in a better position to pass the torch of psychoanalysis on to the next generation.

In conclusion, I would like to thank Arnold Richards for recognizing and championing my work; and thank the American Psychoanalytic Association for this honorary membership. It all means a great deal to me and just goes to show that even outsiders like me can find pleasure in belonging. Thank you.

Alfred Adler met and began work with Freud at 37
Sandor Ferenczi met and began work with Freud at 35
Oskar Pfister met and began work with Freud at 35
Edward Hitchmann met and began work with Freud at 34
Helene Deutsch met and began work with Freud at 34
Paul Federn met and began work with Freud at 33
Carl Jung met and began work with Freud at 32
Melanie Klein began analysis with Ferenczi at 32 and became a member of the Budapest Society at 37
Edward Glover met and began work with Freud at 32
Karl Abraham met and began work with Freud at 30
Franz Alexander was already an assistant at the Berlin Institute by 30
Ernest Jones met and began work with Freud at 29
Hanns Sachs met and began work with Freud at 28
Max Eitingon met and began work with Freud at 26
Erik Erikson met Sigmund Freud and began working with Anna Freud at 26
Karen Horney began her psychoanalytic training at 24
Ernst Kris met Freud and began his training at 24
Sandor Rado was secretary of the Hungarian Psychoanalytic Society when he was 23
Anna Freud began her training when she was 23 and became a training analyst at 29
Siegfried Bernfeld began attending meetings at the Vienna Society when he was 23
Wilhelm Reich became a full member of the Vienna society when he was 23
Theodore Reik met and began work with Freud at 22
Otto Rank met and began work with Freud at 22
Otto Fenichel attended Freud’s lectures at 18 and became a member of the Vienna society at 23
A Long Journey
Ilga B. Svechs

This is a moment to savor! Standing here as an honorary member of the American Psychoanalytic Association.

It has been a long journey for me, with peaks and some valleys.

It was in the early 1960s when the late Elizabeth McKay from Judge Baker Clinic in Boston taught postgraduate students at Smith College School for Social Work. I was fortunate to be one of those students. McKay taught a course entitled “Introduction to Psychoanalytic Theory.” I was smitten by the theoretical concepts; they made me reflect on the human mind in all its vicissitudes. Thereafter, during my 29 years in academia at Case Western Reserve University, I continued to have a consistent interest in and awe of psychoanalytic theory, specifically its fluidity relevant to understanding the course of human development and the psychodynamics of functioning in the broader context of the cultures and subcultures that shape us.

Another peak in my life’s journey has been the affiliation with the Cleveland Psychoanalytic Center for the past 15 years. I want to thank all its members here with me tonight. A note of special appreciation to Norman Clemens and Richard Lightbody who nominated me for this honorary membership. On a slightly different note, I would like to thank Kay McKenzie for energizing and supporting me to teach a course entitled “Cultural Psychoanalysis” at the Center.

At this time, I would like to introduce three people surrounding me here this evening. Indirectly or directly, they represented earlier phases of my life in the United States whose shores with Lady Liberty I first saw at the age of 13. As a Latvian refugee from post-Nazi, post-WWII Germany, I arrived here with my parents and a much beloved younger brother from a displaced persons camp near Nuremberg, Germany.

We were sponsored to the United States by a dairy owner in Byron, Michigan—a rural village with no stoplights, just a few stop signs. They still do not have any stoplights. I finished the eighth grade there before moving to the next village called Gaines, about four miles down the road, for high school. We constituted a high school graduating class of 14 in 1954. It was in Gaines where I first met an American girl who tirelessly listened to my broken English, to my dreams and with whom I played basketball on the arguably winning Gaines High School girls’ basketball team, Class D division. Marylu Gilbert Fitzpatrick and I have been friends for well over six decades. So I am very delighted that Marylu’s son, Shane Fitzpatrick, could be here at this event.

From Gaines it was on to Grand Rapids, where I attended and graduated from Calvin College. I also became somewhat active in my small ethnic community of Latvians in the area. Dana Mahar, who hails from Washington, D.C., and Mara Urshel, a long-time New Yorker are sisters and good friends from the days of our youth. Somehow tonight, those days seem like not so long ago.…

Thank you all for being here with me at this memorable event.
Paul Holinger won this year’s contest for the best caption on Victoria Todd’s cartoon. This is another watercolor in the series of SigiCartoons painted by Victoria Todd, child analyst and sixth-year candidate in adult analysis at the Cleveland Psychoanalytic Center.
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Origins of Psychoanalysis: Inexorably Entangled with Art

Feel how you will about Freud and his eccentricities, hypocrisies and sexist paradigms, he is still the fountainhead of the landscape of psychoanalysis as a field today. And the fountainhead behind Freud was art. Freud was an obsessive collector of rare art objects from antiquity, with a refined and educated eye similar to that of a museum curator or an archaeologist. He was fascinated by ancient art as deeply as he was by study of the mind and had a lifelong love affair with the process of collecting. Psychoanalysis itself mimics the archaeological process—uncovering layers of the past to reveal hidden strata of the psyche. Freud’s love of art was intertwined with his quest to understand the psyche; each pursuit would not have been possible without the other.

Sculptural figures of the human form from a variety of ancient civilizations, including Egyptian, Greek, Etruscan and Asian, were used by Freud as a visual means of contemplating universal human myths, archetypes and psychological forces. Freud described his art collection as a “personal microcosm” of his own psyche. Jung, influenced by Freud, was also obsessed with art and archetypes, as evidenced in his seminal work Man and His Symbols, which was integral to the birth of the field of modern psychiatry.

The ancient Egyptians are qualified as the “first aesthetes” by social critic Camille Paglia, because of their reverence for style, form and grace. Ancient Egyptian art was Freud’s favorite form of art, both for its visual uniqueness and the mythology that accompanies it. In Freud’s collection was an ancient Egyptian piece, Head of Osiris, from the Third Intermediate Period (1076-716 BC or later). A deep fascination with the presence, meaning and mythology of Osiris planted the seeds for Freud’s development of the process of psychoanalysis. Osiris, a powerful male god, is one of the core gods of ancient Egyptian theology: the god of death, reincarnation, and rebirth, and of the flowing, never-ending, eternal cycle of life. The Egyptian legend tells of Osiris continually under attack from various enemies, yet somehow always rising from the dead to live again and rule over his domain. One legend describes Osiris, the supreme ruler of Egypt, brutally murdered by his jealous brother Set, who chopped Osiris’s body into hundreds of pieces and scattered the pieces around the kingdom. The pieces were collected and reassembled by Isis, a feminine goddess figure, who performed a mysterious ritual and reincarnated Osiris back to life from his reconstructed body parts, after which she and Osiris conceived a son, Horus.

Freud’s fascination with ancient Egyptian mythology and the archetype of reincarnation as personified by Osiris inspired him to reflect deeply upon the psyche and contributed to the invention of psychoanalysis as a means of transformation of the human spirit in the face of trauma. Osiris is a microcosm of the human psyche, and the continual cyclic process of death and reincarnation are metaphors for transcendence—which was the driving ideal that compelled Freud’s imagination and his work, ultimately laying the groundwork for the continuing cycles of dismantled and newly born ideas that created the fields of psychiatry, psychoanalysis and psychotherapy.

Leah Montalto, a painter who lives and works in New York, is inspired by Jung and the singularity archetype. Her paintings have been exhibited worldwide, including at the National Academy Museum of Fine Art in New York, www.LeahMontalto.com.

Howard M. Nowes is the owner and director of Art for Eternity, an art gallery on New York’s Upper East Side, specializing in classical antiquities and ethnographic art for 25 years. The gallery is located at 303 East 81st Street.
Challenges in Training

Phoebe A. Cirio

This COPE Study Group on Challenges in Training, the only one whose members are not certified, was established about five years ago by Hilli Dagon-Clark during her tenure as president of the Candidates’ Council. Composed entirely of candidate members, and those new graduates who began with the study group as candidates, the group has begun to read the psychoanalytic literature on candidacy.

...the goal...is for us to acquire the personal depth to be able to apprehend that which is different from us.

Reading this literature has informed our discussions about some of the common experiences of candidacy and deepened our understanding of the reasons for some of those experiences. In our recent meeting in June 2015 in San Francisco, we discussed several articles about learning psychoanalysis. One article was on learning in a multi-theoretical environment, another looked at the impact of one’s status as a candidate on analytic process, and the third examined the transferential and countertransferential aspects of the analyst being an apprentice. In our discussions about these articles we looked at our own experiences as candidates in classes, supervision and in our analyses.

One of the consistent themes in our discussions is the development of one’s identity as a psychoanalyst. In a paper we discussed there was a quote from Erik Erikson’s 1968 book Identity, Youth and Crisis, “The psychoanalyst must be aware of the historical determinants of what made him what he is before he can hope to perfect the human gift: the ability to understand that which is different from him.”

As candidates and new graduates in 2015, we have a particular challenge, to begin to identify and define ourselves as psychoanalysts in the face of the challenges of getting enough control cases, and especially control cases that have a neurotic structure, which can provide us with a good training experience. Doesn’t one need analysands to think of oneself as a psychoanalyst? But I like the point Erikson makes above; the goal of our studies, in all the forms they take—personal analysis, supervision of cases, classwork—is for us to acquire the personal depth to be able to apprehend that which is different from us. And in the current world, where we live with tremendous intolerance for difference and variance, a psychoanalytic education that fulfills the understated goal of being able to understand that which is different from us is a worthwhile undertaking, regardless of the challenges to obtaining that education.

Our study group plans to survey APsaA candidates about their thoughts and attitudes about their analytic identity and their training, but in the process of developing our survey we are devoting much of our time to discussion and reading so as to deepen our own understanding of these questions. Our group’s goal is to produce a paper that reflects our understanding of the experience of the challenges, and gratifications, of contemporary psychoanalytic training.

Phoebe A. Cirio, M.S.W., LCSW, is chair of the Challenges in Training COPE Study Group and president of the Candidates’ Council.
How Small Institutes Can Survive and Grow

Sam Robertson

All of us who belong to a small institute experience challenges to survival and growth in our own community. Visiting and consulting with other small institutes offer an opportunity to see these challenges more clearly and to recognize their universal elements.

In an expansionary time, growth promises a solution for the limited resources in a small institute. Strains on the small number of faculty will be time limited, the workload will soon be spread and the future will be bright. In a time of contraction the future promises the opposite; an increasingly smaller number of faculty each having to do more, for a dwindling number of candidates. Eventually, some faculty, exhausted or simply wanting to return to a larger life, withdraw. This increases the workload for those who remain. With little time for outreach and less involvement in the larger community, recruitment suffers; contraction continues.

This is in complete contrast to an expansionary period in a large institute where typical problems more likely include competition to teach and obtain positions or power. While there may be many ways to address this, I describe two ideas that can operate independently or synergistically. The first focuses on reducing fixed costs, largely manpower. The second is designed to create more efficient outreach.

LOWER FixED COSTS

Many fixed costs are approximately the same across the spectrum, leaving small institutes on the wrong side of economies of scale.

Regardless of the number of candidates or faculty, institutes have approximately the same leadership needs, the same number of committees, the same number of classes, and the same needs for outreach programs.

A potential remedy would be created if several small institutes simply combined or joined a larger institute but that would lead to lack of local autonomy. However, if several small institutes joined together in a voluntary partnership to share certain functions, overall autonomy could be preserved. For example, curriculum, ethics, progression and selection could be joint committees with the chairs rotating to create balance and equal representation from each institute. Each institute’s Education Committee (EC) might select representatives to the committees and approve or disapprove proposals from the partnerships committees. Generally speaking, willingness to accept these proposals would foster greater efficiency and sense of cooperation, but a dynamic tension between efficiency and autonomy would be a natural result of this system. Recognizing this potential for dynamic tension, by prior agreement, each institute could choose to go it alone at certain times and in certain ways, for example, teach a particular class separately or have an independent elective.

Using electronic means and shared teaching would create greater range and depth in faculty talents, ideas and courses. Since classes could be offered more frequently, potential candidates would not have to wait. Of course, this system might generate power struggles and competition for roles. But this is a lesser evil compared to no manpower at all.

IMPROVING OUTREACH, CREATING CANDIDATES

Effective outreach requires interested manpower, efficiently invested. The efficiency of the above recommended partnership frees talent. What follows is a design to utilize that talent in a more focused and efficient way. The details are less important than the basic idea of “creating analytic candidates” in an organized way. And, importantly, the organized whole is greater than the sum of the parts.

Consider for the moment, outreach having four primary functions:

• Altruism, providing something of value to the community;
• Advertising, making the presence and value of the institute and its members better known;
• Economic, some who attend programs might seek treatment;
• Generating students, especially analytic candidates.

Various offerings will serve one or more of the four functions. For example, programs designed for the general public automatically serve the first three. But to serve the fourth goal, it will help to have a thoughtful cascade of programs, sequentially offered, with gradually increasing depth, sophistication and requirements for greater investment.

Imagine this tiered array:

- The first tier is the entry level, offerings for the general public, supervision or teaching at the residency level or a chance encounter and might be completely independent of the EC. Any clinician engaged in these activities would be invited to attend a second tier event.
- The second tier, offered to clinicians, by invitation only, would be more analytically oriented but, importantly, of short duration. Examples might include: a single 90-minute case presentation; an ethics workshop with CME credits; the presentation of an accessible paper or a
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combination of these. All attendees to a second tier event would receive a personal invitation to attend a third tier event. Beginning at this level and for each following tier, some degree of oversight by the EC would help integrate the offerings.

- The third tier would involve a slightly longer time commitment, for example six weekly or six monthly clinical seminars, perhaps accompanied by accessible readings. To maintain touch with those attending more recent events on the second tier, these could be offered twice a year. All who attend a third tier program would be invited to level four courses.

- The fourth tier involves more time commitment and reading, perhaps a six-month weekly course, 90 minutes a week, offered annually. If there are multiple offerings at this level, each could occur every second or third year. Potential offerings include courses on child psychotherapy, adult psychotherapy, adolescents, sexual issues, dreams or any relevant interesting topic. Those who attend a fourth tier course should be invited to other level four courses, and invited to apply for level five programs.

- Level five includes both the analytic and psychotherapy programs. Each requires application and acceptance. The partnership allows each program to occur more frequently. Without this, small institutes are often stuck delaying acceptance because they don’t have a critical mass, or in order to avoid delaying a class, adding students to a program that is not an ideal fit. With the partnership available, acceptance to each program is more likely to be based on what is best for each applicant (and for the programs). Depending on the desire and ability of the applicants, they would be admitted to either the analytic program or the psychotherapy program. Some accepted into the psychotherapy program might be considered able to do the analytic program but, as yet, unwilling to do so. All psychotherapy graduates would be invited to apply for the analytic program.

STEPPING STONES

This tiered system is similar to the idea of “creating” analytic patients, taking them where they are but gradually helping them move toward increased deepening rather than immediately recommending analysis. The tiers are largely structured to encourage a similar deepening process in the community. When analysis was idealized, it was easier for clinicians (and patients) to take a long step into the unknown. Also, when the analytic ideas were more consistently part of earlier training, the step from what they knew to analytic training was shorter. Given the current environment, taking a series of small steps with minimal incremental investment is both more rational and more likely than a large leap into the unknown. Of course, it is essential that each step proves useful so each subsequent step is both logically and emotionally enticing.

Where would the manpower come from, a problem at every level in small institutes? The partnering would free manpower but the actual number of people needed for the lower tiers is not as onerous because the system is efficient. The first level requires whatever time each individual presenter wishes. At the second level, there is little strain leading a one-shot clinical conference. The third tier could involve two people (at a minimum), each teaching six 90-minute periods a year; not a major strain. The fourth tier would require more investment but, assuming several people developed different topics, no one need teach in successive years. The real manpower problem would occur at level five, the separate psychotherapy program and an analytic program. Circling back to the first issue, economies of scale, the consortium, used for one or both, provide one answer.

How to Participate in APsaA’s Scientific Program

Scientific papers for oral presentation must be no longer than 18 pages and timed for 40 minutes reading time. Submit all manuscripts by electronic mail and please include an abstract. Send one blind paper, with all references to the author deleted. The first page of the manuscript must show only the author’s name, address, phone number, and the title of the paper. The author’s name should not appear on any subsequent page. JAPA has right of first refusal on any paper accepted for presentation. The paper cannot have been accepted or be under consideration for publication by another journal.

Panel proposals should be two pages maximum. The proposal should contain a description of the format, the objective of the panel, and names of possible participants (chair, panelists, discussant, if any). The Program Committee chooses panels one year in advance.

Discussion group proposals should be two pages maximum. Decisions concerning new discussion groups are made based upon how subject matter relates to what is already taken up in existing groups and on space availability.

Symposia explore the interface between psychoanalysis, society, and related disciplines, attempting to demonstrate how psychoanalytic thinking can be applied to non-psychoanalytic settings. Symposia must be in talking points format, 10 to 15 minutes per presentation (no papers read), with a minimum of 15 minutes for audience participation with emphasis on audience interaction. Submit a brief (two pages maximum) proposal outlining rationale, program format, and suggested speakers.

The deadline for submission of panel proposals is October 1 for the National Meeting (January) and March 1 for the Annual Meeting (June).

The deadline for all other submissions is May 1 for the National Meeting (January) and December 1 for the Annual Meeting (June).

Address correspondence to Scientific Program Submissions, American Psychoanalytic Association, 309 East 49th Street, New York, New York, 10017 or email cgatto@apsa.org.
Lunch

Or How to Develop an Undergraduate Minor in Psychoanalytic Studies

Lawrence D. Blum, Richard F. Summers and Greg Urban

Undergraduates at the University of Pennsylvania have a new opportunity available at few other academic institutions—a minor in psychoanalytic studies. The minor, which officially began in September 2015, and already has at least half a dozen students enrolled, is the fruit of a decade of collaboration between the Psychoanalytic Center of Philadelphia (PCOP) and the university. The minor is built on a model that could easily be adapted to other organizations. (A minor in psychoanalytic studies is already available in a long-standing and extensive program at Boston College; at Colorado College under the leadership of Marcia Dobson and John Riker; and at Hampshire College.)

HISTORY OF THE MINOR

The minor arose from a collaboration between academics and clinicians. The most concise expression of the principle for the development of such a collaboration is Lunch. Quite a few years ago, when Richard Cornfield and Larry Blum were co-chairs of the PCOP program committee, they became aware of the work of the professor of German studies, Liliane Weissberg, who for many years has taught a popular course for Penn students on “Freud: The Invention of Psychoanalysis,” and invited her to lunch. They were delighted to make a friend with common interests and a vast knowledge and appreciation of Freud and his era.

Additional useful lunches followed. Occurring roughly at the same time, also in the early 21st century, PCOP began a formal collaboration with the Penn Department of Psychiatry. The Collaboration Committee was chaired by Richard Summers, PCOP member and co-director of Residency Training in Psychiatry at Penn. Summers immediately broadened the committee representation to include interested Penn faculty beyond psychiatry, including the energetic and creative Weissberg.

Hoping to follow up on a lifelong interest, Blum asked Weissberg if anyone at Penn had an interest in psychoanalytic or psychological anthropology. She suggested he contact professor and chair of anthropology, Greg Urban. Another fine lunch with exploration of common interests. Urban had trained at the University of Chicago, and had worked with members of Kohut’s group on the application of self-psychological ideas to the study of culture. He has an abiding interest in self-psychology and a deep commitment to the importance of introspective methods in the social sciences and humanities. After some time, Urban announced he wanted to teach a course on psychoanalysis and anthropology and Blum offered to help. They have taught the course together four times in the last six years. It has been a lot of fun and they have had some wonderful students. As a member of the Collaboration Committee, Urban urged going beyond the interesting but ephemeral interdisciplinary panel discussion programs sponsored by the committee and focus on the place of psychoanalysis in the curriculum.

A letter from the Collaboration Committee to Penn faculty elicited a response from English professor Max Cavitch. Lunch. Cavitch proved to have a tremendous knowledge and clinical grasp of North American relational psychoanalysis. He joined the Collaboration Committee and has contributed extensively. Additional lunches led to the realization there were a number of faculty with significant psychoanalytic interest and sophistication, that not all of them were aware of each other’s interests, and there might be the nucleus for a minor in psychoanalytic studies, which would truly solidify the place of psychoanalysis in the curriculum.

The Collaboration Committee and interested faculty began work on a proposal for an undergraduate minor in psychoanalytic studies. The proposal focused on psychoanalysis as a developing body of knowledge that helps to understand how people feel and think, how they function as individuals and in groups, and which serves as a bridge across...
many disciplines throughout the humanities, social sciences and some of the natural sciences. Urban and Blum met with the undergraduate deans (helping to allay concerns about potential cost), and with the outgoing and incoming chairs of the psychology department, who, while finding nothing of interest in the endeavor, were kind enough to understand it was not a threat. After about two years of fantasy, conversation, recruiting interested faculty and writing by committee, the deans allowed the authors to submit a proposal to the college curriculum committee, which voted to approve in October 2014, as did the full faculty, two months later. The webpage, still under development, is http://web.sas.upenn.edu/psys/.

STRUCTURE OF THE MINOR
The minor is conceived as a collaboration between Penn and PCOP, as a meeting between the academy and the clinic. Most of the courses are taught by Penn faculty, but some are co-taught, and others have some degree of participation by psychoanalysts. Each student enrolled in the minor has the opportunity to meet monthly with a PCOP member as a psychoanalytic “mentor.” Those who do this for the period of their enrollment will also be granted, at graduation, a certificate of accomplishment from PCOP. Students are required to take a minimum of six courses that are applicable to the minor, across several academic departments. This will allow them to experience the interdisciplinary possibilities psychoanalysis affords and will also expose them to multiple psychoanalytic viewpoints. (In addition to Urban’s interest in self-psychology and Cavitch’s knowledge of relational analysis, English professor Jean-Michel Rabaté, for example, is a renowned expert on Lacanian interpretation of literature.) Courses for the minor are available in the anthropology, English, German studies, history, and philosophy departments, as well as at the School of Social Policy and Practice (social work).

To develop such a psychoanalytic studies minor, it is necessary to have academics who are analytically sophisticated and interested in clinical psychoanalysis. Reciprocally, it is necessary to have clinicians interested in academics’ views of and contributions to psychoanalysis. The sometimes divergent languages of the two groups at times may need translation. Having broad, or multiple, analytic perspectives is in keeping with scholarly principles of the examination of competing ideas. It is not common for clinicians who teach in a college setting to be paid a great deal of money: They should be prepared to do it for interest, fun, intellectual stimulation, the pleasure of nurturing students, and as a contribution to the future of our field.

The experiment at Penn is barely under way, but is going well so far: the model for the program could, in principle, be readily duplicated, which would please its creators. For further information about it, please contact Larry Blum at ldb@lawrenceblum.com.

New Candidate Members
2016 National Meeting of Members Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York

Roni-Sue Allen, M.A.
Lorie Ammon, M.A.
Nanette C. Auerhahn, Ph.D.
Jonna Lee Barta, Ph.D.
Shabnam Bhojani, M.D.
Candela Maria Bonaccorso, Psy.D.
Mary-Stone Bowers, M.F.T.
Fanny Brito, M.D.
Emily K. Cates, M.A., Ed.M.
John DeMott, D.O.
Emily Deringer, M.D.
Robert DeYoung, M.D.
Garrick Ducker, Ph.D., LMFT
Han Feng, M.A.
Jessica Ferranti, Psy.D.
Kristin Fiorella, M.F.T.
Sandra Francis, Psy.D.
Sidonie Freeman, Psy.D.
Fred Gionia, M.D.
Mead Goedert, Ph.D.
Yael Holoshitz, M.D.
Sureyya Iscan, Ph.D.
Yoko Iwaki, Ph.D., MHC-LP
Jane Keat, Psy.D.
John Kelleher, M.D.
Barbara Kelly, Ph.D.
Arash Khatami, M.D.
Yang Suk Kim, M.D.
Seth Kleinerman, M.D.
Michelle Lalouche-Kadden, Ph.D.
Sandra Lashley, Psy.D.
Dawn Lattuca, LCSW
David M. Lee, M.D.
Amy Leung, M.D.
Rachel Louden, LCSW
Charlotte Malkmus, M.A., LMHC
Elizabeth Marmaras, Ph.D.
Jeanne P. Mosca, Ph.D.
Mark Muecke, M.A.
Abby Mulkeen, M.D.
Bonnianna Luna Pendleton, Ph.D., LPC
Agnes Regeczkey, MFT, Ph.D.
Suzanne Rodgers, LMSW
Susan C. Rosenberg, MSSW
Jacob Sacks, M.D.
Therese Schmolz, M.A., LMFT
Kim Seung Lyoung, M.D.
Matthew Shatzman, L.P.C.
Hopeton Shatzman, M.A.
Loren Sobel, M.D.

Jillian Stile, Ph.D.
Travis Tanner, Ph.D.
Araz Tawfique, M.D.
Christy Tucker, Ph.D.
Sumru Tufekcioglu, Ph.D.
Segio Yero, M.D.

New Academic Associate Candidates
Andrea Crowell, M.D.
Brenda Donaldson, M.D.
Mindy Kronenberg, Ph.D.
Kyuong Jin Lee, M.D., Ph.D.
Noelle McAfee, Ph.D.
Timothy W. Roldan, M.S.W., LCSW, J.D.
Mahalia Way, M.D., Ph.D.
Our June 2016 meeting, at the Palmer House Hilton, will put us once again in the heart of downtown Chicago. The city offers many outstanding examples of planned growth. Much of Chicago was rebuilt after being destroyed by fire in 1871. The original Palmer House Hotel, which had opened just 13 days earlier, burned to the ground and was rebuilt.

VISIONARY PLANNING

Spring is a wonderful season in Chicago. Many of the city's greatest attractions are a short walk away from the hotel and include reminders, should we need them, of how careful planning can preserve a legacy for future generations. Along the lake shore lies Burnham Park, named for planner and architect Daniel Burnham. A strategic planner, he was known for saying, “Make no little plans. They have no magic to stir men’s blood.” Visionary planners protected the parkland, now with running and biking paths which for 26 miles line the city's Lake Michigan shore. Prime beaches, with swimming and sports (beach volleyball, anyone?) are close by. Large plans with visible results include the project that raised the street level one story, 150 years ago, to solve the problem of flooding and poor drainage. In 1900 the flow of the Chicago River was reversed, to help handle the sanitary challenges of a growing city. Millennium Park, completed in 2004, includes newly created parkland above train tracks and parking lots.

Nearby scenic highlights include the Lurie Gardens, the Gehry-designed Pritzker Pavilion within Millennium Park, and Anish Kapoor's nearby Cloud Gate (“The Bean”), which has become a symbol of the city. Navy Pier will be celebrating its centennial, and its new Ferris Wheel may be ready. (In fact, George Washington Gale Ferris, Jr.'s original Ferris Wheel was built in Chicago in 1893.) Navy Pier fireworks explode at 9:30 p.m., Wednesdays and Saturdays. For a more active park excursion, check out weekend morning exercise classes including yoga and Pilates at the Pritzker Pavilion, or discover the new Maggie Daley Park (adjacent to Millennium Park), which features climbing walls and tennis courts against the backdrop of Lake Michigan.

UNLIMITED DINING

Restaurants and cuisines are too numerous to list here, but Chicago is a legendary food destination—anticipate tempting dining arounds. Do not neglect the local specialties, not just the well-known Chicago-style hot dogs and deep dish pizza, but also great ethnic food in the neighborhoods and world renowned dining spots. For food and music, the Taste of Randolph festival will overlap the dates of our meeting and takes place in Chicago's West Loop neighborhood, which has emerged as the city's newest culinary haven. For lunch, dinner or a drink, consider
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seasonal restaurants and bars that appear along the Chicago Riverwalk and offer a break from the bustle of downtown.

ARCHITECTURAL TOURS
BY LAND OR SEA

Also along the Chicago Riverwalk at the corner of Michigan and Wacker is the point of departure for the Chicago Architecture Foundation River Cruise, which gives a curated, informative look at Chicago architecture from our internal waterway. The Chicago Architecture Foundation also conducts walking tours, and several companies offer tours by kayak. (Bring shorts or bathing suit.)

Consider renting a Divvy bike, an inexpensive way to get around the city. It is a great way to explore Chicago’s neighborhoods. Chicago’s great urban universities sit in distinct urban and suburban neighborhoods: the University of Chicago in Hyde Park, DePaul University in Lincoln Park (also site of a great free urban zoo), Loyola University just off North Michigan Avenue, and Northwestern University in nearby Evanston.

SPORTS, THEATER, MUSIC, ART AND SHOPPING

For sports fans there’s Wrigley Field, home of the Chicago Cubs. They will be playing the Pittsburgh Pirates during our meeting. The Chicago White Sox will be home that week at U.S. Cellular Field, where they will play the Detroit Tigers and the Toronto Blue Jays.

Chicago has wonderful theater. Walking distance away, the Cadillac Palace Theater will have a brand-new production of The Sound of Music. Also close by the hotel, the Goodman Theatre will have a new drama, Soups, Stews, and Casseroles: 1976. Farther afield are The Second City in Chicago’s Old Town neighborhood and, much farther, Writers Theatre (Death of a Streetcar Named Virginia Woolf; A Parody).

Musical offerings include a musical-comedy cabaret show, See Jane Sing, featuring Second City alumna Jane Lynch. The Chicago Symphony will feature a Beethoven-Brahms program. The Grant Park Music Festival, in the Pritzker Pavilion at Millennium Park, will have just started. Jazz and blues clubs abound, some within walking distance.

Chicago has great, accessible museums. The Art Institute is two blocks from our meeting site. The Field Museum will have a world-class exhibit, China’s First Emperor and His Terracotta Warriors. The Museum of Contemporary Art, the Shedd Aquarium and the Adler Planetarium are also nearby. Only a little bit farther is the Chicago Children’s Museum.

If you are looking for things to take home with you, Chicago’s Magnificent Mile and State Street shopping districts are nearby and offer a global collection of stores. Beyond downtown but easily reachable, the city’s neighborhoods offer a wide range of smaller shops and boutiques, as well as farmers’ markets. For a great taste of local neighborhood shopping and dining, check out Old Town, Lincoln Park, Bucktown/Wicker Park or Andersonville.

No matter what, our Chicago meeting will be a great opportunity to explore an amazing city while reconnecting with colleagues. Plan to come a day or two early or stay after the meeting to really get to know Chicago at one of the most beautiful times of the year.
APsaA in Austin: 2016 Modern Language Association Convention

Elizabeth Danze and Peter L. Rudnytsky

We often hear calls for psychoanalysts to engage in outreach and bring the skills and sensibility honed in our consulting rooms to bear on the problems in our communities, the nation and the world at large. But in asking for more, we tend to lose sight of how much we are already doing, both as individuals and collectively as an organization. A case in point is the Committee on Psychoanalysis and the Academy, an outgrowth of the 10,000 Minds Project launched by Prudence Gourguechon during her term as president of APsaA from 2008 to 2010.

Counting among its members such eminent scholars and clinicians as Robert A. Paul, George Makari, Britt-Marie Schiller, Vera J. Camden, Nancy J. Chodorow, Diane O’Donoghue, Henry Schwartz, Madelon Sprengnether, Jeffrey Berman and our former co-chair Jeffrey Prager, the Academy Committee oversees three ongoing initiatives aimed at building bridges between the academic and clinical worlds of psychoanalysis. These are: the Courage to Dream book prize; Tuition Grants for Academics taking classes at APsaA institutes; and APsaA as an Allied Organization of the Modern Language Association of America (MLA), which guarantees us a session at the annual convention of the 26,000-member professional body of scholars and teachers of modern languages and literature in the United States.

Thanks to the tireless assistance of Debra Steinke Wardell, manager of Education and Membership Services, and with the enthusiastic support of Stephen Sonnenberg, founding head of the Education Department, in 2010 APsaA became an Allied Organization of MLA. Our first presenter, at the 2011 convention in Los Angeles, was Elyn R. Saks, and this year’s convention, held from January 6-9 in Austin, Texas, marked the sixth consecutive year in which members of the Academy Committee have staged exciting and successful events at the MLA.

SPACE AND PSYCHE

Knowing the convention would be taking place in Austin, committee member Elizabeth Danze volunteered to take charge of our guaranteed session. Her idea was to hold a roundtable titled “Space and Psyche,” moderated by Peter L. Rudnytsky, which featured, in addition to Danze, three other people with connections to the University of Texas: Robert H. Abzug, holder of the Rapoport Regents Chair of Jewish Studies, professor of English Hannah C. Wojciechowski, and Betty Sue Flowers, emeritus professor of English and former director of the Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Library. As we do every year, we used the session to promote our other two initiatives, the book prize and tuition support program, to the 50 or so people in attendance.

Danze opened the roundtable by invoking Gaston Bachelard’s The Poetics of Space to highlight how our experience of buildings transcends the physical realm and extends into our deepest consciousness. Connecting Bachelard’s phenomenology of architecture with spaces intended specifically for psychotherapy, Danze captivated the audience by showing images of analysts’ offices from Sebastian Zimmerman’s book of photographs, Fifty Shrinks. “The transformation that occurs through psychotherapeutic work is as charged as the site where this exchange occurs,” she argued. “No other type of architectural space performs its function in quite the same way.”

In “Jolly Corners: Dream and Fictive Spaces of Henry James,” Hannah C. Wojciechowski noted that James’s “The Jolly Corner” may have originated in an actual dream of its author about the Gallerie d’Apollon in the Louvre. Wojciechowski then connected this famous ghost story to current research on the neuroscience of sleep and dreaming. Acknowledging that J. Allan Hobson’s formalistic approach in Dream Consciousness may help us to ponder the function of movement in and through space within dreams, Wojciechowski nonetheless took issue with Hobson’s rejection of psychoanalysis. “Hobson helps us not at all, however, with understanding the content of dreams, for example, the mysterious ways space can be supercharged with meaning, partly through its resonance with the body and with the embodied meanings we invest in dreams and that we can extract through dream and fictional analysis.”
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Previewing his forthcoming biography of existential psychoanalyst Rollo May, Robert Abzug, in “Reading Love and Will from Montreal,” shifted our attention to the transferential relationship that can arise between a reader and the author of a text. He instanced a letter written to May in 1973 by a 19-year-old Canadian woman, who told him that, while she appreciated the “philosophical and intellectual” content of his bestseller, Love and Will, she most of all wished to thank him for the “emotional experience” that reading it had provided. May’s young admirer poured out her feelings of angst, loneliness and desire to become an artist. At once ingenuous and sophisticated, she was, as Abzug demonstrated, paradoxically “wishing for May’s love and yet understanding the illusory nature of her entire discourse,” much as might happen with a patient in analysis.

CHANGING THE FUTURE

Betty Sue Flowers uses her expertise in fiction to work with governments, corporations and NGOs to create narratives about the future that seek to change what we do in the present. Again, the similarities to analytic work are apparent. In “The War on Drugs: Narrative, Space, and Transformation,” Flowers described how she assembled representatives from all parts of the drug trafficking system in the Western Hemisphere, including a Mexican general, the chief of police of Nicaragua, a former FARC guerrilla, an activist in the legalization movement, the head of a needle exchange program in Canada, and health care professionals. From this unscripted clash of perspectives there emerged four different future scenarios among which it began to be possible to choose thoughtfully, “To solve tough problems,” Flowers concluded her case study in policy making, “we have to gather diverse people together to create a common ground for dialogue and transformation.”

Not only was the ensuing question and answer period with the audience lively and engaging, but people came up afterward to speak with the panelists. One faculty member from Portland was so inspired by the presentations she wanted to explore the possibility of taking classes at an analytic institute. We encouraged her to contact the Oregon Psychoanalytic Center and reminded her about the tuition support program.

Ordinarily, APsaA sponsors only one session at the MLA convention. The 2016 theme, however, was “Literature and Its Publics: Past, Present, and Future,” and it occurred to Rudnytsky to propose that MLA invite former New Jersey senator, 2000 presidential candidate, and New York Knicks basketball star Bill Bradley as a featured speaker. In a high-profile event called a Creative Conversation, Senator Bradley was interviewed by Kathleen Woodward, Lockwood Professor of the Humanities and professor of English at the University of Washington, where she directs the Simpson Center for the Humanities.

INTRODUCING BILL BRADLEY

In introducing Senator Bradley, whom he called “a true champion on and off the court,” Rudnytsky quoted from his most recent book, We Can All Do Better: “As human beings, we must see our interconnectedness and recognize that we are capable of great things when we cooperate with one another…. Only well-considered action will allow us to move beyond our current situation.” He then “passed the ball” to Woodward, who thoughtfully probed the senator on what actions we as Americans can take, both individually and collectively, to address the critical problems facing us in the world today. Senator Bradley said history, his major at Princeton, reveals “the human dimension to our affairs,” and went on to describe how he increasingly came to “enjoy the lyrical aspects of the game” of basketball, when he “was totally in sync” with his Knick teammates, Walt Frazier and Jerry Lucas. As a politician, when he would walk the 127 miles of the Jersey shore to meet his constituents, he, like a psychoanalyst, experienced firsthand how they would “project their fears, their hopes, their anger” onto him, and learned the value of stories as a way to “connect with people” and “how important they were to me, and I could tell them that.”

Since APsaA will be holding its Annual Meeting in June 2017 in Austin, we wanted to report on our efforts at “outreach” on behalf of psychoanalysis and recommend that others discover the pleasures of the “Live Music Capital of the World” for themselves.
Clara Schumann’s Loss and Love

Virtuoso pianist, Clara,
wife, but an untimely widow
mother, whose unborn child never arrived,
lost the ones who were her born ones too.
her pouring tears came like rain,
words ran off in silence.
and, time travelled on.

Fleeting Eros flew over the curtains of cloud
landed gently, circled above her chest.
The longing gaze anchored in her eyes.
The sad, tender and lavished intermezzi
Surrounded the pair like circled arms
Composed new dreams, fears and longings
echoed wild in her newly born sonata
the imagining me envisions two like one
in a warm July night, looking on shimmering stars.
No one could be heard; the time was let to go
Rising rhythm of her fingers on highflying keys was made
walking in the meadow in tiptoes, whispered not,
their dream of one sonic world
Letting the late blooming roses only speak of love

—Mali Mann

Sheri A. Butler, M.D., is an adult training and 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.
Psychoanalysis and Free Speech

Introduction

Michael Slevin

In January 2015, terrorists attacked the staff of Charlie Hebdo, a satirical Paris magazine, killing 12. The offense: a caricature of the Prophet Mohammad, portrayal of whose image is forbidden by Islam. An intense debate ensued over the limits, if any, to free speech. Given the importance of speech in psychoanalysis, I wondered what contribution psychoanalysis might make to this public debate.

I approached three distinguished people to consider the question. They became our contributors: Robert Goldstein, professor at the UCLA law school; Jill Gentile, an analyst with a book in press on democracy, psychoanalysis and free association; and William Winslade, professor of law, professor of philosophy and a licensed research psychoanalyst.

Robert Goldstein, after analyzing eight Supreme Court decisions over the past hundred years on honoring or desecrating the American flag, uses Winnicott’s concept of the transitional object and Bion’s group dynamics theory to consider the symbolic and unifying needs of our national community.

Jill Gentile, writes with a long arc of time, looking at the growth of political democracy, from its origins in ancient Greece to its current ubiquity, as a reality or as a fended off demand. Considering the centrality of speech to psychoanalysis, she wonders whether the discoveries of Freud are in fact essential to the future of democracy.

William Winslade with succinct clarity, contrasts unfettered free speech in the political and media marketplace with the truth demands—each different—placed on speech by each of his three disciplines: law, philosophy and psychoanalysis. He raises a serious question about what a democracy needs to function best.

Since the time the authors began work on their articles, both campus politics and the presidential election contest have raised important questions about free speech, aggression, loosely defined political correctness and safe spaces. While free speech is always in the air in our democracy, some years it is more central than others. This year is one of those times. I hope these three articles will stir in our reader’s questions and understandings about how psychoanalysis can contribute to the needs of our citizens and the needs of our students, the future of our democratic institutions and the future of our universities.

Michael Slevin, M.A., M.S.W., a former TAP editor, graduated as academic associate from the Baltimore Washington Institute for Psychoanalysis, where he completed the Adult Psychotherapy Training Program. He works at Sinai Hospital of Baltimore and has a private practice.

Supreme Court
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from mind to mind,” the Court explained, perhaps intuiting that the flag occupies a transitional space. Accordingly, its meaning must come from within, since “a person gets from a symbol the meaning he puts into it....” For that reason, the Court protected “spontaneous” expression by allowing a person “to speak his own mind” and denying the state the power to coerce even a child, through a flag salute, “to utter what is not in his mind.”

During the Vietnam War, a split Court struggled with allowing protesters expressive leeway in at least three more cases of flag desecration. By contrast, in 1976, in amending the statute that prescribes proper treatment of the flag, Congress declared, The “flag represents a living country and is itself considered a living thing.” As Winnicott notes about a transitional object, “The point of it is not its symbolic value so much as its actuality.”

Finally, following the 1988 presidential election in which the veneration of the flag played a divisive role, the Supreme Court, in a 5-4 decision in Texas v Johnson, reversed Johnson’s conviction for flag burning under a statute forbidding desecration of a venerated object. The Court reasoned that prosecuting the flag-burner impermissibly involved suppressing all ideas about the flag’s meaning except the state’s favored one of “unity.”

Anger at the decision almost led Congress to propose a Constitutional amendment; but it was persuaded to respect the symbolic value of an unamended First Amendment by instead adopting a new statute purporting

Continued on page 26
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We are not just periodic citizen voters but quotidian citizen critics who participate, without restriction, continuously in a collective dialogue with each other and government officials. This account of freedom of speech assumes that if the First Amendment allowed censorship of speech on matters of public concern, such regulation would easily “chill” speakers from speaking their minds in the realm of public discourse, as few material benefits otherwise encourage such public speech. Yet this account also implicitly assumes that, absent legal deterrence, speakers are object seekers, interested in communicating with others in their political community. Thus, the majority in Johnson assumes that allowing flag burning, under the aegis of the First Amendment, will make public conversation more robust. But this involves treating the flag as a symbol of meaning that must be unregulated rather than as a transitional object, in an intermediate (illusory) space, the protection of which may help individuals believe they are communicating with interested and caring fellow citizens, mind to mind.

LIMITATIONS ON FREE SPEECH

The First Amendment theory of public discourse distinguishes free-for-all speech on matters of public concern in the realm of public discourse from the law’s regulation of speech harmful to the individual personality in civil society (or the “lifeworld”). Thus, tort law has long sought to protect the psyche of the speaker and listener from injurious speech: protecting reputation through the law of defamation; protecting privacy against unreasonable disclosures of spontaneous personal speech and intrusions on the self; protecting audience reliance on speaker sincerity through laws penalizing falsehoods; protecting against outrageous treatment through the tort of infliction of emotional distress.

Yet during and after the bruising battles of the flag cases, First Amendment doctrine, for a variety of very good reasons, became more protective of speech but also more formally rigid; and as it increasingly constrained various areas of the law, including defamation and privacy, it reduced the law’s protection of the personality of speakers and listeners. This began in earnest during the Vietnam War in Cohen v California, reversing a breach-of-peace arrest for wearing in a courtroom a coat emblazoned with “F*ck the Draft.” Stressing the importance of emotional expression to free speech (as the “emotive function…may often be the more important element of the overall message”), the Court held that, in public space, the audience (such as a family with its toddlers in tow) must simply avert their eyes and not expect the law to protect them from “mere” offense.

In rapid succession, three cases reversed arrests for a defendant’s use of “mother F*cker” in public settings. In 1988, the Court rejected an emotional distress claim against Hustler Magazine brought by the Moral Majority leader Jerry Falwell for the magazine’s “parody” portraying incest with his mother. In 2011, because it denied that it could distinguish a minor’s physically playing video games from reading a book, the Court struck down a law regulating juvenile access to violent video games. Characterizing an anti-abortion protester’s “quiet counseling” of patients entering Planned Parenthood facilities as speech of public, not private, concern, the Court recently struck down a law restricting unencumbered access to clinics. Finally, members of the Westboro Church, with a slogan “God Hates Fags,” picketed, from a public location, the funeral of a U.S. Marine who was killed in combat. Finding the church’s protest against the nation’s evolving laws on homosexuality a matter of public concern, the Court reversed the jury’s award of damages to the Marine’s grieving father for infliction of emotional distress.

What are the psychological consequences of cases such as these? The justices argue that the regime of free speech itself protects and nurtures a strong personality capable of self-governance (and less likely, in the words of Erich Fromm, to seek an escape from freedom). In his famous free speech opinion, in Whitney v California (1927), Justice Louis D. Brandeis discussed the favorable impact free speech has on the character development of democratic citizens. Cathartic expression integrates individuals within the community,

Continued on page 27
reduces hate and liberates “thought, hope and imagination.” Most important, tolerance of frustration, arising from confrontation with the reality of diverse minds with diverse opinions, builds character. For Brandeis, free speech paves the ego’s way to healthy reality testing: “It is the function of speech to free men from the bondage of irrational fears.”

COLLECTIVE CONVERSATION AND GROUP PSYCHOLOGY

Free speech doctrine allocates to the realm of public discourse the work of expressing political interests and deliberating for collective action, what Justice Brandeis in Whitney called “political truth.” We should expect that such a realm of our collective conversation will be periodically subject to the predictable phenomena of group psychology. This includes the regressive emotional group attitudes that Bion found regularly interfere with the work of a group, and which he attributed to the members’ loss of ego boundaries, interpersonal support and social roles in an unstructured group. Bion identified three alternating basic group assumptions: passive dependency on an idealized leader, unrealistic hopes of being saved by a charismatic couple, and a scapegoating fight-flight group in a persecutory, paranoid state. Indeed, in Whitney, Brandeis expressed the expectation that free speech would, through reality testing, counteract such primitive group anxiety, noting that in an earlier (pre First Amendment) time, “Men feared witches and burnt women.”

Even as it prevents government censorship, does free speech doctrine sometime undermine the conditions that support mature speakers in public discourse? Might denying a shared transitional object (like the flag) that facilitates connection among our vast citizenry, and might reducing the law’s restraint on attacks on the integrity of our personalities increase the regressive pulls of group anxiety? In Cohen v California, Justice John Marshall Harlan expressed the hope that free speech doctrine “will ultimately produce a more capable citizenry.” In limiting the power to proscribe “mere offense” in a society “as diverse and populous as ours,” he also acknowledged that the doctrine of “free expression is powerful medicine.” But he did not explain for what malady and whether this medicine is ever iatrogenic.
Psychoanalysis: Relevant to Democracy

Jill Gentile

Anyone passingly familiar with the history of psychoanalysis knows the field has occupied an embattled, marginalized, often indeterminate identity, and its survival has often seemed precarious. Yet it is from this perch on the margins of culture and community that psychoanalysis speaks. By channeling a vortex of unconscious and conscious energies, it gives voice to raw, novel free associations. In fact, because psychoanalysis leverages, through human relationships, would be available to nearly everyone were it not for the persistent problem of unequal access to speech. Once we recognize this, its relevance to a theory of democracy is obvious.

Despite (and perhaps because of) this proximity to the holy grail that defines and differentiates humanity from other species, psychoanalysis has had to assert and reassert its legitimacy for some 120 years, if we date it to the publication in 1895 of Freud and Breuer’s Studies on Hysteria. Democracy, on the other hand, has been at it for two-and-a-half millennia, ever since the Athenian constitution placed the power of political choice in the hands of the “demos.” Although our memories of Athens’s political experiment tend to be both rosy and dim (we forget the internal contention and the ultimate external defeat), democracy has survived as a set of ideas and practices that nearly everyone acknowledges and governments everywhere reckon with. While psychoanalysis finds itself on the sidelines of both the mental health professions and of the culture at large, democracy has gained a privileged and even hegemonic position.

Modern democracies, which trace back to American and French models, have enjoyed a far more sustained success than their Greek antecedent. This success is partly due to their claim to advance “natural law,” which was a core principle of the Enlightenment philosophy that inspired revolt against arbitrary power. Ideas of natural law and innate rights would not just inspire revolt, they would also find their way into that enduring document that links our individual liberties to our social collectivity, the United States Constitution. Though its framers may not have chosen the word “democracy”—and may have steered clear of it, given its negative historical associations with mob rule—they

Continued on page 29
Sigmund Freud and John Dunn

As our world today grows increasingly polarized, democracy has come to seem less a neutral and universally appealing ideal. The term has been degraded, not only through its entanglement with unregulated capitalism but also by its appropriation by many false claimants. Certainly, actual, direct democracy, true rule by the people, (as opposed to rule by detached representatives) has become improbable and undesirable in today's populous, expansive and complicated world.

But even our far more realistic contemporary models of representative democracy reveal incredible gaps in equality that belie the promise of individual and collective sovereignty. Whereas Freud had revealed that the ego is not master of its own house, John Dunn alerts us to “the distinctive imaginative deceptions” of democracy, specifically our tendency to fall under the “hypnotic spell” of its entanglement with unregulated capitalism. 

Dunn attributes this, arguably provisional, “global comparative advantage” to democracy’s recognition of its citizenry “not merely as notional bearers of ultimate authority, but also as site of power in themselves, with a capacity to act and exert force on their own behalf”.

We psychoanalysts might imagine that herein too lies the very basis for psychoanalysis’s enduring validity and promise. Was not self-sovereignty an essential aspect of Freud’s dream? Democracy’s narrative is actually the story of personal and political, individual and collective, agency—Freud’s reverberating, perplexing motifs.

Both democracy and psychoanalysis evolved as rebukes to repression and tyranny.

Still might have concluded, as political theorist John Dunn has, that democracy is “the most natural of all regimes,” as it comes “closest to preserving the freedom which nature allows to human beings.”

Beyond this commonality, Dunn’s compelling narrative of democracy’s triumph is music to a psychoanalyst’s ears. Dunn, possibly channeling Freud, tells the story of the word “democracy”: of that word’s “spectacular” diffusion; its translation, interpretation, presumptive authority and elusive meanings—and of our complicated relationship with that word, implicitly including our transference to it. It is the story of “democracy,” to borrow from Jean LaPlanche, as a quintessential “enigmatic signifier.” The bewilderingly complex social and political forces that inculcate the word so deeply in our lexicons, across so many languages and cultures, also saturate and burden the word with confusion. As such, democracy is a word that inspires renewed efforts to grapple with what it means and what it authorizes.

Attention to speech opens our capacity to hear it, to recognize its fundamental rule, free association—freedom of thought and of speech—instantiate, by its fundamental rule, an ever impossible and elusive but decidedly democratizing mission! The therapeutic action of speech illuminates the life of the word, of the signifier, the movement of which is a sign itself of the liberation of desire’s democratic impulse. Democracy’s semiotic ascendancy reveals speech’s democratizing action. Speech reveals the contagious, reverberating and transformational flow of desire and its symbols.

Might it be that democracy’s enduring relevance and comparative advantage is a tribute itself to its very own special, maybe sacred, relationship to the practice of free speech? Might democracy’s status as a beguiling master signifier reveal that its mission is essentially also a psychoanalytic and semiotic one. Might psychoanalysis’s commitment to free association—freedom of thought and of speech— instantiate, by its fundamental rule, an ever impossible and elusive but decidedly democratizing mission? Both democracy and psychoanalysis evolved as rebukes to repression and tyranny. They both established imaginative sets of ideas and practices for helping people claim the power of self-rule. Both claimed a progressive enlightenment born of truth seeking and soul searching. And both find mutual resonance, sustenance and relevance to each other and to humanity, in their signature practices, free association and free speech. Attention to speech opens our capacity to hear it, to recognize its fundamental status as a democratizing practice. Perhaps, from the vantage point of the far more ancient word “democracy,” our still youthful “psychoanalysis” simply needs more time on our shared planet to disperse, disseminate, democratize its signifying message and along with that, its replenishing, liberating pulse of desire.
Free Speech: A Mixed Blessing
William J. Winslade

In many authoritarian countries, critics of the prevailing governments risk reprisals, such as harassment, arrest, imprisonment or even assassination or execution. In the United States there is a long tradition of protection of free speech embodied in the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. The Founding Fathers believed that free expression, including conflicting points of view, would create better policies when good ideas could flow freely and drive out bad or even foolish ones. Critics of government were to be expected and their arguments and objections were to be taken seriously and properly evaluated.

Over the years, however, the right to free speech has expanded exponentially. The explosion of communication technologies from newspapers to radios to television to computers to the Internet and its many spin-offs like Twitter, Instagram and others, provide unprecedented opportunities for the expression of ideas of all kinds—not just political ideas and critiques. Many types of advocacy for controversial, unpopular and radical ideas are freely expressed and widely disseminated. We are constantly bombarded by multiple media sources spewing political rhetoric and critical commentaries under the protection of free speech.

Unlike philosophy or litigation in which speech is typically presented publicly, free association is communicated in a private and confidential setting. Vulnerable people purchase bogus bargains and gullible people believe convincingly conveyed false and sometimes outlandish offers.

In addition, fervent advocacy and unchecked overstatement fuel prejudice about many political topics. Although this type of free speech provides entertaining material for humorists like Jon Stewart and Stephen Colbert, they utilize heavily edited clips to poke fun at politicians, Fox News and other targets. But this does not prevent seemingly endless streams of free speech unsupported by reliable evidence and sound reasoning.

Few remedies are available to curtail the torrents of phony, frivolous and misleading free speech. Fact checkers can report false claims but they cannot prevent the proliferation of factual errors. Education at all levels should emphasize the importance of precision, accuracy and evidence-based speech. It is important not to accept truth claims at face value. One should always evaluate the evidence and arguments on the basis of these claims.

In this article, I will discuss three types of free speech—philosophical discourse, adversary litigation and psychoanalytic therapy, which are supported by distinct and different rules of evidence and acceptability, and will explain why these are governed by different criteria.

PHILOSOPHICAL DISCOURSE

Philosophers often spend considerable time discussing what is real (ontology), what is known and knowable (epistemology), and what is right conduct (ethics). In philosophical discourse concepts and theories are examined to determine if they are clear, coherent and based on sound reasoning. Philosophy is not merely a matter of beliefs or opinions. Philosophers typically submit their ideas to colleagues to test the reliability of the evidence and arguments presented. Philosophical discourse that fails to meet these standards is rejected in favor of concepts and theories backed by better evidence and more rigorous reasoning.
ADVERSARIAL LITIGATION

Speech must meet specific standards of acceptability in litigation in the adversary system of justice. The adversary system is based on the assumption that every litigant in a civil or criminal trial before a judge or jury will follow rules of evidence and procedure for presenting their case for their client. It is presumed that the best evidence and legal arguments will prevail. The judge or jury has the responsibility to make a fair decision, not on the basis of their personal opinions or beliefs, but rather on the applicable legal rules and the persuasiveness of the evidence and arguments the attorneys present. As a further test of reliability, the appellate courts provide an opportunity to review the strength and weight of the evidence as well as arguments presented at the trial.

PSYCHOANALYTIC SPEECH

In psychoanalysis the technique of free association on the surface may seem to resemble unfettered free speech. The analysand is supposed to say anything that comes to his or her mind. Unlike philosophy or litigation in which speech is typically presented publicly, free association is communicated in a private and confidential setting. Although a person is encouraged to say whatever comes to mind, the beliefs or opinions expressed are not evaluated by external evidence or rational argument. The speech provides an opportunity for the analyst and the analysand to work together to discern underlying feelings, emotions and patterns of thought. The analyst listens to the analysand's free associations, incidental remarks, dreams and reports of events or encounters, not for the purpose of assessing truth or logic but to gain insights about the psychological life of the analysand. Of course, free associations become restricted by defenses such as denial and repression. The analysand and the analyst must make a joint effort to try to understand not only what is being said but also what is not being said. Indeed, the analyst must “listen with a third ear” to what has not been said. The challenge for the analyst is not to take the free associations at face value. Analysands must also not assume their free associations tell the whole story about their emotional life. The analysand seeks insights and self-knowledge while the analyst seeks understanding of the meaning of the emotions and experiences in the analysand's life and relationships. The analyst seeks clues revealed from the overt as well as the hidden emotions that emerge from the conversations between the analyst and the analysand. Different from speech in philosophy or litigation, free association initiates a special type of collaborative exploration between analyst and analysand to gain a better understanding of the emotional life of the analysand.

It is no surprise many people feel bombarded by unfettered free speech and do not know how to assess the reliability of what they hear or see on television, the Internet or from other unregulated sources. They are not sure what to believe or what to take seriously. In the three types of free speech I have claimed are different, there are rules of evidence and acceptability. Even when disagreements arise, there are accepted means to resolve them. It is critical in an open society to challenge claims that are not supported by good evidence or sound reasoning. Speech in philosophy, litigation and psychoanalysis is assessed in terms of worthy human goals and aspirations. A flourishing open society requires policies and practices that evolve from good evidence and sound reasoning.

SPECIAL SECTION: PSYCHOANALYSIS AND FREE SPEECH
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