VOLUME XXVIII, NO. 2 SPRING 2008 TABLE OF CONTENTS

FROM THE PRESIDENT
Psychoanalytic Self-Interest and Psychoanalytic Vision
Nancy McWilliams .................................................. 1
Psychoanalytic Abstracts Now an Online Publication
Alvin Walker .......................................................... 5

PSYCHOANALYTIC RESEARCH
Bridging the Gap Between Psychoanalytic Research and Practice
Patrick Luytens, Sidney Blatt, and Jozef Corveleyn ...................... 6

ARTICLES
Psychoanalytic Ethnography and Filmmaking
Ricardo Ainslie ....................................................... 12
Post Modern Metaphors
Henry Seiden ................................................................ 14
Love Me; Love My Gecko
Karen Zelan .................................................................. 16
The Challenge of Teaching in a University Setting
Lawrence Josephs ..................................................... 17
National Coalition of Mental Health Professionals and Consumers
William MacGillivray ............................................... 20

CONTROVERSIAL DISCUSSIONS
Whatever Happened to the Unconscious?
A Critique of Dissociation, Multiplicity and the Eclipse of the Unitary Self
Jon Mills ..................................................................... 25
Further Thoughts on Dissociation
Ronald Naso ................................................................ 29

PSYCHOANALYTIC BOOKS
Books Written by Division Members, 2007-2008 ................. 34
David Wallin’s Attachment in Psychotherapy
Linda Guerra ............................................................... 35
Romulo Lander’s Subjective Experience
And the Logic of the Other
Lina Schlacter ........................................................... 37
Erin Labbie’s Lacan’s Medievalism
Marcella Goldsmith .................................................... 40

Justin Clemons and Russell Grigg’s Jacques Lacan
And the Other Side of Psychoanalysis:
Reflections on Seminar XVII
Greg Nove ................................................................. 43
Comment on Drew Westen’s The Political Brain
Harold Davis ............................................................. 45

COMMITTEE REPORTS
APA Summit on Violence and Abuse in Relationships
Marilyn Jacobs .......................................................... 49
New Division Members:
January 2007 to March 2008 ........................................ 53
Sexualities and Gender Identity
Scott Pytluk and Kenneth Maguire ................................ 57
Continuing Education
Laura Porter ............................................................. 58
From the Editor
William MacGillivray ................................................ 58

SECTION REPORTS
Psychologist Psychoanalytic Practitioners
William Fried ............................................................. 60
Psychologist Psychoanalytic Clinicians
Johanna Tabin .......................................................... 61
Couple and Family Psychoanalysis
Toni Halton ............................................................. 61

LOCAL CHAPTER REPORTS
Chicago Association for Psychoanalytic Psychology
Patricia McMahon ...................................................... 62
Rhode Island Association for Psychoanalytic Psychologies
Sally Mayo ................................................................. 62
Southeast Florida for Psychoanalytic Psychology
Max Harris ................................................................. 63
Vermont Association for the Study of Psychoanalysis
Susan Lillich ............................................................. 63

DIVISION BOARD MEETINGS
August 2007 ............................................................ 64
January 2008 ............................................................ 67

ANNOUNCEMENTS ....................................................... 70

DIRECTORY ................................................................ 71
How Are We Doing?

I have been conferring for some time with Steve Axelrod, our Liaison to the APA Business of Practice Network, about how we can address the practice concerns of our members. In these conversations it has become clear to both him and me how little we all know about one another’s practices: how many clinical hours we work, how much we charge, whether we vary our fees, how many times a week we see our patients, how long we see them, what problems they most commonly seek help with, how individual practitioners have adapted to current health care realities, and so on. I find myself making many assumptions about practice issues (for example, I am pretty sure that early-career psychoanalytic professionals are finding it much harder to get a practice going than beginning therapists did before the managed care era), but it is not easy to find hard data on such topics.

How Are We Doing?

In our field it seems to be a matter of pride to have a full analytic practice, and so it may be equally a matter of shame when the practice ideal and the practice reality are discrepant. A few years ago, I gave a seminar for a small group of elderly medical psychoanalysts in a small American city. It slowly became apparent that although they were representing themselves to me and to each other as having robust analytic practices, most of them were surviving on medication consults and the occasional psychotherapy patient seen once a week or less. The subtle posturing—not to mention the underlying dysphoric affect—among these psychiatrists was palpable. I began wondering how many of the rest of us are putting on a brave face in the context of doing less and less of the work we love and value—the training that we pursued at considerable sacrifice—while our real income goes inexorably south.

On the other hand, despite my occasional hand-wringing about what is happening to practice, many of my colleagues seem to be full every time I try to refer someone...
to them. No competent analytic therapist I know has closed a practice for lack of customers (though again, would anyone admit that?). Analysts in the currently hot institutes are reputedly doing fine, and some of the psychoanalytically influenced movements in contemporary psychotherapy (e.g., Diana Fosha’s Accelerated Experiential-Dynamic Psychotherapy) seem to be flourishing. APA’s messages to practitioners are relentlessly cheerful, full of descriptions of the exciting new roles that twenty-first century psychologists are assumed to be eager to fill.

HOW WOULD WE KNOW HOW WE ARE DOING?
Before the Division can figure out how to help our members with the business of practice, we have to find out what their actual circumstances are and what they need. Accordingly, Dr. Axelrod has assembled an advisory group (Mary Beth Cresci, Kenneth Eisold, William Gottdiener, Paul Hymowitz, and Phee Rosnick) to pursue the answers to some basic questions. For example, how many of us have patients in treatment more than twice a week who are not institute candidates? Intensive treatment for any but those in training would seem a rarity these days, but we do not know that for sure, and there may be some collective resistance to even asking this question. What are the average fees in various locales? Is there a gap between what we say we charge and what we actually charge, or actually collect? Has the feminization of the profession (see Philipson, 1993) had the all-too-familiar consequence of reducing its prestige and its financial rewards? Are more psychoanalytic therapists developing clinical “niche practices” rather than offering a general psychotherapy services?

Every five years the American Psychoanalytic Association does a survey on its members’ practices. Because the questions have changed over time, the responses that the organization has collected in different eras cannot be easily compared, but at least the American has a systematic evaluation in place. Although APA does periodic surveys on psychologists’ income, it has many more constituencies than its psychoanalytic practitioners and hence has not, to my knowledge, collected comparable information over the past ten to fifteen years. In the absence of relevant data from our parent organization, it makes sense for us to collect our own. With the cooperation of the American, in the interest of not re-inventing a wheel, Dr. Axelrod’s advisory group took their most recent survey and adapted it to our needs. Once they had a first draft of the revised document, they piloted it on the Division 39 Board of Directors.

The final draft of the survey will go out to all Division members by the fall of 2008. Because not all of us are electronically savvy, we will be sending out a paper questionnaire with a stamped, return-addressed envelope. It should take no more than twenty minutes to complete. In addition to factual questions, the survey tries to assess personal goals, professional satisfaction, expectations for the future, and needs for assistance and support. To protect confidentiality while permitting follow-up communications, every member will be given a numerical code available only to the Division office and the administrator of the survey. When the results have been compiled and interpreted, they will be described in full in a subsequent issue of this newsletter.

THE APA ELECTIONS AND THE DIVISION’S OTHER INTERESTS
As I write about the business of practice, I notice the somewhat jarring juxtaposition of this bread-and-butter issue with the larger moral questions that I tried to address in my winter column on interrogations. I think we can look in both directions at once—toward our professional self-interest and toward our
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ethical fundamentals—but these concerns do exist in some tension.

The April Board meeting threw that tension into stark relief. Both Carol Goodheart and Steven Reisner addressed the Board, asking for the Division’s formal support for their respective candidacies for APA President-Elect. Dr. Goodheart’s platform is organized around how to promote our craft and our clinical value to our organization and the larger society. Dr. Reisner’s is characterized by a vision of psychoanalysis as challenging our organization and society at large. Thus, our self-interest within APA was concretely juxtaposed with the imperative to hold APA morally accountable.

This is the first time in my memory that there are two Division 39 members running for APA President-Elect. Most Board members seemed favorably disposed toward both candidates, for different reasons. Dr. Reisner has been at the forefront of the struggle against what the Division leadership sees as APA’s ethical failure to address the presence of psychologists in settings in which human rights abuses and torture take place, specifically the CIA “black sites” and Guantánamo. He lacks the experience in APA governance and the broad APA connections of his opponent, but he expressed willingness to confront the steep learning curve involved in developing a platform on issues other than interrogations that are salient to psychoanalytic psychologists.

Dr. Goodheart, who came very close to winning the last election, has a long history of involvement in APA and is especially knowledgeable about health care policy. She has accomplished many goals on behalf of practitioners, including expanding APA’s definition of “evidence-based practice” beyond the narrow notions of some of our colleagues. She does not, however, support a prohibition on practice beyond the narrow notions of some of our colleagues. She has accomplished many goals on behalf of practitioners, including expanding APA’s definition of “evidence-based practice” beyond the narrow notions of some of our colleagues. She does not, however, support a prohibition on the presence of psychologists in settings in which human rights abuses and torture take place, specifically the CIA “black sites” and Guantánamo. He lacks the experience in APA governance and the broad APA connections of his opponent, but he expressed willingness to confront the steep learning curve involved in developing a platform on issues other than interrogations that are salient to psychoanalytic psychologists.

The Board considered four different options: 1) supporting Dr. Reisner; 2) supporting Dr. Goodheart; 3) supporting both while educating our membership about their respective positions and the implications of the Hare system of voting; and 4) postponing a decision until our August meeting. We decided to resist the temptation to stall, and in a vote that was unusual for being split several ways, the majority voted to endorse both candidates and ask members to rank them #1 and #2 in either order. Either Dr. Goodheart or Dr. Reisner is far more likely to promote the interests of the Division than any of the other APA presidential hopefuls.

I encourage you to educate yourself about the positions of each candidate, which can be found at their respective web sites: www.CarolGoodheartForAPAPresident.com and www.ReisnerforPresident.org.

There are complex competing issues here. Whichever person you eventually cast your #1 vote for, the Board urges you to give the other Division 39 candidate your #2 ranking. Because of the peculiarities of the Hare system, in many APA elections the person with the most #2 or even #3 votes has won (as was the case for James Bray this past year). Because of this system, voting for one of our candidates does not quite equate with voting against the other. If you support Dr. Reisner, do not forget that it still matters greatly for psychoanalytic psychology which of his opponents leads APA if he is not elected. If you support Dr. Goodheart, do not forget that you can still register an objection to APA’s current interrogation policies by ranking Dr. Reisner #2.

**Update on the Interrogations Issue**

Three significant developments have occurred since my earlier column on interrogations. First, any possible loopholes in the resolution against torture and cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment passed by APA Council last August have been closed. Laurie Wagner, one of our Council Representatives, collaborated with representatives from Divisions 19 (Military Psychology), 41 (Forensic Psychology), and 48 (Peace Psychology) to write an airtight amendment forbidding psychologists from planning, assisting, or participating in any detainee interrogations that are abusive. The amendment met with stunning success at the APA Council meeting last February; it passed without dissent. At the April Board meeting, I gave Dr. Wagner a presidential citation for her role in this achievement and related ones.

In a moving ceremony during the Spring Meeting, Neil Altman received the Division 39 Leadership Award for his courage and tenacity on the interrogations issue. In August 2006, the Divisions of Social Justice as a group, for complex reasons, decided not to initiate a resolution calling for the non-participation of psychologists in detainee interrogations. As an individual Council Representative, Dr. Altman then sponsored what became known as the Moratorium Resolution. In doing so, he kept the issue not just alive, but front-and-center for the governing body of APA.

Second, Laurie Wagner and Division 48 representatives are working with Steve Behnke, APA Ethics Officer, to modify sections 1.02 and 1.03 of the Ethics Code that currently permit psychologists to obey legal orders when those orders and the ethics code are in conflict. The 2007
Resolution is at variance with these sections of the code:

There are no exceptional circumstances whatsoever, whether induced by a state of war or threat of war, internal political instability or any other public emergency, that may be invoked as a justification for torture or cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, including the invocation of laws, regulations, or orders.

APA Council has charged the Ethics Committee with rectifying this disparity. Additionally, Dr. Wagner has been asked to consult with the Ethics Committee about the casebook on the ethics of interrogations. She will bring to the committee the voice of those who believe that psychologist participation in sites without basic human rights is unethical.

Third, Psychologists for an Ethical APA, a group started by Division 39 members, has developed a referendum that states that psychologists “may not work in settings where persons are held outside of, or in violation of, either International Law (e.g., the UN Convention Against Torture and the Geneva Conventions) or the US Constitution (where appropriate), unless they are working directly for the persons being detained or for an independent third party working to protect human rights.” If they get enough signatures of APA members (902 are required), this referendum will allow the interrogations policy question to bypass the governance of APA and go straight to the membership for a majority vote. The entire referendum and the opportunity to support it by becoming a signatory can be found at www.ethicalapa.com

CONCLUDING COMMENTS
A tremendous amount of commitment, talent, mind-power, and sheer sweat has gone into all the above accomplishments. We also need to keep our eye on more prosaic matters, issues of self-interest that coexist with issues of vision. The take-away messages here are:

1. When you get the practice survey, please complete it promptly and send it in.
2. When you get the APA ballot, please give the #1 and #2 rankings to our member candidates (and tell your friends to do the same), and send it in.

REFERENCES

Thanks to Laurie Wagner for supplying me with the finer details of the politics that are reviewed here.
Psychologis-Psychoanalytist

Psychoanalytic Abstracts, ceased publication with the December 2007 issue, Volume 21, No. 4. In response to trends toward use of the electronic version, Psychoanalytic Abstracts became an electronic-only publication beginning in January 2008. This change from a quarterly print journal to a more frequently updated, searchable electronic product will improve its service to members.

Psychoanalytic Abstracts is released electronically on a monthly basis, instead of the quarterly print publication. This electronic journal continues to cover a group of “core” psychoanalytic journals selected by the Psychoanalytic Abstracts Editorial Board, non-core journals selected via psychoanalytic index terms from the Thesaurus of Psychoanalytic Index Terms, and psychoanalytic books and chapters. The group of core journals is covered in every monthly release, while the non-core journals and books and chapters will vary from month to month. The Psychoanalytic Abstracts Editorial Board will continue to meet annually to review new journal titles for possible inclusion in Psychoanalytic Abstracts.


APA has provided information on member access in new member welcome packets as well as on the journal order/renewal form and APA website. Current subscribers to the print journal have access to a rolling three-year file. To gain access to the file, use the following easy steps: 1. Go to APA’s home page, apa.org 2. Direct your cursor over “Association Info.” 3. Click “Members Page” option from that list. 4. Login to “myAPA” using your username and password, and click the blue “Go” button. 5. Click PsycSCANS link under “mySubscriptions.”
that as a member of Division 39 (regular member or affiliate) you are eligible to subscribe to the PEP-WEB for $55.00 a year?

The PEP-WEB is the Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing Company's searchable online database of psychoanalytic writings. It includes full-text articles from all the major psychoanalytic journals, the entire Standard Edition of Freud, and some seminal texts and relevant newsletters. It is updated regularly to include all journal articles up to three years before the current date.

PEP-WEB is an indispensable scholarly resource.

The $55 yearly subscription is a huge saving over the cost of purchasing access on your own. The Division pays a large yearly fee to PEP to provide individual subscriptions for its members.

We urge you to take advantage of this membership benefit!

See the Division website for the details.

www.division39.org
Editor’s Note: This section of the newsletter typically focuses on introducing and reviewing empirical research with a psychoanalytic focus. In this issue, however, we are fortunate to have a paper from three esteemed psychoanalytic clinician/researchers focusing on the importance of collaboration between clinicians and researchers conducting psychoanalytic research. Drs. Luyten, Blatt, and Corveleyn all have distinguished careers as clinicians, researchers, and professors. These authors review some of the historical factors that have contributed to a divide between clinicians and researchers within the psychoanalytic community, make a compelling case for why clinicians and researchers should be interested in building bridges across this divide, and provide some concrete and creative suggestions for how to span this chasm. Dr. Luyten has kindly provided his e-mail address at the end of this article for those interested in corresponding with him. We are also eager and interested in any feedback as well.

Caleb Siefert, PhD, csiefert@partners.org
Tai Katzenstein, PhD, tkatzenstein@partners.org

Over the last several decades, debates over the role and nature of empirical research have led to a divide within psychoanalysis between two predominant cultures. As we have discussed in detail elsewhere (Luyten, Blatt, and Corveleyn, 2006), one culture, often more clinical in orientation, maintains that psychoanalytic research should focus on meaning, interpretation, and narration, relying primarily on the traditional case study method as introduced by Freud. The other culture, often more research oriented, argues that psychoanalytic research should adopt a (neo)positivistic stance focusing on cause and effect relationships, probabilistic (statistical) statements, relying on methods derived from the physical and social sciences including experimental designs. Although these two depictions represent extreme points of a continuum, the distinction between these two cultures has some validity as illustrated by recent debates regarding the role of empirical research within psychoanalysis (e.g., Sandler et al., 2000; Shedler, 2004; Wallerstein, 2005).

In this paper, we briefly describe the origins of this divide, presenting arguments intrinsic and extrinsic to psychoanalysis on the importance of closing this gap. In addition, we formulate a number of principles that the psychoanalytic community and psychoanalytic institutes in particular could implement to close the gap between these two cultures in order to safeguard the rich heritage of psychoanalytic thought for the future.

The origin of two cultures within psychoanalysis
The current divide between these two cultures within the psychoanalytic community partly stems from criticism from outside psychoanalysis (Luyten et al., 2006). Psychoanalysis has been criticized since its inception for being a “pseudo-science,” “old-wives psychiatry,” or as being “pornographic” (Kiell 1988; Turner 1996). In the early 1980s these criticisms intensified as a result of the contributions of some serious scholars such as the philosopher of science Adolf Grünbaum, as well as so-called Freud-bashers including Crews, Farrell, and MacMillan. A common theme that ran through these criticisms was the assumption that the entire psychoanalytic edifice rests on shaky empirical foundations. The famous behaviorist and personality researcher Hans Eysenck (1985), for example, concluded that “there is no evidence at all for psychoanalytic theory,” while Torrey (1992, p. 221) even propounded that psychoanalysis has to be situated “on precisely the same scientific plane as the theory regarding the Loch Ness monster.”

Although these criticisms often rested on distorted presentations of psychoanalysis, they led to a growing concern within segments of the psychoanalytic community about the empirical status of psychoanalysis. Indeed, the growing number of Freud critics forecasted the downfall of psychoanalysis precisely because of its refusal to engage in empirical research. This reinforced the growing divide within the psychoanalytic community between those arguing that the traditional case study method is sufficient to validate psychoanalytic concepts, and those that increasingly considered this method to be limited because of its many methodological pitfalls, not the least of which is the issue of confirmation-bias. Unfortunately, this resulted in these two cultures drifting apart, and the rare debates between proponents of these cultures amply illustrate how they consider each other’s beliefs and assumption often so wrong that any attempt to establish communication between these two cultures is destined to fail.
Why should we bridge the gap?

Signs indicate that this situation may be changing as a growing number of people within the psychoanalytic community realize that this divide between two cultures is not only to a large extent arbitrary, but also false (Luyten et al., 2006). Generally speaking, two sets of reasons indicate why an increasing number of psychoanalysts consider it important to bridge the current divide within psychoanalysis. The first set of reasons have more to do with politics and power and are thus to a certain extent external to psychoanalysis. Psychoanalysis is increasingly pressured by managed health care to prove its efficacy in controlled studies. And although some psychoanalysts remain indifferent to these issues, many others feel that these pressures may threaten their own personal future as well as that of psychoanalysis more generally. Hence, these analysts are becoming increasingly interested in learning more about systematic research of psychoanalytic treatments and concepts in order to support their use of psychoanalysis and psychodynamic psychotherapy. In the meantime, and often as an unanticipated result, these analysts have also become curious to learn how these studies might influence their clinical practice. Research concerning Transference–Focused Psychotherapy (TFP; Clarkin, Levy, & Schiavi, 2005) and Mentalization–based Treatment (MBT; Fonagy & Bateman, 2006), for instance, have not only led to these treatments being considered as evidence–based psychodynamic modes of treatment for borderline patients, but also stirred discussion concerning technical treatment issues for these patients.

But there are also reasons intrinsic to psychoanalysis that could lead to a bridging of the gap between these two cultures. Indeed, as noted, we believe that this gap not only is to a large extent artificial, but also false. Clearly, no single method or approach is “uniquely suited” to investigate psychoanalytic assumptions. Hence, we believe that the future of psychoanalytic research lies in methodological pluralism, ranging from single (N=1) and multiple case studies, to the study of narratives, questionnaires, and observational and experimental studies, as all these methods can potentially contribute to approaching the complexity of psychoanalytic hypotheses and ultimately of human nature. For example, recently developed complex statistical methods (e.g., growth curve modeling; survival analysis) facilitate the modeling and testing of both idiothetic (individual) and nomothetic (group) trajectories over time, while ecological momentary assessment methods and narrative approaches also allow for the investigation of complex dynamic processes over time. Clearly, the time has passed when statistics were only able to model simple linear, unidirectional relationships that were quite foreign to psychoanalytic assumptions concerning complex and recursive cause and effect relationships.

Furthermore, it is now common to assume that any type of research involves interpretation and meaning, just as any type of research should include a process of systematic testing and falsification. The criticism that quantitative research neglects meaning and interpretation is clearly incorrect because the entire research cycle is permeated with interpretations made by investigators. And research over the last several decades has dramatically improved our appreciation of the importance of processes involving the construction of meaning (Luyten et al., 2006; in press). Similarly, research that does not include a process of systematic testing of alternative hypotheses can result in self-fulfilling prophecies and pseudo-science. Furthermore, idiothetic and nomothetic approaches should also not be seen as opposite but as complementary approaches. Much is to be gained from testing nomothetic findings at the idiographic level and vice versa (Ablon and Jones, 2005; Hauser et al., 2006). Such an exchange can only lead to better theories, to a fuller understanding of individual patients, and thus resulting in gains for all involved. In particular, “master narratives” identified in nomothetic research can be further refined and qualified in idiographic research, and subsequently re-evaluated in group designs. Several methods have already been developed in this area (Ablon and Jones, 2005; Josephs et al., 2004), and provide the means by which both researchers and clinicians might collaborate in efforts to bridge the gap between the two cultures within psychoanalysis.

In addition, and perhaps most importantly, the ethics of psychoanalysis clearly imply that our knowledge and interventions should be based on clinical experiences as well as systematic scientific knowledge derived from the study of human nature. The sources of these insights, whether from the study of individual cases or, for instance, wide-ranging genetic research, are to a large extent irrelevant as Freud (1926) already pointed out. It is the knowledge that counts, not where it comes from.

There is yet another important reason why the interpretative and (neo)positivistic cultures within psychoanalysis are complementary, as each culture provides the basis for bridging the gap between psychoanalysis and other disciplines. The interpretative culture provides a bridge with the humanities, which have always played an important role in psychoanalytic thought. The neopositivistic culture provides an important link with the natural sciences, a link which was emphasized by Freud and others within the psychoanalytic movement, but which has remained controversial. We now live in an epoch in which the neurosciences are increasingly moving into the study of the relational brain, considering the brain...
as experience-expectant, focusing upon gene–environment transactions involving the study of the impact of early childhood adversity on vulnerability and resilience, and the link between life history and the development of both somatic and psychiatric disorders (Luyten & Blatt, 2007; Luyten et al., in press). Psychoanalysis might play an important role in developing this new neuroscience provided the response is not one of orthodoxy or self-sufficiency. As Fonagy (2003, p. 220) argued: “The mind remains the mind whether it is on the couch or in the laboratory,” and these new developments in the longitudinal investigation of transactions among genetic, biological, psychological and environmental factors now promise to lead to a more comprehensive model of the functioning of the human mind based on longitudinal multidisciplinary studies of which Freud could have only dreamt (and of which he probably did).

**How should we close the gap?**

Before tackling the question how the current divide within psychoanalysis can be bridged, we have to examine the reasons why this gap exists. As noted, we are arguing that both cultures can make legitimate contributions. Whereas the interpretative culture of the psychoanalytic community is mainly concerned that the recent increase in empirical research on psychoanalytic concepts risks creating an empirical one-sidedness driven by the externally imposed need for empirical research in the context of managed care, the neopositivistic culture is mainly concerned that not engaging in systematic empirical research can lead to intellectual isolation, stagnation, and orthodoxy. Both concerns are fully legitimate. Thus, the future lies in taking these concerns into account, which also necessitates considering the many personal, social, and economical forces that continue to reinforce the current divide.

First, as psychoanalysts, we need to be aware of the psychological forces that maintain this divide. In this respect, both idealization and denigration can be observed in how the two cultures describe each other and interact. Another personal factor that may be involved is the prospect of having to give up cherished ideas, which may entail the fear that research will increasingly intrude upon well-established psychoanalytic traditions. And conversely, empirical investigators may fear that using methods other than quasi-experimental designs may lead to the loss of a still precarious respectability of psychoanalytic research as an empirical science within the scientific community.

Hence, this debate is not purely theoretical, but involves issues of power, politics and economics. Many practicing psychoanalysts not only have had little exposure to research in their training, but have built a professional identity around a model that emphasizes meaning, interpretation, the study of individual cases, and supervision as methods of scientific inquiry. Moreover, they may feel threatened by a managed care system that does not fully appreciate the complexities of clinical reality.

The only way to bridge the current divide is to try to bring the two cultures together by facilitating exchange in a number of ways so that proponents of both cultures may begin to respect each other, recognize the legitimacy of each other’s concerns, and subsequently discuss the future of psychoanalytic research. We believe that much more is to be gained from dialogue than from opposition, and from complementarity rather than conflict. Although these goals might sound difficult to reach in the near future, there are a number of initiatives that may facilitate such process:

One of the best ways to reduce the current divide is to include research experience in psychoanalytic training. Much of the resistance within psychoanalysis against research rests on unfamiliarity with the sophistication of current research efforts and what these findings may offer to practicing clinicians. Part of this process would also entail realizing the limitations of research findings, without considering these findings as totally irrelevant for clinical practice. Furthermore, this could lead to a totally different model of the relationship between research and clinical practice than the one that is currently espoused in many psychoanalytic institutes. Psychoanalytic institutes should critically study the rationale and value of other models of the relationship between research and clinical practice, such as the scientist-practitioner model, and adopt and/or adapt such models for their training programs. Ideally, this could lead to a new generation of psychoanalysts who are at least familiar with research methods and findings, and have the ability to critically evaluate the value of research findings. In this respect, much can be learned from experiences gained from the New Haven Psychoanalytic Research Training Program, which builds upon the model of the IPA–sponsored Research Training Program hosted by the University College London. Both highly successful research programs each year attract a diverse group of international scholars, many of them psychoanalytic candidates, interested in psychoanalytic research. More
efforts in this area, however, are needed.

Similarly, more room should be given in psychoanalytic conferences for research, and particularly presentations that involve discussions between researchers and clinicians, or discussions of the clinical implications of research findings. As most psychoanalytic researchers are also practicing clinicians, this should be easy to implement.

More funding of research by psychoanalytic organizations is needed. Many psychoanalytic researchers have difficulty finding funding for their research, and often are forced to resort to more “mainstream” research proposals to get funding. Although several psychoanalytic organizations, such as the American Psychoanalytic Association (APsaA) and the International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA), fund research, compared to other funding agencies, their financial possibilities are quite limited. A dramatic increase in research funding is therefore needed, to ensure that funding for specifically psychoanalytic research remains possible. And including practicing psychoanalysts familiar with research in funding committees could contribute to making psychoanalytic research more “clinician-friendly,” as is for example done by the IPA Empirical and Conceptual Research Committees, the IPA Research Advisory Board, and the APsaA Fund for Psychoanalytic Research. Likewise, establishing practice research networks consisting of both clinicians and researchers should contribute to closing the gap between the two cultures.

In sum, efforts are needed to develop and strengthen collaborations between the two cultures within psychoanalysis, i.e., to develop collaborative efforts between clinicians and researchers, between those embracing more qualitative and interpretive approaches and those favoring more quantitative methods, and between psychoanalytically trained scholars and researchers/clinicians belonging to other schools of thought. Ultimately, these efforts may lead to a different and probably more encompassing model of the relationship between science and practice as the one that is currently adopted within psychoanalysis.

CONCLUSION: WHEN SHOULD WE BRIDGE THE GAP?
Reconciliation between the two cultures within the psychoanalytic community is urgently needed in view of the external pressures threatening psychoanalysis and the current internal divide. Such reconciliation could end our isolation from each other within psychoanalysis as well as our “not-so-splendid isolation” from other branches of science (Fonagy, 2003). In our opinion, the stakes are high enough to warrant that psychoanalytic organizations take these issues seriously, and act upon them promptly and with strength and vigor.

REFERENCES
2009 MARKS THE 100-YEAR ANNIVERSARY of Freud's visit to America and the publication of two of his most famous case studies, Little Hans and the Rat Man. Since Freud's visit, psychoanalytic thought has been transformed not only by clinical experience in the consulting room, but also by the surrounding cultural milieu. We now have multiple psychoanalytic theories, sometimes spawning conflicts and debate amongst our ranks, yet united by an emphasis on the unconscious.

For the 2009 Spring Meeting, we invite you to ponder the beginnings of psychoanalysis, its current status and practice, and future applications in an ever-changing social context. During the meeting, we will explore the interplay between psychoanalytic practice and research. We also will apply psychoanalytic perspectives to understand and address contemporary social issues.

It thus seems fitting that we will meet in San Antonio, Texas, a city known for its rich multicultural heritage, Spanish missions, military presence, and the Alamo. Possible topics for presentation include the ways in which culture shapes inner realities and vice versa, psychoanalytic viewpoints about current social problems, constructed memory, and clinical applications of psychoanalytic theory. We also welcome proposals that take a cross-disciplinary approach to any of these topics.
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Psychoanalytic ethnography and filmmaking

Ricardo C. Ainslie, PhD, ABPP

I have long been interested in ways of taking our psychoanalytic work out of the consulting room and into communities. I started doing what I term psychoanalytic ethnography in 1987 when I first visited the small West Texas community of Anson. Although I used psychoanalytic concepts to help me understand what I saw and heard in Anson, two things in my view made this work psychoanalytic. One is that the character of the interviews I conducted with Anson’s white and Mexican-American residents, as I explored the social and cultural transformations that had changed their lives since the Civil Rights Era, was often deeply intimate. In fact, at times they were indistinguishable from the kinds of conversations I have with my patients in my office. Secondly, in some instances these conversations extended over the course of several years. In other words, I made every effort to approach this work with the same psychoanalytic sensibility that defines my clinical work, using it as a tool to engage and understand the lives of the people I was meeting on porches, sitting across from at kitchen tables and in domino halls, or while riding in pickup trucks down country roads.

Approximately ten years ago I started incorporating film into my ethnographic work, exploring such topics as the experience of school desegregation, the psychology of immigration, a country on the brink of lawlessness, and the impact of war on combatants. The conversations with the people whose lives these films address have often also been quite emotionally intense and are not far removed from therapeutic conversations we might have in our consulting rooms. I have completed three films to date; and I am working on two more.

My first exploration of this medium was for a project on the impact of school desegregation on a small Texas community whose 3000 or so residents were almost equally divided between whites and African Americans. I completed “Crossover: A Story of Desegregation” in the fall of 1997. Prior to this project I’d had no background in film whatsoever, but I had been passionate about documentaries for years, typically attending 15-18 screenings during the annual week long South by Southwest Film Festival in Austin, Texas, where I live. I used the meager grant funds I’d managed to land for this first project on two things: a good “shooter” and a good editor. My university department purchased a good, but far from top end, prosumer 3-chip digital camera (they run about $4,000) and I was up and running. The other necessary components for making a film are not that expensive, relatively speaking. The best editing software (if you are a Mac person) is Final Cut Pro-Studio and it can be purchased for less than $1,000 (and at half that price if you are affiliated with a university and can therefore get an educational discount). There are other things like microphones, booms, and tripods and these may be inexpensively rented for shoots. My entire budget for this first film (Total Running Time: 54 minutes) was less than $20,000. That’s very cheap when you consider what you have at the end of it.

To date, Crossover has been screened at more than 25 universities, psychoanalytic societies, conferences, and community events. It became the springboard for a collaborative project between Humanities Texas, The Texas Association of Developing Colleges, and the Texas African American Heritage Association to document personal narratives about the coming of school desegregation in Texas communities. Parallel and Crossover Lives: Texas Before and After Desegregation, became a pilot community oral history project funded through the “Extending the Reach” initiative of the National Endowment for the Humanities. This should tell you something about the power of this medium: it is extremely versatile and it can bring a broad range of viewers into contact with the issues that are of interest to you. The kind of discussion becomes framed by the context in which the film is screened and the ways I attempt to structure that discussion through my commentary.

My second film project was Looking North: Mexican Images of Immigration (TRT: 30 minutes). For this, I went to Mexico City and conducted random interviews with people from all walks of life, asking them, as a point of departure, whether they had friends, family, neighbors, or coworkers who had migrated to the United States. I was interested in trying to tap what Cornelius Castoriadis calls the Social Imaginary, that is, the universe of views that immigrants from Mexico might bring with them, as part of an unacknowledged, partly unconscious set of inner voices that shape their experience and their understanding of what they are doing. I was surprised when it turned out that of thirty interviews that I conducted, every single person (from taxi drivers, to factory workers, to policemen, to store clerks, to book collectors, to teachers) knew someone first-hand who had left for the United States. The stereotype that many have of the Mexican immigrant is that they are from rural, agricultural areas, and that they have little formal education. Research from the Pew Hispanic Center, however, indicates...

“Working . . . in communities where I have explored the ways in which social and cultural experience resides in the emotional lives of the people I interview has made me keenly aware of the power of these elements in the lives of my patients as well.”
articles

otherwise. Nearly a quarter of Mexican immigrants have at least some college, and increasingly they come from urban areas. I’ve used this film to give workshops for people working on the front lines with immigrants (police departments, social service agencies, NGOs, school districts) to help them understand the psychology of the immigrant experience. I’ve also used this film for presentations at conferences, such as the International Borders Conference in El Paso, Texas, The APA’s “Expert Conference on Immigration” in San Antonio; and the Center for Mexican American Studies here at the University of Texas where I teach. The total budget for this film was under $15,000.

In 2007 I completed a feature length film (TRT: 74 minutes) on Mexico’s crisis of security, focusing on the wave of kidnapping that has swept through the country over the last decade (Mexico, along with Colombia and Russia, is one of the countries with the highest incidence of kidnapping in the world, not counting Iraq, which is a special case). Many consider Mexico to be at a crossroads, on the verge of what some have termed the “Cubanization” of the country given the growing power and corrosive influence of drug cartels. For this film I interviewed numerous individuals who had been kidnapped, as well as Mexican experts—academics, journalists, and government people. The budget for this film was approximately $150,000.

I am currently working on two new projects. Coming Home began as an exploration of the lives of Vietnam War veterans suffering from PTSD, but I have now decided to include veterans from a variety of wars, including World War II, Korea, Afghanistan and Iraq. In this film I’m exploring the toll that war takes on those we send to fight on our behalf. How does the experience of war continue to live in their minds? The second film is on the mystery of human consciousness for which I’m interviewing neuroscientists.

How this work has in turn affected my clinical work is hard to say. Film requires one to think visually, to imagine what things are going to look like, or what kinds of material can be presented to convey the stories one is trying to tell. Perhaps I am more inclined to think of my patients’ lives in visual terms as well, although I think all empathy and understanding requires this kind of representation. Typically, we haven’t seen the spaces where our patients’ lives unfold, but we imagine them just the same. The ethnographic elements of my work also make me more curious about my patients’ lives from a social and cultural perspective. Working on these projects, out in communities where I have explored the ways in which social and cultural experience resides in the emotional lives of the people I interview has made me keenly aware of the power of these elements in the lives of my patients as well.
Psychoanalysts deal in metaphor. In both our clinical exchanges and our theoretical formulations we talk about one thing by referring to another. Of course, we are not alone. The use of metaphor probably goes back to the beginning of human thought. Relatively recent examples are found in poetry four thousand years old, in Egyptian poetry, and in the epic of Gilgamesh. There is serious opinion that the cave paintings of Lascaux, some 30,000 years old, are visual metaphors. The awareness of, and study of, the use of metaphor as a trope, or formal rhetorical device, is a classical pursuit going back at least to Aristotle.

I. A. Richards (1935) has provided the received modern analysis of metaphor: there is a vehicle that carries a tenor; or meaning. When one refers to King Richard as “The Lion Hearted,” (to use Richards’ example) “lion hearted” is the vehicle, “courage” is the tenor. A metaphor carries a meaning. The difference between lions and men is important too, creating a tension and a resonance with other meanings that give power and beauty to the rhetorical device.

But as psychoanalysts we know that thought doesn’t necessarily work in such an orderly way. We know that a metaphor is less a carrying than a pointing at (see Seiden 2004a, 2004b), and that the pointing is often vague, foggy, ill defined or unconsciously driven. As Freud showed us, the true tenor (what’s being pointed at) can be unconscious. The relationship between vehicle and tenor can be muddled. When a child who knows his mother is angry says “my mother is going to kill me,” is “kill” only the vehicle—or the unconscious tenor?

These complexities shed some light on an interesting poem by recent Poet Laureate of the United States, Robert Hass. In “Heroic Simile” (1978) he turns metaphorical orderliness on its head with an associative, postmodern playfulness. (His title indicates that his subject is simile—a simile, you will remember, is a metaphor stated literally, a direct comparison insisting that one thing is “like” another: for example, “Richard is like a lion” or “his heart is like a lion’s heart.”)

**Heroic Simile**

When the swordsman fell in Kurosawa’s Seven Samurai in the gray rain, in Cinemascope and the Tokugawa dynasty, he fell straight as a pine, he fell

---

1 (From *Praise*, Copyright © 1978 by Robert Hass. Reprinted by permission of HarperCollins Publishers. All rights reserved.)
fallen tree becomes the concern of the poem—or seems to. Then the concern is the woodcutters. Or is it? Is the subject fallen heroes or woodcutters? Is the setting 20th Century cinema or the medieval Japanese forest, or is it ancient Greek myth? The associative shifts are disorienting. Everything, it seems, is metaphor! Everything is vehicle—and if that’s so, is there no tenor? Is everything we think about only a way of thinking about something else? It’s characteristic of postmodern sensibility to find that there’s no bedrock—here or anywhere. Or so it would seem.

But then one discovers that there is something familiar—intimately and accurately so—going on in “Heroic Simile.” This is indeed the way we float along inside our private musings. And as we give ourselves over to the poem, the floating sensation becomes a pleasure. The dizziness gives way to lightness and to the recognition of a sweet truth. One realizes by the time one finishes reading the last few lines that the subject here is consciousness itself. This is a poem about imagination, its power and its limits. Like the woodcutters, we’re rich if we’re already rich.

And like the woodcutters, we’re stuck with what we’ve got. And like the man and woman, we’re stuck in the loneliness of our “separate fidelities.” Our dead and dying heroes leave us more lonely still. Although even this aperçu gets a “yes” and a “no!” A good poem, the poem reminds us, makes it possible, however briefly, to break through the prison of aloneness. And of course we look to our lesser heroes, our loved ones and our analysts, to help with that too.
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Children on the autistic spectrum like Ryan wish to express themselves to others. The casual observer would never know it because of the kids’ willful silence or their apparently meaningless chatter. Many children with autistic spectrum disorder have made a pact with themselves to avoid engaging in conversation despite their longings for human company. Yet they enjoy talking about their special interests, as they try to capture the attention of their parents and friends in a discussion, for example, about reptiles. In spite of themselves they rise above their linguistic insecurities. Ryan’s parents indulged his interest in animals because they saw that he attended to an aspect of the real world.

Even as a much loved child, young Ryan tended to withdraw from the social world. He was sensitive to sound and touch. He was intolerant of the unexpected and developed an obsessive dependence on family routines. The family pediatrician noticed Ryan’s withdrawn nature when he was less than a year old but didn’t suspect a developing autistic disorder for another six months. By then, Ryan was communicating fairly regularly by pointing to desired objects or toys and using the single words, “no,” “stop,” or “move ‘way” (move away). He’d often accompany his speech by flinging his arms around and grimacing ominously. When he suddenly stopped speaking altogether, the family doctor told Ryan’s parents that their son needed to be closely watched for other signs of autism. His parents thought that nursery school would afford Ryan an important social experience. He would be surrounded by talking children and might regain the speech he lost a year earlier. Ryan’s parents brought him to see me for consultation.

Ryan adapted well to nursery school, especially to his teacher, a young, vibrant woman who exuded genuine affection for the young students. She fashioned a structured classroom with interesting projects laid out for the children as they entered the classroom, letting them choose their activity tables—except for Ryan, who had to be led gently but firmly to one of the tables and shown how to color geometric shapes or start a puzzle. He quickly understood puzzles and became the puzzle ace of the class. He noticed a gerbil in a cage on a table in the back of the classroom. Curious, he went to quietly observe its behavior. Later that day, he asked his mom if he could take his pet gecko to school to show to his teacher and friends. His mom agreed and everyone was duly impressed with Ryan’s pet.

The next day Ryan brought his gecko to my office. He introduced me to his pet, saying, “Love me, love my gecko!” The gecko slithered out of Ryan’s hands and began to climb the redwood walls of my office. “Don’t worry!” said Ryan. “He knows his name. If I call ‘Benny,’ he will come right down, into my hands.” “Okay,” I said doubtfully. “Benny,” shouted Ryan and down came the gecko, landing with a thud in Ryan’s open hands! Amazed, I said to Ryan, “You sure know how to take care of your pet!”

Ryan began to act more like a kid with Asperger’s Syndrome, so I questioned the doctor’s original diagnosis of autism. The more he interacted with people—his parents and his peers—and the more he talked with me about his gecko, the more I believed I could help him adapt to the social world. Young children develop rapidly and Ryan flourished as everyone acknowledged his love for his precious gecko. The gecko had become an extension of Ryan’s identity. “Love my gecko, love me!” might have been the boy’s sub rosa communication.

Ryan knew that his parents accepted his pet, even loved the gecko as he did. So he assumed that his friends would feel the same about Benny. Ryan took Benny to school, and his classmates gathered around to watch the gecko in its cage. “Let it out!” shouted one of his friends. Ryan carefully removed his gecko from its enclosure and held it gently in his hands, rubbing its back affectionately, lest it jump away and climb the classroom walls. One of his friends asked to hold Benny and Ryan instructed him how to handle his pet. Ryan carefully transferred the gecko from his hands to his friend’s and there Benny rested motionlessly for a few minutes. The minute the gecko got agitated, Ryan said, “Uh oh, you better give him back to me or else he’ll run up the walls again.”

Several kids said in unison, “Ryan, please bring Benny to school tomorrow.” “I’ll have to ask him if he wants to come,” joked Ryan. Ryan had not only learned a great deal about geckos but he also learned to share his pet with his friends. Benny literally became a bridge between the boy and his classmates, and Ryan finished the school year with several new playmates. His parents were enormously pleased and no longer needed parent conferences with their son’s teacher on how to help Ryan socialize more comfortably. At the conclusion of Ryan’s psychotherapy, I believed his pet had played as significant a part in his recovery as had I!
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Commentators have long bemoaned the fate of psychoanalysis in American universities. Undergraduate psychology departments, largely staffed by experimental psychologists, have mostly taught negative caricatures of psychoanalysis, suggesting that psychoanalysis has little empirical support. Bornstein (2005) has noted that personality and social psychologists have been busily rediscovering and empirically testing many psychoanalytic ideas but those ideas have been relabeled with new technical terms without reference to Freud’s seminal work. Few undergraduates would appreciate that Bowlby was a psychoanalyst highly influenced by the work of Melanie Klein when he developed attachment theory.

Psychoanalytic education in doctoral programs in clinical psychology has also progressively declined with the rise of cognitive behavioral approaches and the emphasis on evidence based treatment. There was a time when there were quite a few prestigious psychodynamically oriented doctoral programs in clinical psychology but one by one the psychodynamic influence in those programs has been diminished or eliminated entirely. Thus we have a situation with fewer and fewer psychoanalytically well-informed students seeking training in psychodynamically oriented clinical programs and fewer and fewer of such programs remaining in existence to which to apply.

Psychoanalytic education in a university setting must face the challenge of teaching three types of students: 1) Students who are sympathetic to and well informed about psychoanalytic ideas, 2) Students uninformed about analytic ideas with few preconceived notions, and 3) Highly skeptical students with strong negative stereotypes about psychoanalysis. This is a particularly daunting challenge when a teacher is faced with all three types of students in a single class.

Another challenge of psychoanalytic education relates to the special requirements of enabling students to grasp psychoanalytic ideas that ultimately derive from a deep immersion in the clinical situation, regardless of whether those ideas have found empirical support outside of the clinical situation. At the level of the independent psychoanalytic institute, the guiding assumption has always been that to really learn psychoanalysis one must immerse oneself in the tripartite model of at least four years worth of courses on psychoanalytic theory, intensive training analysis, and intensive supervised control cases. How then, one might ask, can psychoanalytic education be approached at undergraduate or graduate levels in a university setting in which students might be exposed to no more than a single survey course reading secondary sources on psychodynamic approaches to psychotherapy or object relations theory or more likely as just one approach to personality, psychopathology, and psychotherapy among many in an even broader survey course on those topics? Even if psychoanalysis is presented sympathetically and accurately in a survey course might not the presentation be so cursory as to preclude students from fully appreciating its personal and/or clinical relevance. What level of immersion and depth of understanding is necessary for an adequate psychoanalytic education in a university setting? Do students need to read primary sources (i.e., Freud, Klein, Sullivan, etc.) and is a basic grounding in Freud necessary to fully appreciate what is “beyond” Freud? Must there be empirical support for a psychoanalytic idea for that idea to be taught as worthy of serious consideration or might there be more experience near rationales (i.e., personal or clinical applicability) and/or hermeneutic rationales (i.e., psychoanalysis applied to interpreting cultural products) that justify teaching psychoanalytic ideas in a university context?

For over the last twenty years I have been fortunate to teach both doctoral students in clinical psychology and undergraduates at Adelphi University, presumably one of the last remaining bastions of psychodynamic psychology. So I will share some thoughts about my experiences teaching these two groups of students. To motivate doctoral faculty to teach undergraduates a former dean generated an undergraduate course in psychoanalysis that all undergraduate psychology majors needed to take. The course has proven popular among majors in education, nursing, and social work as well those who need to take some courses outside of their major. Quite a few sections of psychoanalysis need to be taught every year. Exposure at this level is invariably a survey course taught to students who may never have heard of Sigmund Freud but who at least do not enter the class with that many negative stereotypes.

I spend half the course on Freud and half the course on what is “beyond” Freud using the well-known

“\textit{The challenge... with undergraduates is not so much to convince them that psychoanalytic ideas have scientific support but to convince them that psychoanalytic ideas are of sufficient personal relevance that they should care whether or not those ideas have empirical backing.}”
Mitchell and Black (1995) book to summarize what is beyond Freud. Drew Westen’s (1998, 2004) articles are invaluable summaries of much of the research that supports basic psychodynamic concepts that also question current approaches to evidence based treatment. Object relations theory can be supported by the attachment research, the mother/infant affective communication research, and children’s theory of mind research. The challenge, though, with undergraduates is not so much to convince them that psychoanalytic ideas have scientific support but to convince them that psychoanalytic ideas are of sufficient personal relevance that they should care whether or not those ideas have empirical backing. To that end I have developed a number of strategies of trying to make psychoanalytic concepts personally meaningful to undergraduates.

I teach the Oedipal conflict by trying to get students to discuss issues like love triangles, infidelity, romantic jealousy, Madonna/whore conflicts, Dad/Cad conflicts, and splitting love and lust in their current love lives. Then I try to get them to reflect on the developmental antecedents of such conflicts by trying to recall the first time they had a romantic crush on someone. Usually, quite a few students will recall romantic crushes from nursery school. Though students may still find the idea of universal incestuous wishes farfetched, remembering their childhood crushes makes it less farfetched for them to appreciate that romantic interest begins quite early in life and that adult love life is rife with the inner conflicts associated with love triangles. Students who baby sit, change diapers, or work in nursery schools may report observing childhood masturbation and temper tantrums so that it becomes plausible that children may be motivated by sexual and aggressive urges.

I have found a way to make Freud’s dream theory come alive. I have students keep a dream journal and interpret one of their own dreams using Freud’s approach to dream interpretation. Initially, I found that students were interpreting the symbolic meaning of their dreams at a pretty superficial level. Then I suggested that the difference between an A and an A+ on the assignment would be to interpret the forbidden wish; but that they shouldn’t feel compelled to reveal anything too embarrassing or personal. Soon enough, I started having to give almost everyone an A+ on the assignment, as students were more than eager to admit to forbidden wishes to obtain a better grade! Their dream interpretations became much deeper and students started reporting that the assignment had overcome much of their initial skepticism. Here is an example of the sort of work I often get: A student who works after school at a country club where she feels mistreated remembered a dream in which she was required to clean up a toilet that had overflowed at the country club. She interpreted the forbidden wish as wanting to turn the country club into a “shit hole” as payback for mistreating her.

I try to help students see how the “face duets” and proto-conversations that transpire between mother and infant at three months of life are still part of the way adults communicate with each other. I have students do an assignment in which they try to make naturalistic observations of adult flirting and courtship behavior. They might report going to a noisy club where they can’t hear a thing but can accurately assess the progression of a romantic encounter from the nonverbal communication alone. These two assignments enable students to examine unconscious processes firsthand, whether it is discovering the latent content of a dream or attuning themselves to the subtleties of nonverbal communication.

Fortunately, at the doctoral level at Adelphi we are able to go beyond survey courses based on secondary sources and allow for a deeper immersion in primary sources. We start the first semester first year with a course on Freud, primarily reading Freud’s classic papers. The idea is not so much to make anybody Freudian but to start everyone off with grounding in the basic psychodynamic concepts first articulated by Freud such as unconscious processes, inner conflict, defense mechanisms, etc. In the first year we have a yearlong sequence on psychological testing, including Rorschach, TAT, and psychodynamic interpretation of the WAIS. Writing psychodynamic formulations on a dozen test batteries certainly trains you to think analytically about patients prior to seeing one’s first psychotherapy patient. We also get first year students involved in doing clinical intake in which they are also expected to come up with dynamic formulations as well as diagnostic impressions.

Since Adelphi is known for being analytically oriented, we often get students who already possess a fair degree of psychoanalytic sophistication. But that is not always or even usually the case. The early immersion in primary sources and clinical training requiring dynamic thought prior to doing psychotherapy usually means that by the third year of training that the novices catch up to the more sophisticated students so that you couldn’t tell the difference between the two groups. Adelphi has always had on its faculty a group of prominent psychodynamically oriented researchers such as Morris Eagle, George Stricker, Wilma Bucci, Bob Bornstein, Joel Weinberger, and Mark Hilsenroth. So students have the opportunity to learn the extent to which psychoanalytic ideas have been empirically supported and to engage in various types of psychoanalytic research themselves.

This strong research presence has also inspired more theoretical/clinical types like myself to try my hand at more empirically oriented work. Recently, my colleagues and I were able to use mind set priming to experimentally activate primal scene fantasies in order to test some of my
ideas about infidelity and the Oedipal conflict (Josephs, 2006). Men who are rated as high narcissists usually possess more permissive attitudes towards infidelity than do women low narcissists. In this study, we were able to induce “high narcissist” men to have equally prohibitive attitudes towards infidelity as women and low narcissists, presumably by facilitating identification with the victim of Oedipal betrayal trauma. (see Hunyady, Josephs, & Jost, in press, online version published 10/22/07). To our surprise we also discovered from our demographic questionnaire that over 20% of our subject pool of Adelphi undergraduates reported awareness of parental cheating and self-report of parental cheating predicted the likelihood of cheating or being cheated on oneself. Thus students have opportunities to co-author and publish original psychoanalytically oriented research and scholarship in top journals in clinical psychology, social psychology, and psychoanalysis.

I appreciate that Adelphi’s situation is becoming increasingly unique. The apparently declining numbers of psychoanalytic educators who work in university settings more frequently have to make the best of a bad situation. Psychoanalytic educators are increasingly faced with having to teach highly skeptical students with strongly held negative stereotypes about psychoanalysis in the context of a survey course using secondary sources. Psychoanalytic educators are feeling compelled to focus their efforts on proving that psychoanalysis is scientific to overcome the skepticism of students who have acquired a somewhat narrow view of science and of evidence based practice. The kind of intensive training that centers on immersion in reading primary sources and in training practicum that make psychoanalytic ideas come alive through firsthand experience is becoming increasingly difficult to justify and implement.

Perhaps we need to gather empirical support to prove that students’ clinical work benefits from a deep immersion in psychoanalytic thought that is made personally meaningful through intensive clinical experiences to convince university administrators and program directors that there is enduring value in a certain sort of training that seems to be becoming a thing of the past. Certainly, when Adelphi doctoral students do very well obtaining internships, those internships seem to believe that the students have been well prepared for the demands of contemporary clinical work. We have not trained psychoanalysts who will simply enter the private practice of psychoanalysis with high-level affluent patients once they are licensed, although many Adelphi grads do obtain postdoctoral analytic training and do open private practices. We are training scientifically well-informed practitioners who have good relationship skills, good emotion regulation skills, and who can mentalize utilizing a sophisticated theory of mind when they are working

with patients with complex problems from highly varied backgrounds in highly varied clinical settings.
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We are roughly midway through the presidential season and healthcare reform is in the air once again, just as in 1992 and the early years of the Coalition. That was a much more hopeful time or perhaps a more naïve time. Once again, candidates are putting forward their plans to reform, and expand access to, healthcare. The challenges facing us today are at least the same as they were when the National Coalition of Mental Health Professional and Consumers was founded. This article is offered as a way to remind Division 39 members where we are as an organization and where we as professionals and consumers are in the struggle to preserve privacy, quality, access and choice in mental health and substance abuse care.

What have we accomplished?

Many Division members know what we accomplished in the early years of opposition to managed care intrusions into health care. The National Coalition educated, alerted and energized many of us to fight for our profession and our craft. We were (and are) the only mental health organization that speaks to the needs of both professionals and consumers and we had a powerful impact on our professional associations. Sometimes subtle, sometimes strident, our voices were heard in our professional groups. The American Psychological Association, for example, had to shelve plans to set up a Division of Managed Care.

Over the last two decades, our professional organizations have come closer to recognizing the importance of the core values of the National Coalition. The American Psychoanalytic Association (APsaA) has been particularly supportive and was a major supporter of the lawsuit against implementation of the HIPAA privacy rules. The Coalition continues to be an active member of the Mental Health Liaison Group (MHLG), an association of all major mental health organizations that tracks legislation affecting mental health treatment and funding.

Although our efforts have resulted in mixed success, our organization is the only one, to my mind, that consistently addresses issues of privacy and confidentiality in mental health treatment. Almost without exception, our professional groups are willing to compromise on this issue. As noted above, only the American Psychoanalytic supported the lawsuit against HIPAA regulations. The American Psychological Association reviewed the lawsuit and refused to join, calculating that the lawsuit would fail and would only alienate the Republican majority in Congress. When asked about this failure to protect privacy, Russ Newman (of APA’s Practice Directorate) assured us (during a Division 39 Board Meeting in Toronto) that privacy protections in the individual states would continue to “trump” HIPAA disclosure rules. He offered this assurance even as the Oregon and other legislatures prepared to align their privacy protection legislation with HIPAA. The “floor” of privacy protection has tended to become the “ceiling.” The American Psychiatric did issue a position paper that was quite helpful in emphasizing the privacy of psychotherapist’s notes, but declined to support the lawsuit that was intended to support full guarantees for privacy for all citizens. The irony of HIPAA is that it has actually strengthened psychotherapist’s protection against disclosure of progress notes, for example, while vastly weakening patient privacy.

Our professional organizations have been reluctant to challenge health information technology (HIT) laws meant to set up nationwide databases for health records, falling in line with the idea that these systems can somehow be made secure and holding out only for “guarantees” of security, when the only guarantee of security would be to have each citizen give permission to have records placed in such a database. While it is hard to accurately assess the Coalition’s impact, I do find that APA and other organizations have at least become more sensitive to the issues of privacy over the last few years (after bowing down to HIPAA). MHLG did issue an alert to member organizations to protest the Health Insurance Marketplace Modernization and Affordability (HIMMA) law, which was defeated and has continued to oppose current HIT legislation.

What have we learned?

I think the most important thing we have learned is to focus much more narrowly on what is truly at stake. In the early years of the National Coalition, our efforts were often directed toward all mental health professionals, and indeed, all healthcare professionals and consumers. We viewed the assaults of managed care as raining down equally on us all; and in many ways this was, and is, correct. Over the years, however, it is clear that there remains a significant difference between medicine, broadly conceived, and psychotherapy and psychosocial treatments. For reasons too complicated to address here, professionals who focus on physical treatment, that is
drugs and surgery, have a fundamentally different position in the healthcare system and remain far less vulnerable to managed care than psychotherapists and others who focus on psychotherapeutic and psychosocial treatments.

The National Coalition certainly welcomes the support of other professional and grassroots organizations and seeks ways to align our organization with them. Dave Byrom, chair of our Liaison Committee (as well as former president), has been tireless in reaching out to healthcare activists in New York as well as across the country and has been a powerful voice for mental health care in these groups, frequently overlooking or even dismissing the need to incorporate mental health treatment as a core part of healthcare reform. His role, however, is often an educative one, keeping mental health treatment “on the table.”

Our professional organizations have tended to be more concerned with guild concerns that other professions might want to “poach” on their turf; or in the case of APA, wanting to “poach” on psychiatry’s turf by expanding prescription privileges to psychologists. The Coalition remains focused on the need to protect all psychotherapists and the right of consumers to seek out any psychotherapist who offers privacy, choice, access, and quality in mental health treatment. This has resulted in our strategic alliance with American Mental Health Alliance (AMHA) and other groups that promote self-pay and other ideas for supporting independent practice of psychotherapy.

Another major thing we have learned is that it is damned hard to come to any consensus on the one best way to pay for mental health treatment. From the beginning, our organization refused to endorse any specific plans for healthcare reform for two important reasons. First of all, we found that there was no plan being proposed that came close to incorporating the four principles of our organization. Although our founder, Karen Shore, and board member Kathie Rudy both developed model plans (available on our web site, www.thenationalcoalition.org), and former board member Ivan Miller has a recent book, *Balanced Choice*, detailing his ideas (reviewed in this newsletter, Spring 2007, pp. 30-32), we have yet to see a plan proposed by a political party or healthcare advocacy group that fully incorporates our core principles. These principles have recently been restated and worked into a model document called *Essential Elements of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Care* (see *Psychologist-Psychoanalyst* Fall 2007, pp. 33-32), which is also available on our web site. We have planned to use this document as a “template” to review the healthcare plans of the presidential candidates, although one problem at this stage is that their plans, however ambitious, tend to be rather short on details, making it difficult to directly compare and contrast their plans based on our core principles. More on this later.

Secondly, the National Coalition has been made up from the beginning both with those who strongly favored government funding as well as those who strongly critiqued any third-party involvement as a threat to our core principles. Their thoroughgoing critiques of third-party reimbursement has been an important contribution of the Coalition to the healthcare debate. For me, if not for most of us, before managed care came to town, insurance and insurance reimbursement were seen more or less as a simple affair and the only task for a clinician was to have access to patients with the “good insurance;” and the main task for our professional organizations was to promote their profession’s right to access insurance reimbursement (and to keep other professions locked out of same). As managed care made inroads into our communities and practices, our main goal was to get back to where we were.

This is where many of our board members in the Coalition served an important role in educating us about the role of third-party reimbursement and the impact any such arrangement has on the therapeutic relationship. Already noted above were Karen Shore and Kathie Rudy’s ideas on “fixing” insurance plans. Peter Gumpert’s proposals with the establishment of the AMHA was another set of valuable ideas about how to structure the clinician’s relationship with insurance reimbursement. Of course there were always psychotherapists who refused third-party reimbursement, insisting that the patient had to deal directly with his/her insurance company rather than involve the therapist in the arrangement.

Ivan Miller and current Coalition vice-president Michaele Dunlap have provided important alternative voices within the Coalition, addressing the questions of entrepreneurship and patient self-pay as a model for practice and practice development. AMHA is the national organization that best represents this model and asks psychotherapists to see their work and craft as one that is best developed and promoted in a collegial association of like-minded clinicians who offer affordable services with little or no third-party involvement. This model is
the only one so far that does meet the core principles of the Coalition, since it is only by jettisoning third-party involvement that patients can be assured that their privacy, access, and choice is guaranteed. This model obviously leaves out many who cannot afford psychotherapy services, but the important challenge of this model is to unrealistic assumptions, often shared by patients (and therapists), that someone else should pay, just as someone else is to blame for their problems. Many years ago, the chief psychiatrist at a local psychiatric hospital would lecture patients before leaving the hospital on their need to continue individual therapy, insisting that quality psychotherapy was at least worth the price of a good car and that a good car cost $10,000 (this was many years ago!) and two years of therapy would not cost that much.

Another important thing we have learned is to stay open-minded about who are our friends and who are our enemies. We have found, for example, that libertarian and conservative members of Congress are far more likely to be on our side on issues of privacy and that liberal and progressive politicians have tended to look favorably on programs such as TeenScreen and HIT legislation that seriously compromise privacy. These proposals are often touted by Democrats and Republicans as promoting mental healthcare (in the case of TeenScreen) or allowing healthcare information to be rapidly and economically shared among professionals, overlooking that fact that patient privacy is given up without consent, and in the case of TeenScreen, teenagers are interviewed and given information about their need for medication for depression without parental consent.

Where are we going?
Our organization continues to be seen as valuable and important by many professional and grassroots organizations. Through our liaison work and our clear message, the Coalition does have an impact on policy development and position statements. We have recently had more active involvement from members and colleagues on NCTalk, the Coalition list. It is encouraging that members are bringing issues, questions and energy to bear on important questions of mental health and substance abuse treatment. We plan to track the healthcare reform debate as the presidential campaigns heat up. Perhaps there will even be real debates on this issue. More realistically, we hope to use the “Essentials” document to educate our political leaders and to encourage our members and colleagues to distribute this document widely as a way to promote a consensus in the mental health community on the need for privacy, quality, access and choice in mental health and substance abuse treatment.

Please contribute to the work of the National Coalition by joining us in this important fight to protect psychotherapy. Applications are on our web site or contact Kathleen at 888-729-6662 to have membership materials sent directly to you.
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Contemporary perspectives on the unconscious vary widely in scope and content, from displacing the dynamic unconscious altogether, to appealing to neuroscience, to favoring postmodern sensibilities that subordinate psychical processes to language. Donnel Stern and Philip Bromberg are two such proponents of these redirective shifts in contemporary thought; and the force of their ideas have arguably reshaped the way many contemporary analysts have come to conceive of mental processes. However rich in clinical utility, these theoretical postulates are not without serious conceptual omissions, particularly when raising the question of selfhood, agency, and unconscious enactments. In what follows, I will attempt to offer an adumbrated meditation on the philosophical implications of their claims with the hope that this may lead to a spirited dialogue between advocates of a dissociative model of mind and those who privilege a dynamic unconscious.

Both Stern and Bromberg have enjoyed theoretical prominence within contemporary psychoanalysis by questioning the presupposed dominion of the unconscious over the puissance of consciousness and language. One cannot ignore in good faith how Herculean, causally efficacious, and advantageous conscious experience, especially the role of language, has on psychological organization and development, which of course transpires within the contours of our familial attachments and cultural ontology. Notwithstanding, there appears to be a predilection among some theorists to construct a false dichotomy between these categories when both stand in relation to their dialectical, hence symmetrical, counterparts. Yet for others, there is a tendency to collapse one category into the other, thereby erasing any distinction between the two realms or orders. One such proponent is Don Stern. As I understand him (1987), unconscious experience is only that which was introduced in some fashion through consciousness yet actively interrupted, suspended, unattended to, blocked and/or avoided, hence left unformulated, whether this be material semiotically encoded and sequestered on parallel levels of distributive processing, defensive constellations designed to protect the subject from psychic threat, the pure (formal) realm of potentiality, or as prereflective non-propositional thought lacking attention, self-conscious awareness, or mnemonic potency. In the end, Stern seems to equate unconscious experience with anything that is linguistically unarticulated and lacks “clarity and differentiation” (p. 37). This definition could equally apply to the most sophisticated forms of unconscious mental functioning or a simple act of conscious inattention.

Since Freud’s early departure from a dissociative model of consciousness for a repression model of unconscious process, psychoanalysis has been tacitly led to believe that dissociation and repression are mutually exclusive categories, when they are not. Contemporary theorists seize upon this assumption when advocating for dissociation as a better theory for understanding unconscious experience (see Howell, 2005) at the expense of retaining repression as a viable construct that aids clinical theory. The either/or false dichotomy that gets erected is that dissociation displaces the need for a repression model or that dissociation becomes subsumed or tantamount to repressive functions. Stern (1997) defines dissociation as “the avoidance of certain formulations of present experience, . . . [which is] a channel or current along which certain meanings can flow and others cannot. To dissociate is simply to restrict the interpretations one makes of experience. . .[or] a restriction on the experiences we allow ourselves to have” (p. 88). Here Stern equates this phenomenon with unconscious experience, but not in any dynamic way, that is, not in a way that an unconscious agency orchestrates, executes, sustains, or harbors. Dissociation from this definition is entirely possible through the operations of consciousness. There is no unconscious teleology, no unconscious ego directing such mental actions, no unconscious intentionality of any kind. “Formulations” or “interpretations” that are “avoided” or barred are simply linguistic processes that are either foreclosed or “restricted.” What Stern calls the unconscious is merely formed through the repudiation or absence of linguistic construction.

Stern’s focus on dissociation as both a defensive process as well as a benign passivity of inattention further parallels Bromberg’s work on the subject. What Stern calls “unformulated,” Bromberg (1998) calls “unsymbolized.” In fact, it is in the realm of “presymbolized experience” (Bromberg, 1998, p. 132) where dissociation transpires on unconscious levels of information processing that block
or abort the emergence of formulated conceptual thought due to danger associated with conceptual formulations that are too cognitively intense to bear. Like Freud’s repression censor, this implies an active banning or barring of consciousness, an aborting of the symbolization process altogether. Here Bromberg, underscores the centrality of trauma on psychic organization. Bromberg emphasizes the defensive and adaptive transformational capacities of dissociation, as well as the pathological. He specifically points toward how dissociation leads to self-hypnoidal and amnesic mental states, and how it becomes a normative and essential operation in the organization of personality. Of course, that which we are unaware of at any given moment becomes a form of unconsciousness even if our attention may be drawn to it. The question becomes how are these self-hypnoidal and amnesic states instituted if by definition we are unaware of our Self during such operations? More specifically, how is dissociation capable of lending order and organization to personality structure if by definition it is fractious and non-consolidatable?

What is not directly discussed by Stern or Bromberg is how unconscious agentic processes instantiate themselves as dissociative enactments. Presumably Stern would deny the unconscious any agency—or at least this is inferred from his text, while Bromberg would not. But these are not questions they directly entertain. It is not enough to confirm the ontic function of dissociation without explaining how it is made possible to begin with. What I have argued elsewhere is that unconscious experience as dissociability is derived from the basic dialectical processes that govern mental life, first and foremost constituted through unconscious agency, and more specifically the unconscious ego (Mills, 2002a). Dissociation is momentary fragmentation in self-continuity—itself a spacing—a split, fissure, or gap in being. From this standpoint, dissociation is the agentic expression and overdetermination of unconscious motivation as teleological intent.

In many ways, dissociation is a failure at representation—whether this be a failure to re-present visual images of events, such as traumas, affective resonance states, or somatic forces that persist as embodied unconscious memorializations. Such unconscious schemata may actively resist becoming recollected within conscious awareness when under the direction of defense and self-protective currents, or evade conceptual formulation or linguistic articulation in consciousness for a variety of reasons, defensively motivated or not. Moreover, dissociative content may have simply not been encoded due to adaptive and normatively benign aspects of inattention, detachment, or compartmentalization (Naso, 2007). But most importantly, dissociative processes must be directed by a mental agent executing such dynamic activity, and here I do not see this issue being directly addressed by many contemporary writers. Dissociability in its most elemental form is none other than the proclivity of the psyche to split or modify itself from its original simple unity as embodied apperceptive desire (Mills, 2002a), dividing itself into bits or pieces of self-experience through self-externalization, only then to re-gather and re-cover its self-division and externalization and incorporate itself back into its immediate self-constitution or internal structure; only to have the process repeat itself endlessly through an ongoing trajectory of dynamic pattern (see Mills, 2000b, for a review). In psychoanalysis, we have come to call this process projective identification.

My understanding of the unconscious is that it is process oriented, process driven, and process derived, what I have outlined in a theoretical system I have coined dialectical psychoanalysis or process psychology (Mills, 2000a, 2002b). Process psychology displaces the primacy of language over the unconscious, but it does not negate the value of signification. Instead, the unconscious incorporates the sign and builds a whole elaborate matrix of unconscious semiotics that conforms to its own laws and its own rules of signification fashioned by its own hands. The linguistic turn in psychoanalysis only partially accounts for unconscious dynamics, for the postmodern collapse of the subject and subjectivity in favor of the reification of language in my mind is misguided. What is fundamentally at stake is the ontological status of the unconscious.

Freud (1915) alerts us to the fact that the unconscious declares itself as discontinuities in consciousness, what I prefer to call spacings of the abyss. We know them as apertures, perforations, or lapses in experience, where time is momentarily eclipsed by the presencing of absence—a hole in being. Dissociation is only one such phenomena in our “gaps of experience,” what Stern (1987) refers to as “empty space” in the “beginning of life” (p. 60). But such empty space is full of non-being, of nothingness, hence no-thing is there, only experiential flow, appetitive pulsation—desire, a hovering over a clearing simultaneously exposed yet closed, open yet occlusive, the yawning gulf of the abyss. The abyss is never completely consolidated or unified, only discontiguous but unifying in its functions.

While many contemporary psychoanalytic theorists remain naive to formal metaphysics, various factions have also posed divided and contradictory notions on the nature and meaning of the self. What has generally been uncontested among several predominant postmodern positions—more specifically within the genre of Foucault, Deleuze, and Derrida—is the insistence that the autonomous self is a fiction. As Lacan (1977) puts it, the ego is an illusory misrecognition (mécognition)
of the Other. These convictions reify society, culture, and language, hence semiotics, which in turn define all discourse about selfhood, and thus causally determine any element of personal agency that we might attribute to an individuated subject. In other words, all aspects of personal subjectivity have been conditioned by cultural signifiers that subordinate the individual to the symbolic order of language operative within one’s social ontology. From this standpoint, there is no individual, hence no self. And what we may customarily call a “self” is really nothing other than a linguistic invention based on social construction.

On the other hand, when discourse on the self is given attention in the relational literature, the notion of the self has been theoretically altered from a singular unity to a multiplicity of selves. Popular among some relationalists today—most notably Bromberg, Mitchell, Harris, and Davies—is the belief that there is no singular unitary self; rather there are a multiplicity of selves that exist within each subject, which in turn are ultimately governed by an intersubjective or dyadic system that determines how multiplicity is instantiated to begin within. Bromberg (1998) is clear when he says “there is no such thing as an integrated self” (p. 186), instead there are “other” (p. 13), “many” (p. 311), or “several selves” (p. 256). It is one thing to argue that there are multiple ego-alterations or self-states that populate intrapsychic life due to the multiple operations of psychic modification (such as through the parameters of dissociation and defense), but it is quite another thing to say that each subject contains a conglomeration of multiple selves that may or may not be in touch with one another yet exist and act as independent nominal agents within a singular mind. Although I agree that self-states may be modified elements of original instantiations as previous expressions of mental processes that have undergone internal division, differentiation, and transmogrification—which may further be experientially realized as atemporal, non-unified, incongruent, dissociated, and/or alienated aspects of mind—it is unfathomable to me how one can view a singular subject as possessing multiple selves that coalesce as existent independent entities.

Multiplicity can be legitimately explained as a unique and particularized experiential activity within the mind that has potentially formed or acquired new organizations of self-experience and adaptation through defensive transformations of earlier or conflicted archaic processes in response to real or perceived threat, anxiety, and/or trauma; and this is substantiated time and again in clinical practice. But when you commit to the proposition of multiple entities within a singular subject, you have the messy burden of explaining how multiple entities could possibly exist within a singular embodied being whereby each entity inhabits the same body, perceptual apparatus, and experiential medium regardless of qualitative differences in desire, content, or form. The resultant array of conundrums is unbounded: Who is the governing agent among agencies; and how could you epistemologically justify that there is such a governing agent to begin with? Who or what organizes or unifies the cacophony of experience if there are different beings within one mind? Who or what is ultimately in control of the mind? How can multiple selves share anything derived from their own nature when by definition they are independent entities that compose different natures? Separate entities by definition cannot share or participate of the same nature because they have separate essences by virtue of their differences. Yet discourse on multiplicity directly assumes that separate selves within a singular mind can intuit, feel, absorb, influence, and communicate with one another, hence they must have a shared essence in order to do so. Therefore, multiple selves within one mind cannot exist because they
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would not have any ability to converse or have contact with the other selves in any way unless they were derived from the same essence. Some theorists clearly confound this issue.

Separate selves eliminate the possibility that there could be any shared psychic participation among these different selves because they would have to have separate experiential mediums or apparatuses that radically vary in phenomenological content and form. What this means is that all experience would have to be perceived and assimilated by a separate psychic register within each self or self-state and hence organized by independent agentic forces processing and guiding self-experience. But how could this be so? How could two or more entities with two or more essences co-habitate and participate of each other’s essence when they are ontologically distinct, thus incapable of intermingling without altering their essences, hence annulling any notion of difference to begin with? These are palpable logical contradictions that any metaphysical theory of duality or multiplicity must be able to account for in order to salvage some theoretical credibility.

From my standpoint, a multiplicity thesis is most legitimately justified by appealing to a developmental monistic ontology governing the subjective mind of each individual, thus accounting for psychic division, differentiation, and modification of content and form (viz. self-states) without generating separate psychic entities (qua selves), each with their own separate essence. To justify a theory of mutually exclusive, multiple essences that have the capacity to interact and intermingle would lead to some form of occasionalism, monadology, or parallelism, each with their own particular set of problems. Explanations of modified self-states, psychic realms, or experiential orders of subjectivity are quite different from multiple subjects, and this is precisely what the relationalists who avouch such a theory of multiple selves need to consider.

Elizabeth Howell (2005) conceptualizes mind as reducible to dissociative processes, and she is following in the same theoretical trend as many relational postmoderns. This view lends itself to parsimonious and possibly reductionistic accounts of the complexifications of mental functioning, not to mention it introduces a theoretical problematic for not adequately addressing the question of agency within a dissociative model. If everything we call mental or psychical is a multiplicity of self-states, how is a state organized? What processes or mechanics are operative that constitute dissociability to begin with? Does this merely devolve into neurobiology? From my account, one has to have active unconscious agentic functions executing mental activity or this argument collapses into and privileges a materialist model of consciousness. Following this line of reasoning, the unconscious is not a necessary psychoanalytic construct let alone an ontological force in the mind. Furthermore, if you do not allow for agency directing mental activity on multiple levels of systemic psychic organization conjoined as a unifying totality that makes multiplicity possible, then you have a problem with human freedom and causality to boot.

If dissociation theory is to replace a model of dynamic unconscious processes and is said to account for all normative and pathological enactments, then how are enactments executed if you cannot sufficiently account for agency? And if agency is to be attributed to consciousness, and dissociation occurs outside of conscious awareness, then are we not begging the question of what constitutes dissociation? If dissociative enactments devolve into consciousness, then this is contradictory because dissociation is presumed to transpire outside of conscious awareness. And if the answer is somewhere to be found in brain processes, then are we not committed to material reduction or a mere logical fallacy? Not only does this not adequately answer to the question and mechanics of dissociative enactments, it subverts the philosophical question of unconscious agency.

Freud (1894) talks about how the splitting of consciousness that takes place in defense is in the service of keeping affect and ideation “detached” from one another. This ideation, however, is not merely dissociative, where signification and thought are relegated to what is simply “unformulated,” as Stern would tell us. Rather, for Freud ideas are “weakened” yet held in dynamic reserve until a “fresh impression . . . succeeds in breaking through the barrier erected by the will” (p. 50). This is the beginning of Freud’s theory of a dynamic unconscious that thinks, feels, and actively converts mental phenomena by either producing associative links or by creating disjunctions: the former involves assigning a semiotic to unconscious experience, the later involves instituting a protective function. Here I believe that Freud succeeds in accounting for both dissociation within consciousness as well as explaining how the content of what becomes dissociated (i.e., affect, sense impressions, ideas) is organized within the abyss. This means that unconscious content has a life and a force of its own that is sustained within a dynamic underworld and creates unconscious pressure that becomes an onus for the ego to deal with. What this ultimately means is that dissociation and repression are not incompatible processes nor contrary psychoanalytic theoretical models that clash with one another or cancel each other out. Rather, they operate on stratified levels of psychic reality carried out and maintained by the dynamic agency that properly belongs to the unconscious ego.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 36
**FURTHER THOUGHTS ON DISSOCIATION**

This essay provides a critical analysis of dissociation, distinguishing the views of Stern and Bromberg in order to illuminate two somewhat different understandings of this construct. For expository purposes, Stern’s (1997) position will be characterized as a response to the “dynamic” (Mele, 2001, p. 60) paradox of how one can harbor an intention to deceive oneself that does not immediately render itself ineffective. It seeks to avoid conceptualizing dissociation as a deceptive strategy that one both devises and is taken in by. By contrast, Bromberg (1998 & 2006) addresses the central issue posed by the “static” paradox (Mele, p. 59). Simply put, rather than merely reflecting incompatible beliefs, dissociation asserts (or implies) the truth of a proposition and its negation in apparent violation of the principle of noncontradiction. Bromberg responds to this challenge by positing multiplicity as a normative condition. This essay closes with a plea for a categorical understanding of pathological dissociation’s unique and multifactorial structure. Throughout, I will assume the readership’s familiarity with the writings of Stern and Bromberg, making a detailed rehearsal of their positions unnecessary.

**DISSOCIATION AS UNFORMULATED EXPERIENCE**

Let us begin with an example inspired by Mele. Tom is very disturbed to learn that his son, Junior, has not been selected for the Little League all star team. He had high hopes for the boy and is shocked by the written evaluation he receives detailing the reasons Junior was not selected. Tom believes he deserves this recognition and that the board’s decision is unjust. After carefully reviewing the player evaluation, he decides to appeal the league’s decision. Because these events unfold over a holiday weekend, he cannot respond for several days. In the interim, Tom re-reads the evaluation and realizes, despite his disappointment, that the league’s decision was appropriate and fair. He speaks with his son about their mutual disappointment and tries, to the best of his ability, to help Junior put the experience in perspective.

As I understand it, Tom’s initial reaction is a nontrivial example of Sternian dissociation. It straightforwardly captures the idea that he was unable to fully process the information in the letter under the pressure of disappointment. How this might happen is not hard to imagine. Strong negative emotions dampened his curiosity about the letter’s implications, consideration of which likely would have led him to question his son’s ability. As evidence that this transpired, one need only consider the fact that, upon rereading the letter, Tom attends precisely to implications that initially escaped notice. But this observation raises an important question: Is this evidence sufficient to establish the conclusion that these implications were not formulated? If Tom’s strong desire for his son to be an all star caused him to ignore or discount evidence that was anxiety provoking, to dissociate as it were, have we uncovered evidence of inattention or unconscious avoidance? Doesn’t the same desire biasing Tom’s processing of information, such that he notes only what is consistent with his beliefs, also cause him unconsciously to avoid evidence likely to disconfirm them?

This idea complicates Stern’s thesis. He wants it to be possible that Tom unconsciously avoids interpretations of experience without committing himself to the position that what is avoided already is known or formulated. For this reason, Stern cannot limit his concept of inattention to its garden variety form in which a man, glued to his television during the Super Bowl, does not hear his wife’s request to take out the trash. Because Tom is not generally inattentive and, in this particular instance, reads the league’s letter with an attorney’s eye, inattention or generic processing bias alone is an unlikely reason for this lapse. His initial reaction more closely resembles a refusal to accept the painful implications of the letter than a failure to attend to them. Suspicion is increased by the consistency of his refusal with his desires, wishes, and fears. Yet, there is no solid evidence that he avoids acknowledging something that he knows or believes. For this reason, Tom’s example illustrates precisely the point Stern wishes to make. It exemplifies a form of self-deception that does not rely on the subject knowing the content of what is avoided. It represents, in an evocative phrase coined by Stern, a story that “must not be told” (p. 114). But it also marks a boundary for that class of dissociative phenomena excluded from awareness on the basis of a pre-reflective weighing of relative risks and benefits. When the potential costs outweigh the benefits, dissociation prevents certain interpretations of experience without requiring their precise meaning to be known. This perspective requires a generous interpretation of the meaning of term pre-reflective; but in principle allows dissociation to be conceptualized in way that does not require partitioning of the mind.

These limitations should make it clear that despite its merits Stern’s account does not easily accommodate dissociative phenomena in which partitioning of consciousness is a primary feature. Dissociative Identity Disorder, for example, presents circumstances in which contradictory beliefs are accessible (with some qualifications) to awareness. Tom’s experience is illustrative of Stern’s thesis because his subsequent
behavior shows no resistance to the truth; it offers evidence neither of the prior belief that his son was undeserving nor of any other motive to deceive himself into false belief. He wants his son to be an all star because he sincerely believes he deserves this honor. Tom is not the type of person whose conscience would permit the promotion of his son undeservedly, depriving another child of this opportunity thereby. This interpretation is supported by the fact that he concurs with the league’s decision after reviewing the evaluation. Tom’s self-deception does not depend on both knowing and not knowing that so frequently characterizes pathological dissociation. It instead reflects a failure to appreciate meanings that can be, but are not, formulated.

**Brombergian Dissociation**

Let us alter this example slightly by assuming that Tom is of two minds about his son. He loves him, and respects and admires his determination. He is a proud father with a clear vision of his son’s athletic potential. At other times, he is frustrated by his tendency to crumble under pressure. He cringes with shame when Junior does not make the “big play.” He reacts with rage, berating the boy for not “stepping up and being a man.” Tom rationalizes these angry outbursts as well as his son’s poor performance, but more often these thoughts and feelings simply fade from his mind. Sometimes, but not often, he has the troubling thought that Junior is not an all star caliber player at all. When Tom receives the evaluation letter, we suspect that he is upset partly because the letter confirms what he has suspected all along. This realization is more painful than Tom can bear; he reacts with a sense of injustice, convinced that his son’s reputation must be vindicated.

Dual beliefs and evasion now figure more prominently. Tom seems more clearly to know what he purports not to know. Moreover, unlike what is typically observed in instances of repression, the information enters consciousness and is (uncomfortably) entertained. To claim that these ideas are not fully formulated raises no fatal objection to the argument that Tom dissociates some beliefs about Junior because Bromberg’s construct subsumes instances in which self states are poorly formulated. He informs us that when particular configurations of meaning occupy conscious, they do so fully. Rather than simply foreclosing the possibility of linguistic formulation, pathological dissociation severs interconnections among selves, undermining the capacity to call them to mind, but only rarely denying them access to consciousness permanently. Were it otherwise, they would not be available when, to paraphrase Bromberg (2006), full absorption in an experience is necessary or desired.

In this perspective, dissociation undermines agency by pitting one set of concerns against another, polarizing them in a way that precludes accurate appraisal. It is not so much that one cannot fully access and/or formulate the implications of experience as it is a problem of holding different perspectives simultaneously in mind, each of which may itself be well-formulated. If Tom experiences his son’s rejection as an intolerable narcissistic injury, he will feel ashamed, angry, and victimized. He will have trouble integrating these feelings with his cherished beliefs about his son. Strongly activated by these unbearable feelings, he may feel that he has no choice but to appeal the decision. He must avoid what threatens him at any cost. Dissociation sequesters information relevant to his deliberations, information that, although painful, is vital to accurate appraisal. It leaves him feeling overwhelmed, unable to live with the shame of rejection. He cannot offer comfort to his devastated son when he himself is devastated and bereft. He cannot seriously entertain any alternative that does not undo his sense of victimhood.

**Deconstructing Dissociation**

Let us make explicit what is implied by these two variations on Tom’s dilemma. The first aligns dissociation with the dynamic paradox in order to bring out Stern’s claim that dissociation requires no formulated intention to deceive. Because most engagements are not “spelled-out” (p. 121) and are processed selectively and pre-reflectively, he reasons that one need not know what, from a third-person perspective, one seems (or ought) to know. Weaker versions of dissociation resemble inattention whereas stronger ones encompass phenomena of great clinical interest. Stern’s thesis is both clear and plausible: one need not know something clearly (or in advance) to keep it from conscious awareness. Many forms of self-deception can be conceptualized in terms of biased information-processing rather than as conforming to an interpersonal model of deception in which a knowing self deceives an unknowing one. One important implication of this view is that it severs any necessary link between dissociation and multiplicity. The validity of Stern’s account can be established independently of his endorsement of the multiplicity thesis. This point is often overlooked. Also overlooked is the fact that this model holds up reasonably well to a variety of criticisms (Mele, 2001).

Bromberg’s view begins with the assumption of multiplicity and therefore imposes no such restrictions on dissociation. He imagines self-experience “…as originating in relatively unlinked self-states, each coherent in its own right” (1998, p. 182), such that the experience of self is an “acquired, developmentally adaptive illusion” (p. 182). What separates health from pathology? Bromberg’s answer is that health is the degree to which self-states have access to awareness and to other aspects of personality. He
explicitly denies that we are all multiple personalities, but is fascinated by the correspondence between dissociative phenomena and the view of the self as decentered and multiple. If self-states are intrinsically unlinked and variably accessible to consciousness, personal identity, as a product of reflective self-awareness, is necessarily partial, perspectivistic, and, for Bromberg, motivated by the need to maintain cherished illusions.

Like Stern, Bromberg offers two views of dissociation. The first refers to the normative condition that obtains between self-states, a benign absence of linkage that does not foreclose intercommunication. The second is dissociation proper in which self-states become objects of consciousness without necessarily being known to each other. The latter circumstance brings it about that one self may deceive another. So long as some selves remain hidden from those occupying consciousness at a particular moment, the agent can hold contradictory beliefs simultaneously. Thus, Bromberg avoids the contradiction posed by the static paradox by positing multiplicity as a normative condition. It is not the agent-as-unified-self who holds contradictory beliefs, but individual subagents who hold one belief or the other, but never both (contradictory) beliefs simultaneously. Each belief inheres in or reflects the perspective of a different self. Consistency requires one to accord full autonomy to each self with regard to agency, beliefs, and desires, something Bromberg is willing to do. Mills (2008) raises several serious issues with this strategy.

**PATHOLOGICAL DISSOCIATION**

What does it mean to conceptualize dissociation as a normative condition of the mind that permits free and open communication among self states? How does this differ from saying straightforwardly that each of us have different feelings, ideas, and/or perspectives at various times that differ only in the degree to which they are accessible to awareness? If communication among multiple selves is normative, in what sense are they distinct and monadic? More importantly, how does normative dissociation support a partitioned or multiple model of the mind? Those endorsing Bromberg’s position seem to want it both ways. They want to encompass robust intercommunication and division, linkage and splitting, in a single concept. Such usage conflates two distinct classes of phenomena, both of which are important in their own right (Naso, 2007). It is inadvisable to adopt one usage and dismiss the other; rather both must be carefully defined in a way that recognizes dissociation’s multifactorial structure and is consistent with other sources of clinical and empirical data.

Failing this, the extremes of the dissociative spectrum can be regarded as falling along a single dimension only by assuming the very unity one purports to explain. Dissociation’s power to obliterate agency problematizes this assumption. When one cannot realistically consider alternatives because they create unbearable internal tension, one acts out of what feels like necessity. It is true that the source of this tension may not be well-formulated, but this does not fully explain how it is that one’s plans, desires, and intentions no longer are experienced as one’s own. One now dwells in a region of ambiguous agency, a region of uncertain ownership of one’s engagements. By undermining agency, pathological dissociation threatens the relationship between what one does and who one is.

A categorical view allows us to separate the processes producing dissociative symptoms from those maintaining them. These are not necessarily the same. To return to the example of Tom, we can easily understand his reaction to the news of his son’s rejection as a failure of formulation. But what do we make of the fact that he reacts in an identical fashion when confronted with a similar rejection next year? Even if the Sternian account adequately explains Tom’s initial reaction, it seems a less plausible explanation for subsequent instances in which prior knowledge can be established.

Is the difference between the extremes of the dissociative phenomena adequately understood in terms of the relative ease with which they lend themselves to linguistic expression? Is this difference bridged by a special pleading for intercommunication among selves in health that is foreclosed in illness? Does this pleading also account for the loss of reality testing observed in some instances of pathological dissociation? Neither Stern nor Bromberg address these complexities. They attend neither to the clinically important distinction between compartmentalization and detachment (Cardena, 1994) nor to the admittedly more controversial taxometric evidence of a unique marker for pathological dissociation (Waller et al., 1996). This evidence underscores the relative rarity of pathological dissociation in both clinical populations as well as in individuals who manifest common dissociative symptoms, like momentary forgetting, imaginative absorption, inattention, and mild detachment. Cumulatively, it suggests that the “domain of dissociation” (Cardena, p. 15) is multifactorial and discontinuous. Although Stern would reject this idea, one major difference between dissociation in the “weak and strong” (p. 113) senses, between stories that “cannot” (p. 114) and “must not” (p. 114) be told, is precisely the distinction between normal and pathological dissociation, a distinction also implicit in Bromberg’s account. Stein’s (2007) work with violent offenders underscores this distinction by identifying a unique form of dissociation, called “psychosomnia” (p. 24), a chronic, dream-like mode of experience that eludes
verbal representation and undermines moral appraisal. It allows offenders to exploit an already comprised ability for integration and, in Stein’s view, originates in response to massive childhood trauma.

**Conclusion**

Stern and Bromberg’s views have been distinguished in order to highlight their different understandings of dissociation as well as to suggest a place that a categorical concept might occupy. This strategy should not be construed as minimizing the continuities in their views. For Stern, a dimensional concept links dissociative pathology with the unbidden imaginings of the unconscious mind. Central to the therapeutic task is the capacity to “…free oneself to articulate or construct what one has refused to think about (Stern, 2003, p. 844), a process always mediated intersubjectively via language. Subjectivity depends on a mentalizing other, another subject for whom one exists also as a subject and who bears witness to one’s story. In this view, the undoing of dissociation marks the beginning rather than the end of self-understanding, creating opportunities for deep and mutual relatedness.

Bromberg focuses less on the act of formulation than on bridging partitioned components of a decentered self. He regards self-states as individual sub-agents, each a perspective experienced as who one is. Most important is the degree of linkage/splitting among self-states; how facilely they can be held simultaneously in mind. Although not requiring mental contents to be irreconcilable, Bromberg’s position easily accommodates the contradictory beliefs observed in pathological dissociation. Trauma is the precipitous exposure of these contradictions that shatters one’s illusion of unity. Rather than inherently pathological, dissociation is the mask worn by consciousness. However, contrary to modernist assumptions, no true self lurks beneath it; what is found there are only other masks, other illusions, each marking off a region of what is known from what is not known.

The rejection of a unitary, core, or true self links the contributions of Stern and Bromberg and reveals the deeper aspirations of the relational turn: to offer an account of the clinical process keenly attuned to perspectivism and the legitimacy of other points of view. There is much to be learned from this quest. It begins with a comprehensive retelling of individual stories woven from the narrative strands of trauma, focusing on the impact of real events, how they are experienced and enacted in the analytic setting and, more broadly, within patients’ lives. Taking relativism seriously means recognizing the limits of the analyst’s authority despite his/her active participation in the therapeutic process. More than this, it entails a vision of the analyst as a witness to suffering embedded in and continually transformed by what is co-constructed. In this view, dissociation reflects the totality of processes shaping the patient’s life, prompting both adaptation and inner fragmentation and incoherence. If instinctual conflict plays a diminished role in these narratives, it is because they regard the individual’s relationship to himself as inconstant and ruptured by trauma. However much it is put into perspective, trauma cannot be controlled; nor can its shattering impact be undone.

If relativism confronts us with the impossibility of a God’s eye view, relational theory denies any certitude in the last bastion of modernity: the individual self. It challenges us to reevaluate what we know and how we know it in light of this pervasive uncertainty. At the therapeutic level, this counts as respect for the other. It is part of the continuing effort to remain open to the other fully aware that he or she can never be completely known from a first-person perspective. For this reason, choosing between Stern and Bromberg is less important than continuing to engage these two creative thinkers in dialogue. It is only by deepening our understanding of their perspectives that we can clarify our own and further the field’s efforts to alleviate the suffering of those devastated by trauma.
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In his new book, *Attachment in Psychotherapy*, David Wallin provides a clear and comprehensive review of the body of attachment theory and research including the work of John Bowlby, Mary Ainsworth, Mary Main, and Peter Fonagy. With this as a foundation, he helps us to see how ideas from attachment theory, intersubjectivity theory and the psychology of mindfulness, can be combined to provide a strong theoretical framework for our clinical endeavors with our patients. In the preface of the book, Wallin states,

*I aim to convey how therapists can make practical use of three key findings of attachment research. Accordingly, I focus on the therapeutic relationship as a developmental crucible, the centrality of the nonverbal dimension, and the transformative influence of reflection and mindfulness.* (p. xii italics added)

What I love about this book is how Wallin clearly explains and integrates complex theoretical ideas that are currently very popular, ties them to clinical interventions, and offers specific examples from his own psychotherapy practice. He shows us how intersubjectivity theory and the relational perspective have evolved from, and are consistent with, attachment research findings, and indicates how clinicians can productively interact with their patients, depending on the patient’s pattern and predominant style of attachment. Using Mary Main’s Adult Attachment Interview research (p. 207), he tells us what to look for in order to determine if our patient’s attachment style is secure, dismissing, preoccupied or unresolved. Once we have identified the patient’s prevailing attachment style, we can then begin to relate to the patient in ways that provide “an attachment relationship that is friendlier to the patient’s psychological development” than his original attachment relationships (p. 194).

Wallin is careful to point out however, that attachment is complicated, and that people are too complex to simply place in a single category. In addition, he explores *the interplay of the therapist’s attachment style with the patient’s*, and how this can at times be helpful to the patient, or can result in enactments in which patient and therapist collude to serve the self-protective needs of both. For example,

*…a therapist and patient whose predominantly dismissing styles mirror each other, may collude to steer clear of strong feelings. In so doing, they may enact an emotionally distant relationship that is familiar to both. In such a relationship…vital, but anxiety-provoking issues will continue to be avoided.* (p. 274)

Wallin finds it useful to think in terms of three stances toward experience: embeddedness, mentalizing, and mindfulness. In describing what he means by embeddedness, he draws on Fonagy’s concept of *psychic equivalence* (Fonagy et al., 2002) and Melanie Klein’s *paranoid-schizoid position*. When we are embedded in our experience, “it’s as if we are the experience. . . whatever we sense, feel, and believe at any given moment, we simply take at face value.” In this mode, we are unable to consider alternative views of our experience. To be embedded is to be stuck in our experience and at its mercy. Wallin shows how we can liberate ourselves from the trap of embeddedness, through either the use of mindfulness or the use of mentalization (self-reflection). Both processes foster better emotional regulation, a stronger sense of internal security, and the enhanced “capacities to freely feel, reflect and love.” (p. 166) Thus through the therapeutic relationship, the therapist fosters the patient’s capacities to be reflective and mindful, and gradually the inner void that many of our patients experience, begins to be filled. Wallin believes that sometimes the therapist’s thoughtful self-disclosure is important in facilitating the therapeutic work, although he cautions that it is not appropriate for every therapist with every patient. Utilizing the relational, intersubjective prospective, he stresses that what occurs in a therapy session, is no less a creation of the therapist, than it is of the patient.
Consistent with using attachment theory as a framework, Wallin gives special emphasis to attending to the patient’s nonverbal communication, and believes that it makes sense for the psychotherapist to pay attention to as much of the patient’s experience as possible. He reminds us that Bowlby (1988) theorized that the child excludes from conscious awareness, any thoughts, feelings and behaviors that threaten his attachment relationships. He agrees with many current psychoanalytic thinkers that the patient expresses what he cannot verbalize either through enacting it with others, evoking it in others or embodying it. Therefore the therapist has to attend to what she is thinking, feeling, and/or doing while the session goes on, in order to pick up what the patient is transmitting nonverbally as well as verbally. He also emphasizes the importance of the therapist’s being aware of what is going on in the body, both the patient’s and ours. To help therapists increase their self-awareness, he suggests that we adopt a stance of mindfulness, i.e., an awareness of the present moment with acceptance. Both the therapist’s mindfulness and her teaching her patient to be mindful, assist in increasing awareness of bodily sensations and postures, which in turn can provide access to dissociated feelings and defenses against feelings. Wallin feels that focusing on bodily experience is important for many patients, and essential for patients with unresolved trauma.

In sum, *Attachment in Psychotherapy*, not only offers instruction in how to make practical use of attachment theory, but espouses an egalitarian approach to psychotherapy, in which the therapist and patient are viewed as flawed human beings who are continuously engaged in trying to create or reenact certain types of relationships with each other. Wallin emphasizes the bidirectional nature of projective identification, and cautions therapists that they must be careful about too readily assuming that what they feel the patient has evoked in them belongs to the patient alone. By addressing both the verbal and the nonverbal realms, and rooting his therapeutic interventions in attachment theory, he provides us with a vision of how to conduct a psychotherapy that is comprehensive, liberating and humane. Reading this book can be a therapeutic experience for therapists and a boon to their clinical practices.
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Continued from page 28
Dissociative enactments must be exercised by an agentic teleological organization of mind executing the enactments, or else you have the intractable problem of multiple essences conversing, or you have the view of the mind as a biological machine that is turned on by the environment devoid of freedom and agency. This sounds like Skinner is potentially alive and well in contemporary psychoanalysis. Although I cannot do justice to this complex issue here, I do propose that an adequate solution may be found by conceiving the multiplicity of the self as a dispersal of modified and differentiated self-states that are ontologically conjoined and inseparable from a unitary self that is a unifying unifier, but one that is not static or unified. Rather, the self is pure process that is systemically and developmentally organized as a dynamic self-articulated complex holism. Here the inherent dichotomizing that characterizes the unitary versus multiple self debate can find resolve in a process psychology that dialectically accounts for plurality within a unifying conception of mind.
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Writing about Lacan is not an easy task. Lacan often wrote or gave his seminars in an enigmatic and metaphorical form, and very frequently left the impression that he was right: expressing exactly what we want using language is impossible. Lander tries to demystify that, and translate, or even interpret, whatever Lacan wanted to teach to the psychoanalytic community. For that, first he explains basic concepts, such as desire, signifier, the three orders, and others. Then, he describes how different diagnoses are understood by Lacanian theory. Finally, he finishes his book clarifying how the Lacanian analysis works. Further, throughout his book, Lander very frequently talks about the Freudian background of the theory, which is very salutary because Lacan defined himself as a Freudian.

His book starts with the description of one of the most, if not the most, crucial concepts in Lacan: desire. Desire, in Lacan, is the desire of the Other: we desire because we are not complete, and cannot fulfill what the Other wants from us. So, the Lacanian subject will be always asking this fundamental question: “what do you want from me?” In that, our desire is related to lack, to what we don’t have, or to what we don’t know.

In the other initial chapters, Lander explains the logic of other important concepts in Lacanian theory, which are also related to desire. Hence, Lander starts with the broader concept, and only afterward explains its particularities. Due to the organization of the book, Lander sometimes uses concepts throughout the first chapters not explained until later in the book. Therefore, the reader may be left with questions such as “What is the Other? What about this object (a)? And jouissance?” The elucidation of most concepts is found only in subsequent chapters.

One of the concepts that Lander explains is the “object” in the Lacanian theory. Here, he superficially discusses Klein’s and Winnicott’s concept of the object, while describing Freud’s and Lacan’s conception in more detail. Lacan named his object the object (a). First, Lacan understood the (a) as related to the small other (l’autre), in that l’autre would seem to have something that made it the object of desire. Then, (a) became what causes desire in that it symbolizes a lack, and is also the lack itself. In this chapter, Lander’s main contribution is a chart that he created about the lack of the object. The chart is extremely didactic and clarifies how the lack of the object is presented (privation, frustration and castration) in each register (symbolic, real, and imaginary), and in which form (nature, object, and agent of the lack).

The logic of the symptom is another important aspect in the Lacanian theory. Lander emphasizes that there are two types of symptoms: 1) the clinical symptom, in which there is a demand for help addressed to the Other, and 2) the analytic symptom, in which there is not an appeal to the Other, and has a component of jouissance. Hence, for example, the patient starts the treatment asking for a cure for depression, and believes that the analyst is supposed to know how to make him get better. The symptom, here, is seen as a foreign body that he does not control. As the analysis progresses, the patient realizes that he is in charge of his symptom, and that there is a desire involved in his suffering. The goal would be to have him recognizing that he is a subject of desire. Therefore, in psychoanalysis, distinct from other orientations, the objective is to understand the role of the unconscious in people’s lives. There is a search for the inner truth, as people must become able to act according to their desires. In that, a symptom is never just a symptom that we need to “get rid of.”

People, however, are psychically structured differently. Therefore, there are hysterics, obsessives, perverts, psychotics, and also other structures. In the second part of the book, Lander describes the logic of a variety of diagnoses. Here, he offers clinical examples (which he has not done so far), and also tries to understand in a Lacanian
perspective diagnoses that Lacan did not explain, such as the borderline personality disorder.

Due to a lack of a Lacanian understanding, at times Lander appeals for an object relations comprehension of some diagnoses; however, he does not always clarify when he is making that transition, which may be problematic for readers that may think, for example, that Lacan worked with “introjected objects.” In fact, Lacan would prefer to talk about signifiers rather than introjected objects. Further, this concept is irreconcilable with the Lacanian theory, and Lander should have pointed that out.

Lander offers good metaphors when explaining the logic of the hysterics, which are understood as “a slave that looks for a Master upon whom to reign” (“they want to be desired and wanted by this phallic Other, bearer of the semblance”), and also when describing the obsessives, which are seen as “a king who cannot cease to be a slave” (they want to become everything to the Other and close the field of lack). Surprisingly, when describing both structures, Lander does not mention their fundamental questions. In hysteria, we would have “Am I a man or a woman?” or, more precisely, “What is a woman?” In the obsesive, we would have “Am I dead or alive?”

To explain depression, Lander talks about the *jouissance*, about a hate toward the introjected object, and others. A deeper Lacanian perspective on this problematic is missed, or even more hypotheses of how Lacan may have thought about depression. Depression, for Lacan, is connected to the moment when the subject does not desire. When the subject feels that way, Eros withdraws and the subject just wants to die. However, Lacan understood that this *douleur d’exister* did not happen in the same way in all subjects, which means that the analyst would need to comprehend it according to the different psychoanalytic structures (neurosis, psychosis, and perversion).

Lander seems to have deviated from the Lacanian perspective when talking about the suicidal act. First, he proposes which types of suicidal acts are wrong and right. How can we define that? Lander gives example of right, or justifiable, suicidal acts, such as incurable chronic illness, physical disability due to simple aging, chronic mental disability, and others. Suicide for these reasons, however, may also be a passage to the act as the subject may be overly identified with the lack, or the flaw, for example. Instead of stating that suicide is justifiable in those stances, he might said that any suicide that is properly symbolized, and elaborated upon, is a “right” suicide.

Offering a “what to do list” of how to behave if subjects are at risk of committing suicide is also odd from a Lacanian perspective. His list has items that must be obvious for any therapist that follows a psychoanalytic orientation (e.g., enter the conflict area; explore the origin and the apparent reasons for these suicidal ideas; specify the subjective experience of failure, etc.). Therapists do, or at least must try to do, what he instructs not only when facing a suicidal patient but any type of patient. Lander then offers a list of what to do in the face of an imminent suicidal act. This list, again, is a list that any mental health professional must follow (e.g., eliminate the means to commit suicide; do not leave the suicidal subjects alone, etc.). The only point, here, of discussion is when Lander states that “to accomplish these goals one must not prescribe any medication.” Generalizing this situation in mental health is difficult, and risky. The type of environment where the patient is, as well as his mental state, must be considered in that condition.

The discussion about the borderline state is curious, because Lander tries to understand this phenomenon using different perspectives. Here, Lander blends what seems impossible: Lacanian theory and object relations. Lander hypothesizes that borderlines have a hole on the imaginary area, and work under the discourse of domination. The discourse of domination, which claims that the word of the other works as law, was not a concept developed by Lacan, and perhaps Lander borrows this concept from the social sciences. That is not clear. In addition, Lander also believes that borderline patients experience a “reversal of perspective” in a dramatic form. This is a concept developed by Wilfred Bion, and is related to the fact that what we see depends on our point of view. For this reason, borderlines may suddenly transform the idealized person into an evil person. Therefore, this chapter may help our understanding of the borderline disorder; but he presents different, and sometimes divergent, psychoanalytic ideas without noting this or reconciling these ideas in a consistent framework.

The logic of perversion is explained mainly according to Freud and Lacan. Here, Lander talks about disavowal (*Verleugnung*) and the phallus. In this chapter, his last comment is that it is impossible “for women (organized as feminine) to be subjects of perversion.” The logic of the phallus and of castration is relentless. The feminine woman does not become perverse—her sexual structure does not allow it—is debatable. Here, Lander introduces the discussion of what feminine and masculine are. However, he does not explore these definitions deeply. Lacan preferred to use “phallus” instead of “penis” because he wanted to make use of a metaphor that indicated the male organ in the fantasy; in that men have a penis but this does not mean that they also have a phallus. So, phallus is related to the lack for males and females, and both sexes must renounce the aspiration to be the phallus of the mother to become a subject. Hence, man can be in the feminine side, and women are also free to be in the
masculine side—the sexuality of the subject is not always related to the biological sex. Consequently, what is the difference between a feminine woman and a feminine man?

In the third part of this book, Lander speaks of important aspect of Lacanian practice. First, he talks about transference. He suggests that there is a love or hate transference, and that the transference is understood by Lacan as 1) symbolic, in that it is related to the repetition compulsion, and hence reveals important aspects of the patient’s history, and 2) as imaginary, because it is manifested through strong affects, such as love and hate. Further, Lander emphasizes the importance of the analyst be seen as the “subject supposed to know,” which indicates that the analyst is seen as having a knowledge that the patient does not have. However, the analyst must not believe that the knowledge is in him, because this will elicit him to make interpretations from the imaginary and not from the symbolic register, as it is expected. Therefore, the analyst must be located in the locus of the symbolic Other, and speak from the position of the lack of knowledge, which will produce a subjective division. When the subject becomes aware of his, and also of his analyst’s incompleteness, the analyst will stop being idealized, and will become a waste. That is the analytic cure according to Lacan.

Lander also talks about the logic of the negative transference. Here, he describes a case of a woman whom he saw for over a year. This woman felt at times as if he were dominating her, and was reluctant to continue with her analysis. Lander shows how he managed her negative transference, and also how he attempted to have an “absent presence” in the room as an analyst. In this chapter, he also discusses about the problem of bisexuality, because his patient fell in love with people of both sexes. He believes that there is an unconscious bisexual structure, in addition to a heterosexual and a homosexual unconscious structure. Surprisingly, Lander does not explore the side (active or passive) where the subject is in those relationships. This discussion is fundamental to the understanding of the sexual choice in Lacan. The phallus, according to Lacan, emerges on active side, and the hole on the passive side.

To finalize his discussion about transference, Lander offers a transference graph in which the transferential phenomenon is explained. according to the logic of both the analysand and analyst, in four different levels: imaginary, symbolic, at an articulation of the three registers (when the analyst is seen as a waste), and at a level beyond the transference (when the post-analytic effects happen). This graph is extremely easy to follow, and demonstrates how the transferences occur in each time of the analysis.

To conclude his book, Lander talks about supervision, and here he offers excellent clinical vignettes. Lander discusses about what a good supervision is: Should the supervision be deep, and help the students recognize their own unresolved issues? Should the unresolved issues be talked about only in the personal analysis? Should the students be in personal analysis at the same time that they are doing clinical work? These are questions, however, that remain unanswered. Analysts have discussed these for years, and no final answer has been agreed upon. Lacan suggested that people can become an analyst only after being in clinical supervision, having been in analysis, and participating in official seminars. Most importantly, people need to be recognized as analysts to become an analyst.

In conclusion, Subjective Experience and the Logic of the Other is a good book for beginners. He offers an overview of the Lacanian theory, and for this reason one must not expect to find deep and critical discussions about problematic issues in Lacanian theory. It is a book, however, that may make more advanced Lacanian readers somewhat frustrated, and more aware of the incompleteness in his discussion. On the other hand, Lander also may make beginners less resistant to the Lacanian theory, as he digests the main Lacanian concepts and techniques, and makes this theory—one that just few try to explore in United States— accessible.
Lacan’s Medievalism is an inventive, complex, and stimulating book that stretches from literature, to philosophy to psychoanalysis. To follow the itinerary of its main theses demands not only erudition but also close attention to its labyrinthine structure. The book is divided into an introduction and five chapters; there is also an extensive apparatus of notes that demonstrate just how in command Erin Felicia Labbie is of her material while defending the strong thesis that “psychoanalysis extend[s] the language and methods of scholasticism to get at the core of the unconscious” (p. 19).

In the first chapter, entitled “Singularity, Sovereignty, and the One,” Labbie discusses Chaucer’s The Canterbury Tales, which she uses as a source to explain the quarrel of the universals that was so crucial in the Middle Ages. Boethius and Lacan’s Seminar VII on ethics and Seminar XX, given in the years 1972-73, are also protagonists of this work that, being so detailed, can be given only a summary account in a book review. Suffice to say here that Labbie proceeds in the second chapter—on duality, desire, and ambivalence—to connect desire with animality in order to reveal desire’s ambivalence. In chapter three—on dialectic and Courtly Love—Labbie examines Lacan’s views on desire, the troubadours, and the “knot-like structure of the unconscious” (p. 33). Chapter four introduces the theme of the hard sciences, mathematics in primitis, to show Lacan’s search for scientific precision. He was hoping that these sciences would make his theories more compelling, although he was also doubtful that they could explain everything under the sun. The fifth and last chapter, “The Pentangle and the Resistant Knot,” discusses the difference between paranoia and hysteria: the paranoid wants to conceal the unconscious (such is the case of Daniel Paul Schreber, a case history discussed by Freud), whereas the hysterical displays it.

The philosophical aspect of the work is about the quarrel of the universals, a debate that occupied philosophers from the eleventh century on. There are three possible solutions to this problematic: realism, nominalism, and conceptualism. Labbie discusses the first two of these interpretations of the universals to bring to light the many facets of realism, which she analyzes in great detail. The opposition realism/nominalism serves her purpose to demonstrate that the ontological status of the unconscious is “real.” It is important to pose this question because it is at this juncture that literary themes and psychoanalysis alternate in an apparent disorder. The psychoanalytic theory that provides an answer to this question is not so much that of the founder of psychoanalysis, Freud, but instead that of Jacques Lacan, who pondered all throughout his productive life about the ontological status of the unconscious. He was not the first to do so; however, Lacan’s extraordinary cultural background makes him a good source to introduce the philosophy of the Middle Ages. Whether Lacan accepted the religiosity of those times is doubtful, rather he looked—and here Labbie provides a useful and detailed analysis—at the sciences that could throw some light on how the unconscious “works.” He looked in particular at topology and the Borromean knots, because the unconscious itself is like a knot; that is, a rope cluster that follows geometrical patterns.

There are other threads in Labbie’s book, one of the most important of which is the theme of desire, seen through the eyes of Courtly Love. Desire is the key to the understanding of Courtly Love, those erotic approaches between a lady and a troubadour of the Middle Ages that were ritualistic in the extreme.

Courtly Love was so “staged” and formalized that the codes of love given by André le Chapelain in the twelfth century included no less than thirty-one articles. To call this romanticism would miss the point; and indeed Labbie is cautious enough not to claim that Courtly Love had anything to do with romantic love. But Lacan was perhaps a romantic in incognito. Labbie is convinced enough of this to say that it is the reason why Lacan devoted many pages of his work to the discussion of love.
But even more relevant is the narrative of the legend of Mélusine. According to the version by Jean d’Arras—*Le Roman de Mélusine*, written in 1393—Mélusine made a pact with Raymond, her husband to be, that he should never look at her while she was bathing. But eventually he was unable to resist, and discovered her to be a phallic-mother with a serpent tail. The mother’s animality makes her a monster, something “other,” who disappears after having been seen naked. For Labbie, this legend is significant in that it puts in evidence the voyeurism of Mélusine’s husband and the epistemophilia that accompanies it (p. 87). Desire is not defeated, but what disappears, it seems, is matriarchy. This legend has many different versions in different parts of the world, and it serves as an emblematic metaphor of the disappearance of the woman (Lacan wrote the word “woman” with a horizontal line crossing it). Summarizing the different elements of the Mélusine’s legend, Labbie writes: “Any attempt to sublimate animality will result in its emergence in a different, potentially more threatening form that will carry with it the force and power of the symptom that returns from the place of repression” (p. 90). Additionally, she writes: “when sublimation fails, ambivalence prevails.” (p. 90). But this is a debatable conclusion, because sublimation and its cultural products can be, from the start, ambivalent too. The title Labbie gives to the section on Mélusine, “Stealing Woman,” however, could not be more appropriate and her interpretation of Lacan is accurate, since for him the “death” or “non-existence” of the woman is the beginning of the symbolic order; that is, of the humanization process typical, for Lacan, of that order.

The Mélusine legend serves Labbie’s purpose to pose some relevant questions concerning Lacan’s stand on the debate of feminism/antifeminism. The fact that Lacan wrote the word “woman” and then crossed it out indicates that, in his view, there is no sexual relationship. Yet this statement can be explained in more than one way. Labbie’s hypothesis is that these were Lacan’s words to defend himself from the accusation of antifeminism. She claims that writing “woman” as Lacan did, “was a statement about the category of woman, as an impossible category, equal to the impossibility of God” (pp. 101-102). It is a debatable thesis, given Lacan’s insistence on the paternal metaphor and the patriarchic Law, which casts serious doubts about his feminist sympathies. Rather, Lacan liked to provoke his readers and listeners; and he avoided some issues, not so much because he did not want to disappoint feminists but because it was part of his “aesthetics,” ethics, and also rhetoric to leave undecided relevant theoretical points. What is certain, though, is that Lacan did not believe—as Goethe did—in the eternal feminine.

In the end, “love compensates for the lack of sexual relationship,” Labbie writes, connecting the theme of love to a distant God and a distant Other (p. 30). Notwithstanding these unavoidable ambiguities, Labbie’s thesis—stated at the beginning—is that Lacan was a realist in three specific senses: he was “an ethical realist,” and also an epistemological and linguistic realist. The unconscious, too, is a real universal substance, something real and material. Being foundational, the category of the Real connects the material with the spiritual. These themes run throughout Labbie’s book, and she concludes that Lacan was, after all, a Thomist (p. 215).

As a consequence, Labbie states that “Lacan’s theories engage ideas prominent in medieval literature such that our understanding of psychoanalysis and the Middle Ages is reconceived” (p. 9). Indeed, the Real, being linguistic in nature, plays an important role also in the poetics of the troubadours. Yet in the case of Lacan it can also be said that the real becomes “surreal,” given his early association with the surrealists of his time.

But the unconscious is real in more than one sense, so it is an ambiguous term in itself, although the first meaning of “Real” in this context concerns the quarrel of the universals. “Real” meant that the ontological status of genus and species is not a flatus vocis as Roscelin and the nominalists thought; realism means that the universals exist not only in the human mind but also in the things themselves. Ontologically, realism indicates that when we speak we are speaking of something existing, thus introducing the philosophical problem of the relationship between ontology and epistemology, which is still debated today. As to Lacan’s notion of “the Real,” it is one of the three structures he put forth to indicate that the Real is to be distinguished from the Imaginary and the Symbolic. The intricate connections and differences among these three structures could become a book in itself, since the transitions among these registers (as Lacan called them) are extremely complex. Put in a few words, Labbie’s thesis is that the unconscious corresponds to the Real of Lacan (p. 103). The unconscious is an “object,” and Lacan was a medievalist, because—as Labbie insists with vigor and erudition—he gave prominence to the unconscious Real.

The Lacanian rationalizing process of the unconscious begins here, and it continues with his project of its mathematization. Reality, as we understand it in everyday language, is not what Lacan meant by the Real, which refers also to unconscious desire; as such, though, it is something elusive and phantasmatic. Consequently, Labbie considers Lacan’s position in the quarrel of the universals as being situated between nominalism and realism, because language and reality have no common link (p. 49).

But the main theme of the book is desire. Desire is so pervasive in our culture that—from Aristotle, to
Descartes, Diderot, and Hegel—it has become a prominent object of study among philosophers. Lacan was no exception, and appropriately Labbie’s book exergue is a quotation from Lacan: “Desire must be taken literally.” Coming from a psychoanalyst who theorized on linguistic structures and thought that language is essentially metaphorical, one can see that desire is, in a way, the troublemaker—bringing disorder to a structuralist, scientific theory that ideally should be neutral and uncontaminated by feelings and passions. If desire must be taken literally, then it becomes more difficult to satisfy it, even more than if it were metaphorical. Courtly Love demonstrates this point. Still, unconscious desire is so pervasive that to silence it is impossible; at the same time, desire cannot be satisfied, because if it is, it implodes.

An interesting point Labbie makes is “As the primary means of knowing the unconscious, desire is foundational to the epistemological map of the subject” (p. 20). Such a role cannot be underestimated, and Lacan certainly did not when he said that the only ethics worth following is not to give up desire. This means that the potential—and not so much the actual—has a special relevance for humans, since desire, as a universal, is projected into the future. The way Labbie discusses these points is remarkable: desire is a labyrinthine web of knots that Lacan attempted to mathematize, but the project ended in what Labbie does not hesitate to call a failure, which puts in evidence her independence from—and objectivity vis-à-vis—the Lacanian discourse of the master. Lacan was not the only psychoanalyst who attempted the mathematization of the unconscious in order to give it a more scientific status. In 1975, the Chilean psychoanalyst Ignacio Matte Blanco published The Unconscious as Infinite Sets. An Essay in Bi-Logic. Though such efforts are often aporetic, they are worth pursuing as they can lead to further discoveries. However, these attempts show the limits not only of psychoanalysis but also of the scientific discourse itself.

Labbie defines desire semiotically “as a sign of the real of the unconscious” (p. 11). It is the desire of the Other. As such, it is always out of reach. Its circular vortices have, it seems, no origin; a point Labbie mentions in a note on how important it is for psychoanalysis to explore the desire for origins (p. 224, note n. 6). Lacan’s Medievalism, interesting and stimulating as it is, cannot decide once and for all in what direction to proceed toward; in this sense it is like a Borromean knot itself, which is left to the reader to untangle. So many are the themes of this book that to fully grasp their relevance and get a general picture requires specific knowledge. Labbie is surely competent in literary matters and philosophy; however, when she discusses “the real” and realism in the philosophical sense it had in the medieval period, one might wish for more precision of expression and exposition. Her main point, though, is clear: the unconscious is something real. But, whether Lacan was committed to a realistic interpretation of the universals, is still an open question. And, in fact, Labbie herself is candid on this: Lacan oscillated between realism and nominalism. It is not surprising, since Lacan was ambiguous about almost everything. He liked to make puns and postpone answering the questions he himself had raised; he coined new words and nonce words that were left to the reader to decipher. But to give Lacan the attention he deserves, we should consider also that his use of language was a means to intrigue and seduce the listeners of his famous seminars.

Ultimately, Lacan was always in search of the Sovereign Good and happiness; a consoling conclusion for a book as captivating as Lacan’s Medievalism.

Marcella Tarozzi Goldsmith Marcellatarozzi@verizon.net
This book is a collection of essays commenting on Jacques Lacan’s yearlong seminar, which he titled Seminar XVII, the penultimate book of his major theoretical contributions. Seminar XVII, subtitled The Other Side of Psychoanalysis, came at a time of social and political upheaval in France and in much of the Western world. The time was 1969. Indeed, the cover of the book shows what appears to be a confrontation between a young student and a policeman. This photo is reminiscent of a famous picture from the 1960s protest era in the United States, a picture of a woman putting flowers in the gun barrel of a National Guardsman who had been called by President Nixon to quell campus demonstrations. So it was a time of revolution in many places and in Paris this was the “soil” that contributed to the development and change in Lacan’s theory. His choice of the words “the other side” I take to mean something between provocative and revolutionary. He is inviting us to think of what we don’t see in the psychoanalytic project, the underside, or the part hidden from view. It is a deconstructive position as it is borne of his personal revolution. He had been expelled from the International Psychoanalytic Association, in his words excommunicated, and he was holding his seminar within a new setting for the psychoanalytic movement: the university. He began the yearlong series of fortnightly lectures of Seminar XVII within the newly constituted Department of Psychoanalysis at the University of Paris. This department was under, and housed within, the Department of Philosophy, whose chair at the time was Michel Foucault, a revolutionary thinker as well. Foucault was the midwife for the birth of psychoanalysis within the university setting.

What does Lacan mean in “the other side”? What he means is that all social bonds, all human discourse, can be described in four types: the master’s, the university, the analyst’s, and the hysteric’s. Lacan was fond of putting his concepts into formulas, using what he termed “mathemes” as a sort of algebraic expression of his concepts. The four fundamental social discourses are all variations among four basic elements, or mathemes. These are the master Signifier (S1), Knowledge (S2), the divided Subject ($, that is, S with a line through it), and objet a, loosely defined as jouissance (something like pleasure but more complicated and ambivalent). What did Lacan think was the purpose that these four discourses were to serve? The contributors to this book try to answer this from and varied perspectives. Only two of the sixteen authors are from the United States with the majority from France, Australia, and Slovenia. Belgium and the Netherlands are also represented.

Like Freud, Lacan’s ideas touch other disciplines in a fruitful cross-breeding, areas such as linguistics, philosophy, and in this Seminar in particular, politics. This is logical in that he was lecturing at a time of great political and social upheaval and I believe he was attempting to explain this revolution, this “other side” of society, the reasons for its discontents. For what all contributors would agree on is that Lacan was speaking about the very nature of the social order, what binds social discourse together. The various authors delineate his four fundamental types of discourse or ways of structuring social interaction. These four discourses are the master’s, the university, the hysteric’s, and the analyst’s. All four represent combinations of what Lacan believed to be the fundamental elements of social reality and that these elements were in the process of change in 1970. He believed that the master’s discourse, built upon Hegel’s conception of the master/slave discourse, had been the original if not the dominant social bond, but that this had given way to the university discourse, the mode of social reality exemplified in bureaucracies. This was a shift from the patriarchal “monarchy” to one where knowledge, routine and procedure reigned supreme. In his article “Objet a in Social Links,” Slavoj Zizek wrote that the former Soviet Union was the “pure reign” of the university discourse, the ultimate bureaucratic form. Zizek described the analyst’s discourse as the revolutionary-emancipatory expression of individual subjectivity. It could
perhaps be said that this would describe the process of a psychoanalysis, the finding of one’s subjectivity beneath the alienating armor of identifications and defense.

But Zizek extends his reach beyond the clinic to the body politic. He believes that the agent of the social link today is objet a, the matheme Lacan called surplus enjoyment. Indeed, it is surplus enjoyment that drives the capitalist machinery, in Zizek’s words, promulgating the circular repetition of self-aggrandizement. The capitalist system provides products to satisfy every new and perverse mode of pleasure.

Lacan used the term jouissance for desire and its meaning combines aspects of desire, pleasure, and enjoyment without leaning toward any one of these elements. It is his answer to Freud’s drive but is not under the demand of an instinctual id as much as an unconscious that is, to use Lacan’s most famous line, structured like a language: like a language and not like a cauldron of primitive, instinctual need. In his article “Enjoyment and the Impossibility: Lacan’s Revision of the Oedipus Complex,” Paul Verhage begins by establishing some link between Freud and Lacan. Freud’s psychic apparatus is grounded in the prohibition of enjoyment. The same holds true for Lacan’s four discourses. If both systems depict the elementary objects of social relations, of social bonds, then desire (jouissance for Lacan) is the original driving force. But a desire for what? Freud ultimately believed that death was the final form of pleasure, that Thanatos eventually eclipses Eros. But let us return to Oedipus. Verhaghe believed that the role of father was not primarily to contain the desire, the jouissance of the child. The father’s role is to protect the child from engulfment by mother’s jouissance. Mother’s is the dangerous desire. Father’s limiting of mother’s jouissance gives the child space for the possibility of its own experience of desire. Verhaghe further describes how it is not the child’s fear of castration from father that leads to a renunciation of desire and identification but something else. Imaginary castration hides and blocks from view an elemental truth about being human—enjoyment is impossible from the moment that one speaks. This castration is symbolic, a given of structure says Verhaghe, and its agent is the father. At its heart jouissance is of the body. Animals do not “know” enjoyment; they experience it without knowing it. The human being is split off from the body with the emergence of the signifier through language and hence forever cut off from this primary, complete experience of pleasure.

Pleasure, prohibition, repression are all actors in both the Freudian and Lacanian dramas. In his article “On Shame,” Jacques-Alain Miller writes that in this contemporary drama shame has ceased to be a player. At the start of Seminar XVII Lacan told his audience of mostly analysts that they came “... because I happen to make you ashamed.” Miller believed that shame had always been conveyed by the gaze of the Other or the gaze of God. Miller described an account from Jean Paul Sartre’s Being and Nothingness. A man is looking through a keyhole and is absorbed in what he is seeing. We don’t know what he’s looking at. But then he hears footsteps and looks up at someone whose gaze is upon him: enter shame and the subject’s awareness of himself as an object in the world, now cut from the seamless transcendent experience of looking without self-awareness. Miller felt that Sartre was attempting to understand the subject’s “... fall in the status of this shameful reject.”

As a portent for the future, Eric Laurent in his article “Symptom and Discourse” is none too optimistic. He believes societies are moving toward a new definition of what it means to be human. He quotes Peter Sloterdijk’s 2000 lecture “The Domestication of Being” as an example of an ushering in of such a new definition. Francis Fukuyama echoes this warning in his book “Our Posthumous Future,” where he described how with medication society is trying to “remove the inequality of moods between the sexes” (Laurent’s words) through the use of Prozac and Ritalin. Medication allows the subject to approach a mean, “an ‘ordinary life’ that is now the experiential frame of our civilization.” Indeed, Laurent argues that in such a world guilt and shame are rendered useless virtues.

Lacan used language with some provocation in mind. Indeed, I think he believed that language itself is a provocateur. It offers this portal to a false promise, the possibility of a desire so purely gratified that we enlist the useless virtues. For Lacan, it is unspeakable, it the real. But the longing for it, the desire, is mobilized toward it, riding the wheels of words. But this does not make life meaningless. It is the search for meaning, the search for jouissance that connects the subject with her desire. I use the word her to provoke, not just something in you but something in me. It brings us back to one of the points in the book, the idea that it is mother’s desire that must not be provoked, and a maternal, feminine desire. This is where fear ultimately resides, not in the strong, castrating father of 19th century Europe. As one of the author’s contend, was this Freud’s heroic attempt

Continued on page 52
COMMENT: DREW WESTEN’S THE POLITICAL BRAIN

As a psychoanalyst who previously had done graduate work in political science, I read Westen’s book with a double perspective. I am aware that Westen (2007) is focusing on marketing, i.e., persuasion, and he is making a claim that emotions need to be evoked for effective marketing of ideas. He offers a number of suggestions for evoking emotions in the political realm. I question the weight he gives to the emotions, and more specifically his use of the neurosciences to support his recommendations. While reading Westen’s book and Waugaman’s (2008) review engendered this comment, it is an essay on the relationship of psychoanalysis and psychology in the political process.

In The Sane Society published in 1955 Erich Fromm wrote:

In an alienated society the mode in which people express their will is not very different from that of their choice in buying commodities. They are listening to the drums of propaganda and facts mean little in comparison with the suggestive noise which hammers at them. They use television to build up personal politicalities as they use it to build up a soap; what matters is the effect, in sales or votes, not the rationality or usefulness of what is presented. This phenomenon found a remarkable frank expression in recent statements about the future of the Republican Party. They are to the effect that since one cannot hope the majority of voters will vote for the Republican Party, one must find a personality who wants to represent the party—then he will get the votes. In principle this is not different from the endorsement of a cigarette by a famous sportsman or movie actor. (italics his p. 186)

So we got Reagan and later George W. Bush. After Mondale lost to Reagan he said that the 1980 election might be the last one in which issues are important. While Fromm bemoans the lack of rationality and debate, Westen emphasizes the primacy of emotions in politics and proposes ways to evoke the emotions. All political parties evoke emotions in political life. Anyone who has seen Leni Riefenstahl’s classic film, The Triumph of Will, that depicts Hitler’s attendance at the Nuremburg rally, can attest to the power of political imagery to evoke a positive response even where there is clear opposition to the principles espoused. It has always been done on an intuitive basis, without resort to the neurosciences.

When it comes to persuasion, Westen is aware that he is treading on the border of the ethical and unethical in the political realm. On page 17 he notes that he could choose to write the book as a 21st century scientific address to the princes—red and blue. He then says that by laying out his proposals he is “. . . stepping into some large, if not altogether savory, sixteenth century Italian shoes.” His clear reference to Machiavelli’s classic work, The Prince.

While Westen considers subliminal perception as used in advertising, and in politics, to be unethical he is less concerned with political marketing if the content is technically conscious but functionally unconscious or “implicit.” (italics and quotation marks his). For me this is a distinction without a difference. In the latter instance the words are not subliminal, but they are largely outside conscious awareness. He claims this use is not unethical since the stimuli are available to consciousness and are not deliberately misleading. One may ask what then is the intent of making something technically conscious, but functionally unconscious. He sees this procedure as an effective marketing rather than subliminal manipulation. He states “. . . the two are difficult to distinguish at the borders” (p. 59).

Westen lays out his ethics and they are personal ones. He will only work for the Democrats, thus not being an advisor to both sides. Since he reports voting for John Anderson over Carter perhaps he would work for only those candidates he believes in: a fair and principled position. A candidate’s conduct in areas unrelated to public service, or that are not part of a broader pattern, or were distant ones and not repeated, or involved sex with a consulting adult are unfair. These are rules of thumb so the critical issue is where he defines the borders. Again only specific cases will determine the borders. These rules reflect his concern about ethical issues and distinguish him from political marketers who will resort to any approach.

Westen’s main points are essentially two.

1. In the political process emotion not rationality is primary and needs to be evoked. Democrats must learn to evoke the emotions.
2. Knowledge of brain functioning can help in the political process hence the title of his book.

With regard to the first item, facts do not support his thesis. The facts that I refer to are actual election results that clearly suggest that factors other than evoking emotions are primary.

Westen’s ideal narrative maker is Bill Clinton. But looking at the official returns (thanks to Google), Clinton’s initial success is due to a split in the Republican Party. In
1992 his popular vote was only 43.3%. Yes, 43.3. The only state he carried with a majority was his home state. How could he win with such a small percentage of the vote? He could because Perot split the Republican Party polling 19% and Bush Senior polled 37.7%. In effect in 1992, 56.7% voted against Clinton to his 43.3%. Because of the Republican split Clinton could win the Electoral College votes. In 1996 after being president and after moving the Democratic Party to the center, he polled 49.23% of the popular vote, Dole, 40.72% and Perot 8.4%. In 1996 Clinton was ahead by a hair, .11% of the vote, polling 49.23% of the popular vote to Dole-Perot polling 49.12% of the vote. While Clinton picked up 6% of the popular votes in 1996 as an incumbent president who had moved the Democratic Party to the center, the country was basically evenly divided. Was he a better narrative maker or did he increase his vote because he shifted his narrative and political principles? In 1960 another good narrative maker, Jack Kennedy (I mention JFK in part because he is depicted on Westen’s web site, to which one has to go to get citations.), polled 49.7% of the popular vote to Nixon’s 49.5%, winning the popular vote by .2%, but success in the Electoral College was the result of questionable vote counting (and buying) in Texas and Chicago. Narratives and principles are inevitable, and important for all political parties have them; but factors other than narratives and the emotions they evoke may be more important. A split political party loses elections. George W. Bush learned an important lesson: don’t alienate your right wing base.

In Pennsylvania Westen notes that Democrat Casey was able to defeat Bush-supporting Republican Rick Santorum in the recent Senate race by being more assertive in the debates. However he makes no reference to what for me is an essential element of his victory. He was selected to run because he had a good reputation, was well respected, and was the son of a previous popular governor. But Casey, being Catholic and personally opposed to abortion, in a state with a significant percentage of Catholic voters, ran on the understanding that he did not have to support the Democratic position on abortion. He did not challenge the values of many in the electorate. An assertive candidate is important, but where a candidate stands on important issues to the electorate may well be more important.

Does knowledge of brain functioning and research have relevancy for the political process? When Westen discusses brain research, especially the amygdala, his citations are correct, but he extrapolates it to the political process in a way that is metaphorical and evocative. It is this extrapolation that is open to question. He states in explaining the Willie Horton issue in the Dukakis election: “The Bush campaign was successful in activating the public amygdala because the Dukakis campaign had undergone a radical amygdalectomy and hence never registered the danger” (p. 67). Does the public, an abstraction, have an amygdala? How does the above sentence differ from something like: The Bush campaign was successful in arousing base emotions of fear and prejudice in a way that Dukakis was unable to recognize and more importantly respond to. Is he on good scientific grounds in applying neuroscience data to the political process? I don’t think so.

In the 1950s Ford hired Ernst Dichter as a consultant for designing a car. His expertise was marketing using psychological and psychoanalytic concepts. A car was designed to represent various images that presumably would emotionally appeal to a customer. The Edsel was born and was a dud because there are other factors that enter into a decision to buy a car. Decisions are multi-determined and in the privacy of the voting booth many factors contribute to one’s decision. How one feels about the candidate is an important one, but this feeling may be a response to a host of rational factors. This is no different than any other important decision in life.

I am reminded of a story told early in my career that involved Theodor Reik and Sigmund Freud. Reik met Freud while walking on the Ringstrasse in Vienna and when asked how he was, he told Freud about some problem he was facing and a decision that he needed to make. Freud reportedly said, “My dear Dr. Reik, on the small things of life I analyze them fully, on the big decisions I let them come from within.” Letting them come from within incorporates both an affective and rational decision especially if one uses Fromm’s definition of rationality. Fromm (1973) criticizes the split between rationality and emotion that I believe is inherent in Westen’s thesis. Fromm would label rational “any thought, feeling, or act that promotes the adequate functioning and growth of the whole of which it is a part, and irrational that which tends to weaken or destroy the whole” (italics his p. 263).

Waugaman raises the important question why people vote against their economic interests. Fromm may hold an answer to this important question. When life enhancing “thought, feeling, and act” are not available because realistic conditions do not exist for their development, then life thwarting thought, feeling, and act take over. The decisions based upon the latter are a rational response to the existential condition in which he or she lives although from an ideal standard it is irrational. Waugaman is either implicitly using an ideal standard to judge people voting against their economic interests, or he is imposing his own values. People may vote against their economic interests because they feel thwarted in life growth and a political party offers what at the moment appears as a rational decision for one’s existential dilemma.

Political forces of all stripes have used, exploited,
Psychoanalytic books or given meaning to peoples’ existential dilemmas for ages. Becker (1975) has described the heroic image as a way cultures help individuals cope with evil and death. Existentially we all desire a heroic effort to overcome our awareness of the finiteness of our lives and experience as evil anything or anyone who we feel potentially thwarts this desire. Power structures manipulate this desire often with images that are destructive to the individual. Only by being aware of the way the heroic image is used by the power structures can some degree of reason appear in decision-making.

Andrew Samuels (2008), a Jungian analyst in Britain, active in IARPP, and a political consultant who has written on the interface of psychoanalysis and politics, recently spoke about the “heroic leader.” Political leaders need to appear and act forcefully to reinforce the image of being a heroic leader who will protect us and be a repository for our political anxieties. Westen’s suggestions are ways to fill this image. No Democrat should be another Dukakis. However, Samuels raises the question whether this needs be the case. What he poses is a “good enough” leader who can acknowledge mistakes. In his talk, Samuels alluded to Tony Blair who received the highest voter ratings in British history when he entered office and the lowest voter ratings when he left office. This dramatic emotional shift, from idealization to denigration, is due to facts or changed realities and is not much different from what we experience as analysts. One can see a similar phenomenon with George W. Bush’s poll numbers. In the course of an analysis an analysand will both idealize and denigrate, but as Glover once noted as a saving grace, we are not as bad and not as good as the patient make us out to be. This is true despite what we may have contributed to the patient’s experience. Emotional reactions reflect the reality of a person’s experience but changes as the reality changes.

Given the nature of marketing in politics today with its emphasis on personality, sound bites, and trivia what is a voter to do? The ethical principle of the marketplace is buyer beware. The voter, as buyer, needs to be aware of the persuasive message he is being sold, and hopefully sees beyond the candidate to comprehend his actual message and which forces he represents. Again Fromm may be useful since he always emphasized the need to see beyond the illusion of the society as illustrated in Hans Christian Andersen’s, The Emperor’s New Clothes. Can the voter see reality, i.e., beyond the illusions, images, and propaganda that are aimed at his emotions? Can he see the dangers in a heroic leader upon whom we identify and emotionally attached to in order to cope with our experience with death and evil and consequently transcend our lives? Becker holds that by exploring the nature of evil and the heroic image it is possible to have some degree of reason occur in our decisions. I will conclude with a hopeful possibility that a modicum of reason is possible today. The first Republican president, Abe Lincoln, reportedly said, “You can fool some of the people, all of the time, all of the people some of the time, but you can’t fool all of the people all of the time.”
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The APA Summit on Violence and Abuse in Relationships was selected by Alan Kazdin, APA President, as part of his presidential initiative. The Summit was held February 28-29, 2008 in Bethesda. The topics for the summit included: Intimate Partner Violence, Child Maltreatment, Children Exposed to Intimate Partner Violence, Sexual Violence, Peer and Dating Violence, At Risk Groups, Substance Abuse/CoMorbidly and Vulnerable and Special Needs. The focus of the Summit was on What We Know, What We Need to Know and Where Do We Need to Go with respect to research, intervention and prevention. The Summit was co-coordinated by Division 35 (Psychology of Women) and Division 56 (Trauma Psychology) of APA. The Summit brochure is available at: http://reisman-white.com/associations/4888/files/APAprog_%C6%92.pdf as a download. Division 39 was one of the APA Divisions who served as collaborators to the Summit and a five-member delegation attended. The following are their reports:

**Marilyn S. Jacobs, PhD**

**Los Angeles**

In 2007, I was asked to be the Division 39 representative to the planning committee for the APA Summit on Violence and Abuse in Relationships. The impetus for this meeting was the view of Alan Kazdin that APA needed to make a wide-ranging commitment to this complex social problem. There were representatives from eighteen APA Divisions involved in the planning. We had our first meeting at APA in 2007 and subsequent communications by e-mail and conference call during the next months. I was asked to co-coordinate (along with Christopher Kilmartin) the Legislative Advocacy Workshop for the Summit sponsored by the APA Office of Governmental Affairs.

My rationale for participation in the planning of the Summit—to bring psychoanalytic thinking to this endeavor—was a challenging one. As many of us in Division 39 with direct involvement with APA have experienced, psychoanalysis is not easily packaged for those outside of its realm. Nonetheless, having had some experience with this role in recent years, I thought I could make a contribution. When the call for speakers went out I suggested for consideration the names of many of our Division members who have written and presented in the areas of abuse, violence and trauma; however, only one of our own was considered. This was Judith Alpert, and she was not asked to speak about psychoanalysis per se. Nonetheless, she was asked; and she is a psychoanalyst and a scholar of high repute with an expertise in trauma.

I also wanted to have as many of our Division members attend the Summit. With the support of Nancy McWilliams and the Division Board, I was able to put together a delegation of Division 39 members representing members, early career members and graduate students. This was gratifying. I am thankful for the time and participation of the Division 39 delegation: Judith Alpert, Marilyn Metzl, Rachel Barbanel-Fried and Bethany Schaer.

The Summit, as well as the Legislative Advocacy Workshop, was rewarding and informative. Alan Kazdin noted that he hoped that the Summit would have an enduring impact on APA and the public. I learned a lot from the plenary sessions. An intriguing example: Why violent crime has dropped in the US from the period 1994-2005? There is no clear answer, but it is hypothesized that the discovery and availability of Prozac, the legalization of abortion, the continued U.S. prosperity and the increasingly U.S. prison population are variables which could explain the phenomenon. There were many other diverse perspectives represented in the plenary sessions and it was heuristic to considering so many new ideas.

The breakout groups were equally edifying.

In the one I attended (and facilitated) I noted evidence based practice is not seen as the final answer for the discipline of psychology among clinicians, advocates and researchers alike. Also, many psychologists who are not psychoanalytically oriented equally value context and subjectivity. One can engage with psychology colleagues in a discussion of process and find that one is ultimately speaking psychoanalytically with those who may not have the same language as one schooled in contemporary psychoanalytic thought.

The visit to Capitol Hill highlighted democracy at work and how psychologists can provide expertise to those who define and determine social policy. Future possibilities for psychoanalysts on the Hill are indeed something to consider! It was enjoyable to meet with the aides to Representative Henry Waxman from my home district in West Los Angeles and with my Congressman.

To everyone I encountered, I emphasized that I represented Division 39 and that “I am a psychoanalyst.” I emphasized that psychoanalysts are interested in making a contribution and sharing our knowledge with our colleagues. As I have learned before, once we begin to speak of our tradition we can stimulate interest and garner respect for our ideas. But it is an arduous and at times...
frustrating process. Yet, as psychoanalysts, we are obliged to continue the dialogue whenever we can as a part of our professional role.

**Judith L. Alpert, PhD**
**New York**

We all wear many hats. For the APA Summit on Violence and Abuse in Relationships, I was invited to present a paper that considered child maltreatment and to specifically discuss the state of knowledge and gaps in knowledge in this area. Following is the introduction to this paper.

I have never forgotten Bill. He was my patient in psychoanalytically oriented psychotherapy over twenty years ago. He was happily married and had two children. Work was going well for Bill also as he had a secure, creative position in an advertising firm. As I listened to him, I kept wondering what was bringing him into treatment. Nothing seemed wrong with his present life. Slowly he told me about the demons from the past and how he knew it was important to confront them in some way.

His demons: he never knew his father, and his mother was a drug addict who brought men home to their studio apartment and who paid her for, as he put it, “services.” Meals and, often, food, were not routinely a part of his life. At the age of seven, he felt responsible for feeding his younger siblings, ages 5 and 3. And he did this by stealing food from the school cafeteria and prostituting himself on New York City’s 42nd Street. He told me that social services were never involved with his family and that he somehow limped along in this way until he got a scholarship and went to college.

We talked a lot about how well he was doing, especially in light of his history. I wondered aloud, for example, how he learned to be such a caring father who would read to his children and build skyscrapers with them when no one did that for him. He then told me about his teachers. They were dogs. Yes, literally, dogs. While hanging out on 42nd Street, he would see parent dogs caring for baby dogs and stray dogs caring for each other. He watched them. He studied them. In this way he learned about caring, kindness and empathy.

I mention this story in the context of gaps in knowledge. I have never read a study indicating the pedagogical skills of dogs. I am not suggesting a new tool for parent training. Rather, by this brief narrative, I am pointing to what we all know: some kids fall through the cracks, and some kids survive by means we know little about.

I wonder as well if there were teachers or other school staff who knew about Bill’s life. If no one did, why didn’t they? And if they did know, why wasn’t he helped early on? School was the one and only institution that had regular contact with Bill. While Bill survived his horrific childhood, many neglected or abused children do not survive.

I ended the paper by calling for more training in child abuse and neglect for the next generation of psychologists.

**Marilyn Metzl, PhD**
**Kansas City, MO**

I was happily planning a weekend in Canyon, Utah envisioning a glorious few days of skiing when the call came from Marilyn Jacobs saying, “We need you!” The ensuing fight between my Ego, which wanted to race in the powder of Utah and my Superego, which said “Do not be a child, it is important that you represent Division 39 on the Hill, petitioning to help protest the cuts to Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) and to represent psychoanalysis at the Summit on Violence and Abuse in Relationships in Bethesda was intense. Needless to say, my Superego won, and my participation was meaningful and informative.
Hopefully we were able to accomplish our goal of successful legislative advocacy by protesting the proposed Presidential FY 2009 budget cuts that influence the welfare of women, children, families, and the disadvantaged in our society.

I was particularly impressed with the excellent preparation and skill of the APA Office of Public Interest Government Relations, especially the work of Annie Toro (Associate Executive Director), Diane Elmore (Senior Legislative and Federal Affairs Officer) as well as Joslyn Smith (Senior Legislative Assistant) and their support staff. By the time that we arrived on the Hill, we were well prepared for the visit as we had been provided with an intensive briefing that reviewed what we had been taught about government since the fourth grade.

The actual Summit was equally impressive. Professionals with expertise in trauma from various disciplines (i.e., clinical work, research, practice, and public policy/advocacy) joined together to share their perspectives on the prevention of violence and maltreatment of women, children, and minorities. The presentations and discussions considered means of stemming violence, particularly victimization, unwanted pursuit, sexual aggression, victimization, and dating violence. Participants from academic departments of psychology, direct services clinics, government agencies such as the Center for Disease Control (CDC) and shelters for protection against violence joined together to share information and to expand future directions.

It was particularly interesting for me to interact with professionals and communities with whom I have limited contact in the course of my daily clinical work as a psychoanalyst. I was also stunned to realize from discussions with participants of the misperception of psychoanalysis as a field that was out of touch, insular, elitist, and not familiar with the literature on violence and abuse. One comment during a breakout group implied that psychoanalysts were not familiar with research design and statistical methodology since they only treated patients and didn’t read the relevant literature. This view was compounded by the well-meaning jibe of a question that asked “Is there really a need for psychoanalysis in Kansas City?” My response that in Kansas City, Missouri we in fact have two psychoanalytic institutes—representing both contemporary and traditional views of psychoanalysis—as well as an active local chapter of Division 39 was met with surprise and incredulousness.

I was delighted to be one of the participants representing psychoanalysis at this forum, to give and receive information, and most importantly to show that as psychoanalysts, we have a lot to contribute to the prevention of violence and abuse and treatment of its victims. Although recently, along with Gerald Stechler, I presented a paper at a meeting of Division 39, “Hiding Our Psychoanalytic Identity,” this Summit made me realize that we have to do a better job of revealing our psychoanalytic identity.

RACHEL BARBANEL-FRIED, PSYD
WASHINGTON, DC

I have lived in Washington, DC for the past eight years. The year of my postdoctoral training I drove past the U.S. Congress twice each day on my way to and from work. I was at a school with children who were living in extreme poverty in Southeast DC. The juxtaposition of what I drove by and what I drove to has not left me. I have many friends who work “on the Hill,” but February 28th 2008 was the first time I visited Congress. On that day I participated in APA’s Federal Advocacy Training for the Summit on Violence and Abuse. The morning started with an interesting and informative presentation on the federal legislative process. Next we split into smaller groups to learn how to effectively share our expertise with policymakers and how to gain federal support and funding for trauma, violence and abuse programs.

After lunch I rushed off for my early appointment at the office of Washington DC’s Delegate to Congress, Eleanor Holmes Norton. I was excited as I walked into the Rayburn Building and found my way to her office. Her staff greeted me and we sat down to discuss the Children’s Abuse Protection and Treatment Act (CAPTA). As I was going through my presentation Representative Holmes Norton walked in and stopped to talk with me. She has been in office since 1991 and generally wins her elections by about 90%. She’s much taller than I expected and had a no-nonsense way about her. As I told her about CAPTA she quickly said, “Well we should support that! I’ll sign onto that letter. Get me the information.” While I was happy to have her agree to sign on I can’t deny that I was a tad bit disappointed that I didn’t have the opportunity to practice my points of persuasion.

That evening and the next day were the Summit itself. I met many interesting people who were doing important work all over the country. One of the best talks I heard was entitled “Shattering the Silence: Intimate Partner Abuse and Women of African Descent” by Thelma Bryant-Davis. But her presentation was only one among many. Subsequently, I described my experiences of the Summit and the legislative advocacy training workshop to a friend who commented; “I never thought that I would see you so jazzed about trauma and abuse!” The time was well spent and I feel hopeful that we as a profession and as an organization are doing good work that is having real effect on people’s lives.
BETHANY SCHEER, BA
WASHINGTON, DC
The recent APA Summit on Violence and Abuse was an exciting, educational and empowering experience. The conference was successful in its aim of encouraging attendees to work outside the familiar psychological milieu while uniting psychological professionals from across APA divisions.

The first part of the conference involved advocacy training for the two federal programs due for refunding: the Child Abuse Prevention & Treatment Act (CAPTA) and the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). I participated in the CAPTA training, where I learned about the provisions for the prevention, assessment, and treatment for abused and neglected children that have never come into full fruition due to a shortage in funding. I then met with the aide to the Congressman in my home state of Michigan to urge that office to support a full funding of CAPTA. This experience allowed me to gain a new appreciation for the legislative processes that determines much of the work I have and will be doing in clinical psychology. Most importantly the experience allowed me to see that I have a great deal of agency as a psychologist-to-be. I realized my input was considered important and could truly influence the degree to which an act gets attention in Congress, directly affecting the degree to which my patients get the resources they need for treatment.

The second part of the training involved a summit of individuals from almost twenty APA Divisions, who all had the same goal in mind of gaining a better and more global understanding of the interpersonal violence and abuse. While these endemic issues are often connected to psychopathology, there is remarkably little common language and communication within the field of psychology about these environmental problems. The lack of clarity about what qualifies as abusive within the social service community (corporeal punishment, date rape, etc…), confounds our ability as professionals to create a united front against violence and abuse. Perpetrators of domestic violence (or neglect) are often ignorant of the severity of their crimes and their victims are often quiet, in fear of the stigma of victim-hood. The Summit taught that lessening the occurrence and stigma of violence and abuse in interpersonal relationships involves a change within ourselves, the field of psychology and the community at large.

APA has planned for the Summit to be held forthwith every other year in rotation with the APA National Multicultural Conference and Summit. In addition, a Summit Mini Convention will be held at APA 2008 in Boston.
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to rescue the declining father? Was this the decline of the master’s discourse, the crumbling of empires and kings at the end of the 19th century? The trajectory of discourse, from master’s to university’s, is illuminated in the rise of the great bureaucracies of the 20th century, vast monolithic powers replacing czars and mandarins.

So what was Lacan trying to tell us in using the words “the other side” of psychoanalysis? Up to 1970 we had been on one side, and Lacan saw himself as being able to detect something in western culture, some paradigm shift. I think he saw this as a seismic shift, something revolutionary, certainly something political. Indeed, many of the authors in this volume chose to comment on the meaning of the other side in political and economic life. Even though Lacan probably would not have agreed, I think Seminar XVII is a question of what it means to be human.

Thus, I believe it is still in the realm of a humanistic tradition, in part because Lacan is not telling us that he knows what it means to be human. He is telling us that the attempt to know oneself takes at bedrock four fundamental ways, or discourses. I think he believed we were missing something and that a revolution in psychoanalytic thinking was in order. We had been too long on one side, now it was time to be on “the other side.”

Perhaps this book is relevant today as we struggle to find some sense of ourselves, straining to exist under the weight of late capitalism and the lure of an experience of “surplus jouissance.” Do all these authors, from all over the globe, continue to find something in Seminar XVII that propels them to do what I am attempting this moment: to understand what Lacan was trying to say, to relate it to my experience in the clinical setting and in my own life.

In the true spirit of Lacan, reading this book leaves one with more questions and fewer answers. But it does inspire one to think about the psychoanalytic project and to appreciate how others across the globe see this project. The understanding of what it means to be human is important not only for the consulting room but also to understand those larger social and political forces we find ourselves swirling around in. Lacan felt societies and psychoanalysis were both in the midst of profound change in 1970 and in the midst of the whirlwind he was trying to bring our gaze to “the other side” of psychoanalysis. I am still searching for what that might mean and in that sense I think I’m experiencing what Lacan intended in those lectures now thirty-some years ago.

Greg Novie
novosatko@msn.com
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Marilyn S. Jacobs, PhD
MJacobsPhD@aol.com
The following are new or newly renewing members for last year through March of this year. Please look over the list and see if you recognize someone you know and be sure to welcome them to Division 39.

- Daisy Abreu, Puyallup, WA
- Yasser Ad-Dabbagh, Ottawa, ON
- Deborah Agrest, New York, NY
- Akeela Ali, New York, NY
- Micki Alperin, Boca Raton, FL
- Sharon Alperovitz, Kansas City, MO
- Garth Amundson, Oak Park, IL
- Melissa Anderson, Gladwyne, PA
- Christine Anzieu-Premmereur, NY, NY
- Jessica Armstrong, East Elmhurst, NY
- Cheryl Arutt, Beverly Hills, CA
- Tal Astrachan, New York, NY
- Laura Athey-Lloyd, Bayside, NY
- Galit Atlas-Koch, New York, NY
- Linda Attoe, Toronto, ON
- Marybeth Atwell, Grand Rapids, MI
- John Auerbach, Johnson City, TN
- Tanja Auf der Heyde, New York, NY
- Ron Aviram, New York, NY
- Ehud E. Avitzur, Thornhill, ON
- Yael Babad, Jerusalem, Israel
- Carl Bagnini, Port Washington, NY
- Lawrence Ballon, Atlanta, GA
- Rodrigo Barahona, Brookline, MA
- Ann Baranowski, Toronto ON
- Rachel Barbanel-Fried, Washington, DC
- Fatima Barbosa-Hertz, New York, NY
- Clarissa Barton, Toronto, ON
- Patrick Bartos, Portland, OR
- Graham Bass, New York, NY
- Dawn Bates, Seattle, WA
- Peter Battista, Bowling Green, OH
- Kathy Behrend, New York, NY
- Rivka Bekerman-Greenberg, NY, NY
- Jon Belford, San Francisco, CA
- Catherine Benoist, Chicago, IL
- Eric Bergemann, Los Angeles, CA
- John Bergeron, Cambridge, MA
- Allen Bergson, New York, NY
- Michelle Berman, Aston, PA
- Meredith Bernfeld, Brooklyn, NY
- Susan Bernstein, San Francisco, CA
- Deborah Berry, New York, NY
- Kelly Bertrand, New York, NY
- Susan Bertstein, San Francisco, CA
- David Bialik, Grand Forks, ND
- Joseph Bianco, Athens, OH
- Cathie Bird, Pioneer, TN
- Susan Bliss, Ridgefield, CT
- Aileen Blitz, New York, NY
- Rebecca Block, Brooklyn, NY
- Carla Bluhm, New York, NY
- Susan Blum, New York, NY
- Christopher Bollas, Pekin, ND
- Richard Bollinger, La Mirada, CA
- George Bombel, Toledo, OH
- Elena Bonn, Westlake Village, CA
- Natasha Bonnin, San Francisco, CA
- Sarah Bothe, San Francisco, CA
- Susan Boulware, Sacramento, CA
- Jessica Boyatt, Cambridge, MA
- Susan Boyd, St. Clair Shores, MI
- Anthony Bram, Topeka, KS
- David Brandwein, Staten Island, NY
- Lisa Braun, Centerport, NY
- Jill Bresler, New York, NY
- Abby Brewer-Johnson, San Diego, CA
- Nancy Bridges, Belmont, MA
- Paul Brinich, Chapel Hill, NC
- Glenn Bromley, New York, NY
- Harvey Brooker, Toronto, ON
- Rachel Brooks, Menlo Park, CA
- Lawrence Brown, Newton Centre, MA
- Julia Brown, Evanston, IL
- Christiane Burnett, San Francisco, CA
- Anna Burton, Englewood, NJ
- Jane Caffisch, New York, NY
- Laura Caghan, Los Alamitos, CA
- Marcy Caldwell, Philadelphia, PA
- Rosemarie Camasco, Wellesley, MA
- Elizabeth Canick, Roslindale, MA
- Paul Cantz, MA, Chicago, IL
- David Carreon-Robledo, Mexico, DF
- Marie Carrese, Malverne, NY
- Susan Carswell, Wallingford, PA
- Frances Lea-Jeri Carter, Seattle, WA
- Joseph Cattano, Freeport, NY
- Shannon Chanofsky, West Chester, PA
- Rosalind Kindler, Toronto, ON
- Mary Tatum Chappell, Alexandria, VA
- Lisa Chase, Minneapolis, MN
- Gary Chase, Frisco, TX
- Rukhsana Chaudhry, Washington, DC
- Olivia Chavez, Chicago, IL
- Don Chiappinelli, Fredericksburg, VA
- Andrew Chirchirillo, St. Louis, MO
- Umi Chong, Arlington, VA
- Anna Christopoulos, Athens, Greece
- Diana Clark-Campbell, Cape May, NJ
- Philip Classen, Toronto, ON
- Enika Cocoli, Northfield, VT
- Lisa Colangelo Fischer, Phoenix, AZ
- Kathleen Coletti, Oakland, CA
- Andrew Colitz, Brooklyn, NY
- Paul Cooper, New York, NY
- Abigail Corrigan, Toronto, ON
- Tanya Cotler, New York, NY
- Wendell Cox, Washington, DC
- Stephanie Creekpaum, Indianapolis, IN
- Diana Cuello, Pittsburgh, PA
- Claudia Cumes, Highland Park, NJ
- Wendy Cummings, Cape, CT
- Leslie Cutler, Beverly, MA
- August Cwik, Arlington Heights, IL
- Barbara Davis, South Orange, NJ
- Kristin Davission, Chicago, IL
- Peter De Backer, Erith, UK
- Stephanie de Buffevent, NY, NY
- Hope Dean, Berkeley, CA
- Joseph DeAngelis, Tewksbury, MA
- Darren Del Castillo, Oxford, OH
- Lauren DeMille, Brooklyn, NY
- Brian Denietolis, Melrose, MA
- Seth Dennis, Philadelphia, PA
- Fowler Denton, Lexington, KY
- Douglas M. DeVille, Boston, MA
- Bernadette Di Toro, San Diego, CA
- Karen Dias, Coatesville, PA
- Nicholas M. Dion, Toronto, ON
- Jennifer Dotson, Jamaica Plain, MA
Lane Gerber, Seattle, WA
Andrew Gerber, New York, NY
Bertram Gibbs, Kingston, RI
Dan Gilhooley, Bellport, NY
Christine Girard, New York, NY
Lee Carter Glancey, Bryn Mawr, PA
Debra Gleason, Ocala, FL
Madeline Gleich, New York, NY
Karen Glick, Pequannock, NJ
Peter Glick, New York, NY
David Goldberg, Birmingham, AL
Daniel Goldberg, Princeton, NJ
Lisa Goldfine, New York, NY
David Goldfinger, Cambridge, MA
Brenda Goleburn, New York, NY
Michele Gomes, Los Angeles, CA
David Goodman, Boston, MA
Alla Gordon, Allentown, PA
Ora Gourarie, Highland Park, NJ
Prudence Gourguechon, Chicago, IL
Christopher Graves, Dallas, TX
Sandra Green, New York, NY
Michelle Green, Niagara Falls, ON
Susan Greene, San Francisco, CA
Wendy Greenspun, New York, NY
Kyle Grohmann, Vienna, VA
Efrat Hadar, Haifa, Israel
George Hagman, Stamford, CT
Hannah Hahn, New York, NY
Roderick Hall, Coronado, CA
Erin Hammond, MA, Quantico, VA
Edward Hanna, London, ON
Katharine Hanson, Newton, MA
Catherine Haran, New York, NY
Elizabeth Hardy, Dayton, OH
Lane Harmon, Tucson, AZ
Ilan Harpaz-Rotem, New Haven, CT
Rachel Harris, Baltimore, MD
Joan Harrison, Providence, RI
Stephanie Haun, Miami, FL
Jenny Heller, Amherst, MA
James Heller, Los Angeles, CA
Ellen Helman, Miami Beach, FL
Lynne Herbst, Larchmont, NY
Bruce Herzog, Toronto, ON
Tanya Hess, Philadelphia, PA
Cynthia Hockett, East Lansing, MI
Pauline Hodson, Oxford, UK
Elizabeth Hoffman, New York, NY
Paige Holliman, Nashville, TN
Julietta Holman, Belmont, MA
David Hoover, Wheaton, IL
A. Raja Hornstein, San Rafael, CA
Rachel Hovne, Pittsburgh, PA
Eleanor Huber, New York, NY
Jason Hutchings, Plantation, FL
Totaro Ichimaru, Hiroshima, Japan
John Iddiols, Toronto, ON
Melissa Ilardi, Brooklyn, NY
Ioanna Ioannou, Providence, RI
Lauren Irwin, New York, NY
Gillian Hemmings, Petersfield, NH
Sam Izenberg, Toronto, ON
Meghan Jablonski, Brooklyn, NY
Susannah Jacobi, New York, NY
Melissa Jacobs, Los Angeles, CA
L. Jacobs-Caffey, Westlake Village, CA
Barbara Janetzke, Pasadena, CA
Ryan Janis, Santa Monica, CA
Martha Joachim, Los Angeles, CA
Michael Jody, East Hampton, NY
Therese Johnson, Mercer Island, WA
Justin Jones, New York, NY
Michael Jones, Delphi, IN
Gina Joy-Reyes, Ft. Lauderdale, FL
Lisa Juliano, New York, NY
Nancy Julius, New York, NY
Beth Jung, New York, NY
Beth Kaflka, Davis, CA
Khemchandani Kanchan, NY, NY
Frances Kane, Morrisville, PA
Angelica Kaner, New Haven, CT
S. Montana Katz, West Stockbridge, MA
Adrienne Katzow, MA, Brooklyn, NY
Naoto Kawabata, Kyoto, Japan
Judith C. Kayloe, Lake Worth, FL
Jane Keat, New York, NY
Isolde Keilhofer, New York, NY
Katherine Keon, San Francisco, CA
Stephen Kerzner, Duxbury, MA
Kasra Khorasan, Toronto, ON
Shianling King, New York, NY
Sharon King, Santa Fe, NM
Alan Kintzer, New York, NY
Steve Kirschner, New York, NY
Douglas Kirsner, Melbourne, Australia
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City, State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan Klebanoff</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Koch</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Komisar</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Kranz</td>
<td>ME, Tucson, AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Kraut</td>
<td>Rogers, AK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudette Krizek</td>
<td>Dade City, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Kruft</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Kuchuck</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Kuntze</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eve Kupferman</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Kvaal</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Kwako</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Kyne</td>
<td>Nashville, TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigette Ladisch</td>
<td>Chevy Chase, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Lake</td>
<td>Bronx, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Lashley</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Foglino</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
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Lisa Samstag, New York, NY
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Misa Tsuruta, MA, Tokyo, Japan
Judy Turner, Toronto, ON
Barbara Turner, Seattle, WA
Judy Turner, Toronto, ON
Sandra Undis, Philadelphia, PA
Mark Vail, Washington, DC
Kate Vanden Bergh, Berlin, VT
Alberto Varona, Berkeley, CA
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Thomas Zurfluh, San Francisco, CA
The Sexualities and Gender Identities Committee (SGI) was formed in 2001 and grew out of the Division’s Sexualities Interest Group, which was conceived of by Division past presidents Maureen Murphy and Jonathan Slavin. SGI’s mission is:

1. To conduct needs assessments of the membership of Division 39 regarding LGBT concerns and issues;
2. To give voice to all members with an interest in this topic as it impacts the affairs of the Division;
3. To make recommendations to the Board for actions which need to be taken regarding the place and needs of LGBT members;
4. To sponsor regular programming at Division meetings;
5. To act as consultants to Division members with respect to issues related to sexuality and gender;
6. To maintain contact with APA Division 44 (The Society for the Psychological Study of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Issues), promote joint programming, provide an updated view of psychoanalysis to LGBT psychologists in APA who may have felt, for very good reason, antipathy toward psychoanalysis, and invite members of this and other divisions with like-minded interests to join with us.

For the past seven years, SGI has sponsored symposia at the Division’s Spring Meetings, which were initially conceived of as an ongoing discussion group on sexual object choice. For the most recent incarnations of this symposium, the purpose has been to provide a forum for discussion about sexuality and gender issues in psychoanalytic theory and clinical work in general. Specific foci of the panels have included sexual object choice, non-normative desire, transgender concerns, aging gay men, and bisexuality. Proudly, our panel on non-normative desire was, and our panel on a generation gap between younger and older gay men will be, published in one of our field’s high quality journals. Further, panels have always included seasoned, well-known analysts (e.g., Muriel Dimen, Diane Elise Lynne Layton, Deborah Luepnitz, Debra Roth, Elisabeth Young-Bruehl) as well as newer professionals (Ken Maguire, Scott Pytluk, Andy Suth) and graduate students (Priscilla Butler & Bethany Riddle). We regularly receive very positive feedback from conference attendees about the significant time our panel has devoted to actual discussion among the panelists and audience members.

After co-sponsoring great conference receptions with the Division’s Multicultural Concerns Committee for several years, this past April the two committees joined forces with Sections II and VIII to host an even more highly attended and elaborate reception!

SGI collaborations with Division 44 have been ongoing, including the first jointly sponsored Division 39/44 symposium at APA’s annual convention, a jointly hosted reception at the annual convention, and an interdivisional grant sponsored project. This project entailed development of curricula for undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate training in LGBT-affirmative psychoanalysis that we presented at APA’s annual convention last summer and have begun disseminating electronically.

Future SGI efforts include updating and enlivening our link on the Division’s web site in the upcoming months. We hope to include useful resources like the curricula mentioned above as well as Internet links to assist our membership with interests in sexuality and gender concerns.

This past April, at the Spring Meeting, one of SGI’s cochairs visited the Multicultural Concerns Committee board meeting and a liaison from that committee visited the SGI’s board meeting. Our intention is to work on substantive collaboration (beyond cohosting receptions) with the Multicultural Concerns Committee and we are excited about the great ideas that have been already floated.

Finally, we welcome correspondence from Division members and would also like to invite members interested in serving on our committee to make themselves known. Please do not hesitate to contact either SGI Co-Chairs Scott Pytluk at <spytluk@argosy.edu> or Kenneth Maguire at <DrKennethMaguire@gmail.com>

CORRECTION

The Winter 2008 issue included a profile on the new editor of Psychologist-Psychoanalyst and I managed to misspell the names of both the author of the profile (Dan Livney, not Daniel Livney) and the editor (Elliot L. Jurist, not Elliott M. Jurist). My apologies to both.
Continuing Education

Laura Porter, PhD

The Continuing Education Committee was pleased to offer more than 60 opportunities for participants at the 2008 Spring Meeting to earn continuing education credits. While still a relatively new perquisite for our yearly gathering, we hope that members enjoyed the meeting and are finding a groove with the ins and outs of the CE process. With so many interesting programs available, however, it is entirely likely that participants missed one or more presentations of interest. Good news! Two selected programs from this year’s meeting will soon be available online. For a very nominal fee, two credits can be earned for each of these programs. Simply read the papers involved, then complete the post-test and program evaluation. If the post-test score meets the required standard (80%), you will receive an e-mail invitation to submit payment to the Division 39 office. Upon receipt of payment, a Certificate of Attendance will be mailed to you. Detailed instructions for using these online programs will also be available on the Division 39 web site.

In the meantime, however, please don’t miss the four programs already available online for CE credits (currently free of charge for members) and ready for your use. From the 2006 Spring Meeting in Philadelphia are text versions of “EST, EBT, EBPP: What Might This Alphabet Soup Spell for Psychoanalysis?” and “Strengthening Relationships in Couples.” From the 2007 Spring Meeting in Toronto are text versions of “Stuck in the Middle with You: Impasse and the Restoration of Clinical Momentum” and “Slipping through the Cracks: Unexplored Ethical Issues in Everyday Practice.” To access these programs, begin on the Division 39 Web site home page, then see “Click Here for Division 39 Online CE Project.”

The Section V (Psychologist-Psychoanalyst Clinicians) Web site (http://www.sectionfive.org/) provides another exciting opportunity to receive CE credits and also can be accessed through the Division 39 web site. Once on the Section V Continuing Education web page, the text of the “Turning Point” papers (with articles by Winnicott, Levenson, Rubinstein, Kestenberg, Des Pres, Ferenczi and Freud) are provided, each with introductions and commentaries by distinguished teachers. The Section V site also provides follow-up references, a link for purchasing the texts, and an online list, which allows Section members to continue to dialogue further about the readings. Three CE credits can be earned by reading each paper.

From the Editor

William A. MacGillivray, PhD, ABPP

In her president’s column (pp. 1–4), Nancy raises the question of our identity, focusing on the contrast between our practical ideals of being successful clinicians (including economic success), and our ethical ideals of challenging the social and cultural order when needed (including our own parent organization). As a Division, we have a “home” to seek comfort and security in knowing that others share our ideals and values. A more important challenge for the Division and its members, however, is to go out from this home to bring psychoanalytic ideals and values to the wider profession, to the public and to the wider culture. I believe we are doing a good job in reaching out to both other psychoanalysts and other psychologists, at least on an organizational level. At the same time, psychoanalytic ideas and concepts are increasingly marginalized among researchers, in clinical training programs, in mental health clinics, as well as the wider society. In this column, I would like to address these issues and suggest some things we as a Division might do about this.

Psychoanalysis languished for many years as a “stepchild” within APA, just as psychologists languished as “stepchildren” within American psychoanalysis. The establishment of the Division was a signal triumph in bringing into one broad tent psychoanalytic colleagues who needed a home for their ideas and energy (and for that all important sibling rivalry). At the same time, psychoanalytic psychologists had less reason to “stay and fight” for psychoanalytic ideas within other Divisions of APA. In an important sense the only ones left fighting are psychoanalytic researchers who seek to remain part of the academy, to publish in its journals, to gain influence in its institutions and so on.

At this point, I can only refer the reader back to the article by Drs. Luytens, Blatt and Corveley (pp. 6–10) that explores the increasing gap between psychoanalytic researchers and clinical practitioners and suggest ways to bridge this gap. What I do want to offer is that one reason for this gap may be that psychologist psychoanalysts increasingly operate within a narrower social and intellectual world that they did in the past and do not typically have to engage with other professionals who have vastly different conceptions of what is and is not a legitimate area of inquiry or way of studying. Psychoanalytic researchers, in contrast, are always on the “front lines” of psychology.

While there are many legitimate grievances psychoanalytic researchers have toward their colleagues in academia who blithely dismiss anything that sniffs of a Freudian concept, while eagerly poaching psychoanalytic
Recently, Bill Gottdiener organized an excellent Poster alive in the academy and in clinical training programs.

What I want to emphasize, however, is that the changes wrought in the last 10-20 years as managed care has made inroads into practice, as psychologists have largely been replaced in mental health settings by lesser trained individuals, and as clinical training programs increasingly emphasize the need to bring in grant research funding to the detriment of actual clinical training, is that we end up increasingly “preaching to the choir,” developing collegial and practice relationships with other psychoanalytic clinicians. We do not typically have to explain psychoanalytic ideas to those who are not likeminded (except, of course, our patients). This “circling the wagons” is understandable, especially when surrounded by social, cultural and financial forces that are constantly attacking; but it certainly impoverishes us, as well as the clinic, training programs, psychological science, as well as the culture at large.

I think one of the very important accomplishments of our Division leaders over the last ten years has been an increasing determination to “sit at the table” with anyone and everyone whom we seek to influence and inform. These efforts have largely been directed at other psychoanalytic organizations and at our own APA. Division 39 representatives sit on the Psychoanalytic Consortium and psychologists whose primary affiliation has been with the Division sit on the Accreditation Council for Psychoanalytic Education. Division 39 has had an active presence at the Multicultural Summit for many years, and we were an active presence at the Summit on Violence and Abuse in Relationships (see pp. 49-52). Our colleagues are increasingly represented on APA Boards and Committees. Equally important, our members have been leaders in challenging APA’s position on basic ethical principles and its position on psychologists’ involvement in interrogation of detainees, while at the same time maintaining and sustaining collegial relationships with those with whom we disagree.

For all these efforts, psychoanalytic thought remains marginalized within the academy and in the wider culture. As a Division, we have some work to do to involve psychoanalytic researchers in the life of the Division and to support their efforts to keep psychoanalytic thought alive in the academy and in clinical training programs. Recently, Bill Gottdiener organized an excellent Poster Session at the Spring Meeting (summaries of this session will appear in the Summer 2008 issue of the newsletter); and this is one way for the Division to support and involve researchers. Clinicians need to make an effort to recognize the value and importance of research, just as psychoanalytic researchers also have a way to go to reach out to clinicians and make their findings relevant and useful. Psychoanalytic researchers are the only ones who can consistently and forcefully keep psychoanalytic ideas “at the table” of clinical theory and training. I hope the newsletter will help further this increased collaboration and dialogue. The new journal editor, Elliot Jurist, has also indicated desire to have research articles become a regular feature of the journal.

The larger theme of this column has been to explore ways to bring psychoanalytic ideas and values to the wider world. While psychoanalytic researchers are on the “front lines” of our profession, bringing psychoanalytic ideas to the rest of society is an undertaking that we all must share. We have made important allies in this task by joining with APsaA in developing educational materials that can be used at a variety of levels (Lowder and McWilliams, 2007). Larry Joseph’s article (pp. 17-19) also suggests how psychoanalytic ideas can be communicated effectively to undergraduate students. If we are to succeed, however, we will need to find ways to make sure that psychoanalytic ideas find their way back into the mainstream of our culture. Recently, our colleagues Drew Westen (in The Political Brain: The Role of Emotion in Deciding the Fate of the Nation) and Bryant Welch (in State of Confusion: Political Manipulation and the Assault on the American Mind) have advanced this goal by bringing psychoanalytic insight and sensibility to bear on the political process. These and other efforts will be needed to make psychoanalysis relevant again.

In writing this article, I was reminded of Elizabeth Danto’s Freud’s Free Clinics, on the early years of psychoanalysis. One aspect of the history that struck me was the extent to which psychoanalysts were at the forefront of the social and cultural issues and challenges of the day. Danto describes a particular scene of Wilhelm Reich lecturing in the streets to passersby on the need for sexual freedom, while his colleagues distributed condoms to the crowd. When the police showed up to arrest him, he counseled the angry crowd to recognize that the police were men like they were, sexually and politically repressed, and should not be hated or resented! As a Division, as psychoanalysts, we may not seek to reprise Reich’s actions, but his daring, his energy, and his willingness to challenge the social order remains an important ideal to emulate.
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Among the Section’s noteworthy activities since our last report was our invited panel at the Division Spring Meeting in New York. The panel was titled “Discovering Versus Finding in Analytic Work,” and featured papers by Albert Brok, president of Section I and Robert Oelsner, a member of the Section and special guest from Seattle, WA, where he is a training and supervising analyst, and faculty member and chair of the curriculum committee of the Northwestern Psychoanalytic Society. He is also an associate professor and clinical supervisor in the Department of Psychiatry at the University of Washington, and an authority on the British School of Object Relations. His paper was titled, “On the Babies of Klein and Bion.” Dr. Brok’s paper was called “God Sometimes Plays Dice with the Universe.” Dr. Helen Gediman was moderator, and William Fried served as the discussant. His discussion was titled, “Psychological and Epistemological Limits to Human Knowing.”

Late Friday afternoon, 4/11, a reception was held for early career professionals in the President’s Suite and hosted by Nancy McWilliams with her accustomed grace and warmth. It was cosponsored by Sections I and V, and several members of the Section I board were in attendance. Helen Gediman, the Section's membership chair, brought recruitment materials including copies of the Round Robin for distribution to prospective candidate and student members. Board members took advantage of the opportunity to engage the ECPs in discussion regarding the advantages of membership in the Section.

In addition to the social and collegial purposes ordinarily served by the Section I reception (Saturday, 4/12), it featured a very special occasion: the presentation of an award to Batya Monder, who, after 5 superb years as editor of the Round Robin, has relinquished the position to pursue other worthy professional goals. President Albert Brok expressed the board’s profound gratitude to Batya in an original rhymed composition that captured the essence of the occasion with wit and charm. Batya’s remarks in accepting the award included generous praise for everyone who’d helped her to be successful as editor; in the last analysis, however, her success is attributable to her many talents, literary, journalistic, and interpersonal.

Following the presentation of the award Jane Kupersmidt, the newly-appointed editor of the Round Robin, and Gemma Ainslie, the newly-appointed associate editor, were introduced. The board joined Dr. Brok in wishing them their own success as they assume stewardship of the newsletter.

On Sunday, April 13th, Dr. Oelsner, along with his wife, Mirta Berman-Oelsner, who is also a training and supervising analyst and faculty member at the Northwestern Psychoanalytic Society, conducted a workshop on Klein and Bion at the office of Dr. Brok. It was attended by 11 candidates and interested Div. 39 members, and in addition to its substantive value, it was an effective recruitment event.

Looking ahead to August, the Section will present an invited panel at the APA Annual Meeting in Boston. It will be called “Limits and Limitations to Intimacy: Quasi Affairs, Convenient Assumptions and Induced Responses.” The panel will consist of two papers, the first by Albert Brok “Disavowal of Knowing: A Factor in a Good Relationship or Malady of an Ideal?” The second paper, by Stephen Miller, secretary of Section I, is “Induction: Punishment Fantasies and the Construction of Conscience in the Interpersonal World.” The panel will be chaired by Section I member Marilyn Metzl, who will also serve as discussant.

Further in the future, around October 2009, the board is planning a program for presentation to a local chapters group in Tucson, AZ. The subject has not yet been finalized, but the negotiations are being worked out, with enthusiasm on both sides.

Noteworthy in the preceding paragraphs is the participation in the Section’s substantive programs of recently recruited and new members with whom contact was originally made in the course of the board’s visits to psychoanalytic enclaves in various parts of the country and even in foreign countries. For example, before Robert and Mirta Oelsner became members of Section I, they were in the audience of a presentation made by members of the board on a visit to Seattle. Subsequently, they invited William Fried, then president of the Section, to be a principal speaker at a conference on the British School of Object Relations that was held in November of 2007. Likewise, the board first met Marilyn Metzl during a visit to Kansas City, MO, where Helen Gediman presented a paper on self-disclosure. Dr. Metzl later became a member of the Section and, as already noted, will be the discussant of our panel in Boston.

In similar fashion, after being invited to deliver a stimulating interpretation of the work and thought of Jacques Lacan to a group of members and potential members of the Section, on November 18th, 2007, Federico Aberastury, an analyst from Buenos Aires, Argentina, joined the Section.

Our aim is to reach out to the psychoanalytic community both here and overseas to recruit new members who will play a prominent role in our substantive programming as well as in our development as an organization.
Elgan Baker has passed the baton of presidency to David Downing. Beatrice Beebe and Frank Lachmann shared the Morton Schillinger Award for their unique and fundamental contributions to psychoanalytic theory. For their invited presentation, they applied the techniques of split camera observation they have used so importantly in studies of infant/caregiver interactions to the equally significant rhythms of analyst/analysand interactions.

David Lichtenstein has assumed editorship of the Section V Web site <sectionv.org>. The current issue of The Sphinx, Section V’s on-line journal offered to all members of Division 39, is devoted to pragmatic case studies in psychodynamic psychotherapy. The issue features Bertram Karon’s case of Mr. X, a supposedly incurable schizophrenic patient, whom he treated solely with psychoanalytic insight. Larry Davidson, Gary VandenBos and Ann-Louise Silver discuss the case. The editor of Fort Da!, an on-line journal based in Argentina, requested the right to reprint one of Section V’s accredited CE articles, which was gladly granted.

In Boston for the APA Convention in August, Section V’s Invited Panel will be cosponsored with Division 42 on the vital topic of using medication, “Doctor, What about Pills?” David Downing and Stefanie Glennon will chair a double session devoted to various aspects of the relationship of prescribing psychotropic medication and psychoanalytic understanding.

Section VIII continues to be active and creative, as we pursue our goal of promoting the understanding and treatment of the psychological needs of couples and families, throughout the Division 39 community, using a psychoanalytic framework. We held the first meeting of our continuing study group, “Psychoanalytic Couple Therapy: Recent Ideas and Ongoing Study” in New York, in conjunction with the Division 39 Spring Meeting. Shelley Nathans, a Section VIII member-at-large, presented a brief, thoughtful overview about Working With Difficult Couples, together with a case vignette, which a group of 25 attendees discussed. Our next meeting will be on Saturday, August 16, at the Boston APA Conference, with a Conversation Hour in the Hospitality Suite of Division 39, from 10 to 11:50 am.

We are co-sponsoring the Third International Conference on Psychoanalytic Couple Therapy, with the Society of Couple Psychoanalytic Psychotherapists (SCPP), in London. “Contemporary Couples and Their Inner Worlds” will be held from August 14-16, 2009, in the Boston area. This conference has a unique format that provides presenters and participants the opportunity to explore ideas in depth and engage in small-group discussions with couple therapists from around the world. A number of our section members attended the first two International Conferences that SCPP held in England and Scotland, and were enthusiastic about them. For more information, please contact Antonia Halton, at tonihalton@rcn.com, or Joyce Lowenstein, at js.lowenstein@verizon.net.

We continue to focus on multicultural issues, and their intersection with couple therapy. Our Invited Panel at the Division 39 Spring Meeting, “The Namesake: Emerging and Submerging Cultural Identity in the Melting Pot,” included clips from the film, guest speaker Prof. Mina Tharoor from NYU, and brief papers on topics such as arranged marriages and family conflicts between the first and second generations. We also cohosted a Joint Reception with Section II, the Committee on Multicultural Concerns, and the Committee on Sexualities and Gender Identities, which was a great success.

The Division 39 Spring Meeting was quite wonderful, and more than 25 members of Section VIII presented papers, or held discussion hours there. Only a few of these presentations actually dealt with couples or families, so that Section VIII still has some work to do. Leading us in our continued efforts are our new president, Marilyn Metzl, our treasurer, Deborah Clendaniel, our secretary Susan Abelson, and our new and continuing board members Roanne Barnett, Shelly Goldklang, Thomas Greenspon, Marilyn Meyers, Shelley Nathans, Justin Newmark, and Susan Shimmerlik.
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throughout the 2007-2008 year, The Chicago Association for Psychoanalytic Psychology (CAPP) sponsored midweek continuing education programs on a variety of topics featuring local clinicians. From the University of Chicago, Paula Ammerman spoke on “Submission Surrender: Breakdown and Repair within the Relational Paradigm” in November. Also from the University of Chicago, William Borden spoke on “Integrative Approaches in Psychodynamic Psychotherapy,” illustrated with a videotaped treatment session in January. CAPP member and candidate of the Chicago Center for Psychoanalysis, Susan Burland presented “Integrative Psychoanalytic Couple/Family Therapy: Minding Unconscious Experience,” in April. CAPP thanks council members Alice Bernstein, Nancy Peltzman, and Dennis Karamitis for organizing these presentations.

CAPP traditionally sponsors two half-day conferences each year. Conferences feature theorists/writers/clinicians from across the U.S. as the main speakers. In September, Steven Knoblauch presented “Body Music and the Unconscious” that integrated clinical theory with a jazz performance. In May, CAPP presented “An Afternoon with Robert Stolorow: The Evolution and Clinical Application of Intersubjective Systems Theory.” In addition, on September 20, 2008 CAPP is excited that Estelle Shane has agreed to be the featured speaker for the Fall Conference. Christine Kieffer and Bernadette Berardi-Coletta were instrumental in organizing these larger continuing education experiences. Information about upcoming presentation topics and registration forms can be accessed at www.cappchicago.org.

In addition to CE Programs and Conferences, CAPP provides other ongoing supportive services to clinicians at all professional levels. Susan Burland has facilitated an Early Career Group in the western suburbs for several years that has been so well attended that Debra Carioti is organizing a second group in the Chicago loop. Jay Einhorn chairs the Peer Study Group committee and has successfully launched a number of ongoing monthly study groups in various Chicago-area locations. In addition he has offered time-limited groups focused on the study of spirituality in psychotherapy. Bernadette Berardi-Coletta has facilitated a Student Affairs group that discusses clinical theory and facilitates development of a professional identity in its predoctoral student members.

Becca Meyer and Matt Wadland are organizing CAPP’s end-of-year party, planned for June 13, 2008. This year, the party will also include recognition of Frank Summers and Gary Walls for their tireless, committed work in educating psychologists about the history and future implications of APA’s position on the employment of psychologists in detention centers involved in the torture of prisoners.

Rhode Island Association for Psychoanalytic Psychotherapies (RIAPP) is pleased to host James Herzog at our Spring 2008 Conference, presenting on “Father Hunger.” We are also pleased to host Donnel Stern, who will present on “Narrative and Non-sense” at our Fall Conference. We are working to involve our membership more in programs and continue to offer at least one monthly meeting a year to local analysts or analysts in training who want to present their work. Past President Billy Brennan will present his research in February 2009.

The RIAPP web site should be up and running by June of this year. Outgoing president, Louis Rothschild, is taking the lead on this much-anticipated project which is moving along swiftly. RIAPP is fortunate to have an energetic and competent soon-to-be Past-President. We are in the beginning stages of entertaining the possibility of conducting local (Providence and Boston) analyst interviews for inclusion and linking on the web site. As archival material increases, we hope to continue to creatively engage the membership in conversation as we build and document our history as a society. One of our original founders, Doug Bernon, has graciously volunteered to start the process of forming a roster of likely interviewees and will interview colleagues once the roster is moderately robust and we have mastered the technology.

In addition, we are talking to a local theater—2nd Story Theater—about bringing psychoanalysis to productions. Also in the formative stage, this is an exciting opportunity to dovetail thought provoking theater with psychoanalysis. Rhode Island Hospital’s Partial Program Director Rendueles Villalba, leads an existing monthly post-play audience discussion event at 2nd Story Theater called “Shrink Rapt.” While still in the planning stages, RIAPP is working to join forces with 2nd Story and Dr. Villalba to make the structure for a panel he will moderate. The panel is proposed to consist of the play’s director, Dr. Villalba, and a psychoanalyst. We will watch the play; listen to panelist papers relative to their interpretations and thoughts. A trio of panelists will then engage the audience of professionals and non-professionals to discuss their impressions. We are hoping to eventually expand our typical Saturday Fall and Spring Conferences and if we get a good response to the psychoanalysis-at-the-theater event, this may be an ideal Friday night prelude to the Saturday Conference.
Southeast Florida Association for Psychoanalytic Psychology (SEFAPP) is ably led in 2008 by our board members, including Tony Virsida, Michelle Channing, Marshall Fenster, Richard Steinberg.

SEFAPP was honored to have Marilyn Charles from Austen Riggs Center present for our Sunday Brunch on “Two Hands: Point and Counterpoint in Culture, Theory, and Therapy” in March. Future brunches will include Emily Krestow on “Eating Disorders,” Richard Steinberg on “Psychoanalysis and the Movies,” Linda Sherby on “Love in the Therapeutic Relationship,” and Scott Winfield on “Bringing the Body into the Therapeutic Process.”

SEFAPP has had a number of distinguished presenters at its conferences in the last months. Wilma Bucci spoke on “Looking Beneath the Surface of the Therapeutic Relationship.” She focused on the view of the researcher, who attempts to look at implicit as well as explicit aspects of the therapeutic interaction, including aspects of which neither therapist nor patient may be aware. Linguistic measures developed in the context of Bucci’s theory of multiple coding and the referential process were applied to both verbatim session transcripts and case reports, to identify potential points of opportunity in the treatment, points of impasses, and possible mechanisms of change.

SEFAPP also sponsored jointly, with the Florida Psychoanalytic Association, a conference at which Donnel Stern presented on “Unformulated Experience.” Darlene Ehrenberg presented in January “On the Clinical Importance of Working in the Intersubjective Moment.” Dr. Ehrenberg presented cases in which her concept of the “intimate edge” was furthered developed. In February, Joe Lichtenberg presented an all-day conference on “Sensuality and Sexuality in the Therapeutic Setting.” Dr. Lichtenberg looked at the development of sensuality and sexuality from infancy to adulthood. He first discussed the origins of the divide between sensuality and sexuality in infancy then looked at manifestations of these in the 4-6 year old period, and concluded with their development in adolescence and adulthood. Some upcoming SEFAPP conferences include “Ethical Decision-Making for Psychoanalytic Psychologists” by Steve Behnke in May, and Ghislaine Boulanger on “Adult Onset Trauma” on October 4, 2008.

An annual event that always generates a positive impact on SEFAPP and its membership is our annual Freud Onset Trauma” on October 4, 2008.

and hardworking Cristina Virsida, who has put in many extra hours, included Carol Keating, Emily Krestow, Shirley Malove, Lisa Schulman, and Tony Virsida.

SEFAPP has started several new initiatives including study groups and peer groups. Our web site has been updated and is widely used by the membership. We are also starting a new program with a goal to serve the reservists and families who have been impacted by the Iraq war.

Vermont Association for Psychoanalytic Studies (VAPS) has had an enriching and full year of conferences and activities. In January, we hosted Mary Kay O’Neil from Montreal, who presented a half-day conference entitled “The Purpose of a Professional Will.” Dr. O’Neil helped attendees consider steps they should be taking to ensure that clinical and business aspects of their practices would be ethically handled should they become incapacitated or die.

In February, we held our annual business meeting, combined with a case presentation by one of our members and a panel discussion of the case. In April, we socialized with one another at a wonderful event held at a local restaurant. It was nice to be able to enjoy one another’s company in a less formal setting.

May brought Rafael Lopez-Corvo south from Toronto to present a Bionian perspective on “The Three Phases of Interpretation.” In September, we held a full-day conference on ethics and psychoanalysis with Elizabeth Goren. Dr. Goren’s topic was “Beyond Risk Management: Exploring Ethical Issues in Everyday Practice.” Finally, we held our annual scientific meeting in November. We were delighted to welcome Haydee Faimberg from the Paris Psychoanalytic Institute. Dr. Faimberg discussed “The Telescoping of Generations.” This conference was preceded by a workshop in which Dr. Faimberg explored, through literary examples, concepts such as the unseen, unheard, and “un-listened to” moments in psychoanalysis.

Two other exciting developments for us in 2007 were the establishment of an Applied Psychoanalysis Committee and the ongoing work of our Research Committee. The Applied Psychoanalysis Committee focuses on the application of psychoanalysis to the arts and has planned a VAPS’ member art exhibit, a speaker on psychoanalysis in the visual arts, and other events. Film reviews have been published in our quarterly newsletter, and a film and discussion series is planned. In February 2007, our Research Committee awarded its biannual $1,000 prize to Barry Waterson for his study, “Treating Affect Regulatory Disorders in Public Schools.” The next award will be presented in 2009. The Research Committee is also organizing an upcoming conference on research and psychoanalysis.
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING MINUTES
SATURDAY, AUGUST 18, 2007
NIKKO HOTEL, SAN FRANCISCO, CA

PRESENT: N. McWilliams, President; D. Ramirez, Past President; D. Debiak, Secretary; M. McCary, Treasurer; Council Reps: L. Barbanel, J. Darwin, B. Karon, D. Morris, L. Wagnner; Members-at-Large: M. Charles, M. Cresci, C. Kieffer, J. Logue, W. MacGillivray, M. Metzl, J. Slavin, L. Zelnick; Section Reps: A. Brok, Section I; J. Bellison, Section II; M. Kelly, Section III; D. Downing, Section IV; E. Baker, Section V; G. Stechler, Section VIII; F. Summers, Section IX; M. Jacobs, Past Secretary; L. Rothschild, Membership Committee Chair; J. Tabin, Sections I & V Candidate Outreach Committee; F. Goldberg, Federal Advocacy Coordinator.

I. CALL TO ORDER: Dr. McWilliams called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m.

II. ATTENDANCE: Dr. Debiak reviewed the following substitutions: Dr. Baker for Dr. Prince (Section V Representative); Dr. Jacobs for Dr. Slavin (Member-at-Large, when he is not in the room); Dr. Kelly for Dr. Toronto (Section III Representative); Dr. Rothschild for Dr. Morris (Council Rep, when she is not in the room)

III. APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING, APRIL 20, 2007: Dr. Debiak

Motion 1: To approve the draft minutes of the Board of Directors meeting of April 20, 2007 as submitted. Action: Passed unanimously

Dr. McWilliams thanked Dr. Jacobs for her service as Division secretary and her willingness to work with Dr. Debiak in the transition into the Secretary position.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. APPOINTMENTS: Dr. McWilliams
1. Dr. Tillman as Ethics Committee Chair
2. Dr. Ramirez as Fellows Subcommittee Member
3. Dr. Ruth as Outreach Committee Chair

B. ELECTION RESULTS: Dr. Ramirez announced the results of the Division 39 elections:
1. President Elect: Mary Beth Cresci
2. Council of Representatives: Laurel Bass Wagner and Laura Barbanel
3. Member-at-Large: Larry Zelnick, Bert Karon, Nina Thomas

C. STATUS OF CRSPPP APPLICATION: Dr. McWilliams will be working with ABPP and the Academy to appoint a new committee chair to make certain that future applications will be done in a timely manner and that they are written in a way that will ensure their acceptance. The current application is on the consent agenda for Council.

D. BOARD MEETING: The next board meeting will be held January 26, 2008

V. TREASURER’S REPORT: Dr. McCary reviewed the financial statements, emphasizing that the current year has been problematic financially. The reserve account is expected to be considerably lower than in former years. It is customary to have approximately one year of operating expenses in reserve, and the Division will fall well below that for 2007. She intends to recommend strict measures that will build up our reserves by $25,000 per year.

The Spring Meeting in Toronto incurred a loss of $3000-$4000. Since $27,000 was the expected income, this made a net loss to the budgeted overall income for the Spring Meeting of approximately $30,000. In addition, publication expenses also increased unexpectedly this year to $66,000 from $44,000. Dr. McCary also noted that an outlay of $10,000 to PEP was unbudgeted.

On the positive side of the ledger, Dr. McCary reported that the electronic publication disbursement was approximately $19,000 more than expected. She informed the board that the electronic publications would continue to be an income resource for the division.

Dr. McCary reviewed cost-cutting measures already taken, such as changing the November EC meeting to a conference call. Dues have been increased $10 across the board. Passing the motion to drop the paper publication of Psychoanalytic Abstracts would save approximately $6.00 per member. To save printing, mailing and postage, the candidate statements were not sent out as a mailing; and a motion will be presented to have electronic voting for the Division elections.

VI. BUDGET ISSUES: Dr. Ramirez updated the members on the role of the finance committee. This committee meets to assist the treasurer in assessing the financial situation. The following decisions were made:

A. CHANGE IN FALL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING: The meeting will be a conference call rather than a face-to-face meeting. This will save several thousand dollars.

B. ADDITIONAL SAVINGS: The committee is looking at a budget that is cost-saving in many ways in order to
bring the Division back to a better financial situation.

C. FUNDING OF SECTION REPRESENTATIVES’ TRAVEL EXPENSES: Because the Section Representatives come from entities with a separate source of income, Dr. Ramirez originally proposed not funding Section Representatives to attend the board meeting in January. Discussion was held on this issue, with the outcome that Dr. Ramirez withdrew his proposal.

**Motion 2:** To cease funding travel expenses for Section Representatives to the Board. **Action:** Withdrawn

VII. OLD BUSINESS

A. UPDATE ON FREUD AT 150: This book was a cooperative endeavor of the members of the Consortium and the Austrian Embassy to the United States. Dr. Jacobs reviewed her report on the project.

B. UPDATE ON APA SUMMIT ON VIOLENCE: Dr. Jacobs referred to her written report and briefly summarized this summit.

C. BYLAWS REVISIONS: Drs. McWilliams, Ramirez, Rothschild, and Debiak

1. Artic le IV, Section 3h (Publications Committee):
   Dr. McWilliams read changes to Lines 446-480.

**Motion 3:** To approve the revisions to Article IV, Section 3h of the Bylaws as submitted. **Action:** Passed unanimously

2. Articles II and V (Membership & Elections):
   Drs. Ramirez and Rothschild read changes to Lines 88-137, 242-273.

**Motion 4:** To approve the revisions to Articles II and V of the Bylaws as amended. **Action:** Passed unanimously

3. Article IV ( Committees): Dr. Debiak read changes to Lines 278, 290, 335-344, 377-380, 441, 475-481.

**Motion 5:** To approve the revisions to Article IV of the Bylaws as submitted. **Action:** Passed unanimously


**Motion 6:** To approve the revisions to Articles III and VIII of the Bylaws as amended. **Action:** Passed unanimously

The bylaw changes will now be sent to the Division 39 membership for ratification. The board thanked the Bylaws Committee for a job well done.

D. CONSORTIUM REPORT: Dr. Wagner

**Motion 7:** To approve funding of $6000 to ACPE over the next three years beginning in 2007. **Action:** Passed unanimously.

E. PRACTICE DIRECTORATE REPORT: Drs. Russ Newman and Elizabeth Winkleman. Dr. Newman discussed several issues relevant to the practice community, including privacy. He then opened the floor for questions and comment. This will be his last report to Division 39, as Dr. Newman is leaving APA and taking a position with Alliant University.

F. PSYCHOANALYTIC PSYCHOLOGY EDITOR SEARCH: Dr. MacGillivray

**Motion 8:** To appoint Dr. Elliot Jurist as editor of Psychoanalytic Psychology as of January 2008. **Action:** Passed with two abstentions

**Motion 9:** To thank the members of the Search Committee and Chair Maureen Murphy for their work in selecting the new editor of Psychoanalytic Psychology. **Action:** Passed unanimously

G. PSYCHOANALYTIC ABSTRACTS PROPOSAL: Dr. Tabin

**Motion 10:** To discontinue printing the hard copy of Psychoanalytic Abstracts and to so inform APA Press. **Action:** Passed unanimously

H. PEPWEB SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR DIVISION MEMBERS: Dr. McWilliams updated the Board on the progress of sign-ups for PEPWEB. Over 200 members have taken advantage of this benefit, and it is expected that more will do so as their subscriptions through other organizations run out. Income from new members who join to get the PEP perquisite may offset some of the budget deficit.

I. BOOK PROPOSAL PRIZE: Dr. Tabin described the progress of the Publications Committee in developing a prize for a psychoanalytic book proposal. APA Press will fund this with a $1000 prize.

J. RELATIONSHIP WITH JASON ARONSON: Dr. Tabin reviewed the progress toward book club and other connections with this psychoanalytically oriented department of Rowman and Littlefield Publications.

K. LIASON WITH DIVISION 19: Drs. Darwin and Will Wilson from Division 19 made a short presentation on the
value of joint activities between our divisions.

L. **Acknowledgement of Maureen Murphy and Bart Magee for organizing the Division 39 program for the APA convention.** The Board expressed thanks for the excellent accomplishment.

VIII. **NEW BUSINESS**

A. **Membership Committee Report:** Dr. Rothschild elaborated on his written report.

B. **Review of Section Membership:** Dr. Debiak reported that Sections III and VI have not submitted their membership numbers. All other sections have submitted their numbers and have at least 150 members. Maureen Kelly reported that Section III may have only 103 members.

IX. **Council of Representatives Report:** Drs. Barbanel, Darwin, Karon, Morris, and Wagner. Dr. Wagner described how Dr. Altman’s moratorium resolution was not supported by APA’s Board of Directors or any reviewing committee. In light of this the APA Board of Directors introduced a substitute motion detailing specific behaviors psychologists are prohibited from engaging in. However, it did not include a prohibition against psychologist’s participation in interrogations of detainees in settings where their human rights are not preserved. Division 39 collaborated with other Divisions and certain committees to come up with a far stronger motion than that offered by the Board of Directors.

This motion will be presented to the Council of Representatives for debate and vote on Sunday, August 19. All participants in this new substitute motion agreed that an amendment calling for the role of psychologists to be limited to health care provision only will be presented at Council, thereby allowing the debate on the role of psychologists in interrogation to take place. The APA Board of Directors agreed to allow this substitute motion to replace its motion and agreed that a debate on the amendment should take place.

X. **Presentation by Education Directorate:** Dr. CatheGrus described the purview of and resources available from the Education Directorate.

XI. **Committee Reports**

A. **Multicultural Concerns Committee:** Dr. Tummalala-Narra did not appear but submitted a written report.

B. **Candidate Outreach Committee:** Dr. Tabin elaborated on her committee’s written report. She also requested that we make permanent the reduced registration fee for candidates and that we drop the requirement that candidates stay in the host hotel. This requirement is particularly inapt for the NY Spring Meeting since so many NY candidates won’t need hotel rooms.

C. **Task Force on Psychoanalysis and Health Care:** Drs. Jacobs distributed her written report and reviewed it. She briefly summarized the work of this Task Force.

**Motion 11:** To formally change the Task Force on Psychoanalysis and Health Care to a Continuing Committee of the Division. **Action:** Passed unanimously

D. **Early Career Professionals Task Force:** Dr. Charles referenced the report of Winnie Eng on Early Career Psychologists and recommended that their task force become a Standing Committee of the Board.

**Motion 12:** To make the Early Career Professionals Task Force a Standing Committee of the Board. **Action:** Passed unanimously

E. **Continuing Education Committee:** Dr. Porter did not appear but submitted a written report.

F. **Graduate Student Committee:** Dr. Slavin reported that Tanya Cotler from Adelphi is the new co-chair of the committee, along with new committee members from Texas and California. Further new members are being sought. There will be special workshops for graduate students at the Spring meetings, as well as outreach to graduate programs in the New York area for the upcoming meeting.

G. **Education and Training Committee:** Dr. Downing elaborated on his committee’s written report. He attended the Board of Educational Affairs Advocacy Breakfast and found that others there were surprised that a psychoanalyst was involved in the Board’s advocacy efforts. He also talked about NCSPP’s efforts to define and measure competencies in clinical psychology, a potentially problematic way of assessing therapeutic effectiveness.

H. **Ethics Committee:** Dr. Summers elaborated on Dr. Maroda’s report (included in the agenda packet) on the research this committee conducted on home offices.

XII. **Miscellaneous Items**

A. **Section II:** Dr. Zelnick reported that Section II is collaborating with JICAP on a conference on treating children and adolescents in NY.

B. **Section III:** Dr. Kelly reported that Section III is collaborating with Division 35 and other divisions on family life initiatives.

XIII. **Adjournment:** There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Dennis Debiak, PsyD, Secretary
Ruth E. Helein, Recorder
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING MINUTES
SATURDAY, JANUARY 26, 2008
NEW YORK HILTON, NEW YORK


I. CALL TO ORDER: Dr. McWilliams called the meeting to order at 8:43 a.m. She asked members to introduce themselves and say a few words.

II. ATTENDANCE: Dr. Debiak announced the following substitutions: Dr. Altman for Dr. Karon (Member-at-Large); Dr. Dauphin for Dr. Downing (Section IV Representative); Dr. Kohutis for Dr. Logue (Member-at-Large); Dr. Monder for Dr. Toronto (Section III Representative)

III. APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING, AUGUST 18, 2007: Dr. Debiak

MOTION 1: To approve the draft minutes of the Board of Directors meeting of August 18, 2007 as submitted ACTION: Passed unanimously

IV. Announcements

A. General Announcements: Dr. McWilliams

1. Dr. McWilliams updated the Board on Dr. Karon’s condition and rehabilitation following his auto accident.
2. Dr. McWilliams acknowledged departing Board members and welcomed new Board members.
3. Dr. McWilliams discussed some of the accomplishments of 2007 such as PEPWEB access discount for Division members; new bylaws; new journal editor; work on the moratorium; our “Vote 10” efforts resulting in an increase of Council Reps to a total of seven for 2009; the acceptance of our renewal for psychoanalysis as a specialty; the status of the Wisdom Project; and the progress of joint projects with the American.
4. Dr. McWilliams asked members to read Drs. Wagner and McCary’s respective articles in the current newsletter. She acknowledged Dennis Debiak for his work on the Annual Report to APA.
5. The recent national Conference on Psychoanalytic Education had over 50 percent of the speakers from Division 39.
6. Five people from the Division will attend the Summit on Violence in February.
7. The Fellows Committee is working on Fellow applications; Dr. Ramirez is the new Chair.
8. The “Freud at 150” book is in its second printing.
9. Jason Aronson Publications is no longer going to sell psychoanalytic books.
10. Usha Tummala-Nara will serve as Division 39 representative to CEMA.
11. Judie Alpert is waiting to hear if she was accepted to APA President Alan Kazdin’s Task Force on Violence and Trauma.
12. Ken Eisold did not win the Levinson award; he will be nominated again this year.
13. Devon Charles King will join the Membership Committee and be trained to take over the chair position.
14. The January 2009 Board meeting will be held in conjunction with the National Multicultural Summit. The EC meeting will be held the evening of January 16th and the Board meeting will be held on Saturday the 17th in New Orleans.

B. REVIEW OF APPORTIONMENT BALLOT AND BYLAWS REVISIONS RESULTS: Dr. McWilliams announced that the division regained the one position lost for this year and added 2 more positions for a total of 7 Council Reps for 2009. Also, the recent bylaws amendments proposal was passed by the membership.

C. ELECTIONS: Dr. Ramirez summarized the number of nominees needed for the ballot and stated that Dr. Darwin will take over chairing the committee as a consequence of his interest in running for a Council Rep position.

D. 2009 NATIONAL MULTICULTURAL CONFERENCE AND SUMMIT: Dr. Ramirez gave a brief report on this summit, which will be held in New Orleans.
V. Treasurer’s Report: Dr. McCary gave the year-end treasurer’s report, summarizing a variety of line items. She also presented the 2008 budget and the budget for the San Antonio Spring Meeting.

Motion 2: To adopt the proposed 2008 Budget for the Division of Psychoanalysis as submitted. Action: Passed unanimously

Motion 3: To adopt the proposed budget for the 2009 Division of Psychoanalysis Spring Meeting in San Antonio, TX. Action: Passed with 1 no vote

VI. Data Collection and Clerical Issues: Dr. Debiak

A. Section Annual Reports, Membership Numbers and Officers: Dr. Debiak thanked those sections that submitted their annual reports on time. He is still waiting for two sections to respond to his request for those reports, which he needs to complete the Division 39 Annual Report. Sections were urged to get their reports in by the deadline.

B. Committee List, Chairs, Members and Terms of Service: Dr. Debiak asked members to review the 2008 committee list as well as the list of section presidents and section representatives.

VII. Old Business

A. Membership Committee Report: Dr. Gottdiener reviewed the membership report that was included in the agenda packet.

B. Task Force on Membership Requirements Update: Dr. Zelnick. After a report by Dr. Wagner on Council activity with respect to interrogations policy (see below, XI. A.), a discussion was held regarding how to accommodate those members who are withholding APA dues, but who wish to continue as members of the Division. The possibility of bylaws changes, and potential ramifications of such changes, was discussed. Board members exchanged views on many aspects of the issues of membership that have arisen during the current focus on APA’s policies about psychologists’ involvement in interrogations. Several Board members are withholding dues and expressed a desire to have voting rights in the Division, which currently is not possible with the membership category of Affiliate. Dr. Zelnick reported on the recommendations of the Task Force: 1. The Division allow those who are withholding dues to become affiliate members of the Division once their APA membership has expired, which is 2 years following their decision to withhold dues. 2. The Board consider other options, including a change to the criteria for the membership category of Member and that the Board continue to discuss this issue at all Board meetings for the foreseeable future. Dr. Zelnick also referred to his report included in the agenda packet and made a number of comments on the issue. Dr. Ramirez reviewed the terms that were involved in the report and the explained the current categories of membership within the Division.

C. Publications Committee Report: Dr. Seiden

1. PEP Subscription Update: Dr. Seiden reported that subscriptions to PEP are at approximately 400.

2. The Psychoanalytic Book Prize: Dr. Seiden referred to his report in the agenda packet where details of the prize are spelled out.

3. Psychoanalytic Abstracts: The hard copy edition of this publication has been cancelled. It is now available only electronically.

4. Psychologist-Psychoanalyst Update: Dr. MacGillivray referred to his report that was distributed to the board during the meeting.

5. Psychoanalytic Psychology Update: Dr. Jurist reported on his activity since becoming the Journal Editor, effective January 1, 2008. He has worked through the transition process for the past several months. He hopes to make some changes, including a new cover design. He is also planning to increase visibility of the journal with institutes and other interested organizations. He plans to use the promotional department at APA to increase the base of the journal beyond the Division. His specific plan is to have occasional special issues of the Journal. He will be looking into having an editorial council who would meet regularly to discuss articles and plans for the journals. He noted that the journal is officially a member of the Electronic Back Office of APA, meaning that all articles are to be submitted electronically. Reviewers will receive articles electronically and send in their comments electronically, as well, thereby making the process more streamlined and efficient.

D. Graduate Student Committee Report: Dr. Slavin and Ms. Cotler. Tanya Cotler reported that the Graduate Student Committee has planned their presentation for the Spring Meeting and are encouraging graduate students to attend. They are also looking for housing for students who are unable to afford the hotel costs. The keynote speakers will do special presentations for graduate students.

VIII. Survey of Division Member Practices: Dr. Axelrod Dr. Axelrod discussed his proposal to survey the membership of the Division about business-of-practice issues. He has put together an advisory group to formulate the goals and purpose of the survey and then
to develop it. They hope to submit a draft of the survey to the board in April for approval.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. PROGRAM COMMITTEE ISSUES

1. REPORT OF TASK FORCE ON SPRING MEETING FEES RESTRUCTURING: Dr. Slavin referred to his report that was distributed to the board during the meeting. He recommended fee changes based on a variety of issues, including change in the value of the American dollar, resulting in the ability of international members to pay higher registration fees.

Motion 4: To accept recommendations from the Task Force on Spring Meeting Fees Restructuring as submitted. Action: Passed Unanimously

2. SPRING MEETING PLANNING ISSUES: Drs. Gellman and Petrucelli discussed numerous issues surrounding the planning and production of the Spring Meeting. They were excited about the registrations to date and hope to see a very strong attendance at the meeting.

3. STANDARDS FOR NON-JURIED PANELS: Dr. McWilliams raised the question of whether the number of non-juried panels at the spring meetings could be reduced further. Discussion was postponed until Dr. Darwin, the Division’s Program Chair, can participate

Motion 5: To limit non-juried panel time for future Spring Meetings. Action: Tabled until April 2008 meeting.

X. EXECUTIVE SESSION (All non-elected Board members must leave the Board room.) The Board was in Executive Session from 3 to 3:16 pm.

XI. COUNCIL OF REPRESENTATIVES REPORT: Drs. Barbanel, Darwin, Morris, and Wagner

A. INTERROGATION ISSUE: (This was moved to just prior to the discussion of the Task Force on Membership) Dr. Wagner reported on the issue of psychologists’ participation in interrogations. She indicated that there appears to be a shift in attitudes among Council members and APA leaders toward those in Council who supported the Moratorium closer to the position of Division 39. Some DSJ Council Reps, including Dr. Wagner, were asked for input on letters being sent to various federal government leaders. Dr. Wagner encouraged Division members to respond to the ethics committee’s call for comments and vignettes regarding APA policy about psychologists’ participation in interrogations and the PENS Task Force process. She encouraged comments that challenge the ethics of such a policy. Dr. Wagner also referred to her article in the current newsletter for additional information on the various issues.

B. APF HATE CRIME STUDY: Dr. Wagner suggested that individuals could make contributions to studies that are being developed.

C. OTHER: Dr. Morris reported on a variety of activities of the Council or Representatives. Dr. Barbanel discussed APA’s and Council’s work on licensure models and other topics.

XII. CONSORTIUM REPORT: Dr. Wagner reported that representatives of the Consortium met in October. The group is working well together and appears to ease past the distrust and competition that marked earlier meetings. Some institutes of the American Psychoanalytic Association stated that they will encourage APsaA institutes to apply will be applying for ACPE accreditation. The Consortium has also made changes that liberalize its membership criteria.

XIII. FEDERAL ADVOCACY COORDINATOR REPORT: Dr. Goldberg distributed a written report regarding Federal Advocacy and the activities surrounding this endeavor.

XIV. DIVISIONS 39 & 42 INTERDIVISIONAL TASK FORCE REPORT: Dr. Goldberg distributed a report from the Interdivisional Task Force. He reviewed their activities and added comments to his report.

XV. COUNCIL OF SPECIALTIES REPORT: Dr. Morris sat in for Dr. Jacobs at the last meeting. There will now be one annual in-person meeting (funded by each Division) and quarterly teleconferences (funded by APA). Synarchy (which includes the relevant Division, the Academy, and ABPP) wants to change its name to the Specialty Council.

XVI. REVIEW OF CALENDAR AND SCHEDULING OF FUTURE MEETINGS: Dr. Debiak reviewed the calendar and reminded members of dates of future meetings.

XVII. MISCELLANEOUS: No miscellaneous items were raised.

XVIII. ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Dennis Debiak, PsyD, Secretary
Ruth E. Helein, Recorder
ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CONGRATULATIONS

STEPHEN A. MITCHELL CENTER
The Stephen A. Mitchell Center for Relational Studies is pleased to announce the formation of an intensive one-year specialization in Relational Psychoanalysis for advanced clinicians wishing to acquire a deeper understanding of the theoretical and clinical emphases of relational psychoanalytic work. This seminar is intended for graduates of analytic institutes or for those who have never received formal analytic training but have accumulated many years of clinical supervision and course work in private study or supervision groups. The course content will trace the epistemological, theoretical and clinical changes underlying the relational shift in clinical work.

Instructors for the class will include, Neil Altman, Anthony Bass, Jessica Benjamin, Margaret Black, Philip Bromberg, Jody Davies, Muriel Dimen, Sue Grand, Adrienne Harris, Spyros Orfanos, and Joyce Slochower. If you want more information please contact Jody Davies, daviesjm@aol.com or Anthony Bass, alb250@aol.com

COURSE SCHEDULE: SEPTEMBER 2008-JUNE 2009

STEPHEN MITCHELL AWARD
Papers are invited for the annual Stephen A. Mitchell Award. Established by Psychoanalytic Psychology and the Board of the Division of Psychoanalysis, the award honors our esteemed colleague as well as a graduate student whose paper is deemed exemplary by a panel of judges. The award includes a $500 cash prize, airfare and registration for the Division Spring Meeting, at which the paper will be read, and publication in Psychoanalytic Psychology. Deadline for submission is July 1, 2008, and presentation of the paper will be at the 2009 Spring Meeting in San Antonio. Five printouts of the paper should be submitted to me according to the procedure for submission to Psychoanalytic Psychology and should include a cover letter indicating that the paper is being submitted for the Stephen A. Mitchell Award. Division members, especially those with academic affiliations, are strongly encouraged to invite graduate students to submit papers. There are no restrictions as to topic or theoretical orientation, although the papers must be of a psychoanalytic nature. Manuscripts and questions should be addressed to the editor, Elliot Jurist, PhD, at psychoanalyticpsychology@gmail.com

DEADLINE: JULY 1, 2008

METROPOLITAN INSTITUTE
On Saturday, July 12th, The Metropolitan Institute for Training in Psychoanalytic Psychology (MITPP) is offering a workshop with Jill Bellinson, “All We Ever Do Is Play Uno: Children’s Use Of Board Games In Psychotherapy.” The workshop will focus on ways to understand the structured game play of children in therapy and to use it therapeutically. Case examples from the instructor and from workshop members will be used to demonstrate the latent meaning of structured game play and to turn board game play sessions into therapy sessions. For more information, contact Joyce A. Lerner at 212-496-2858 or mitppnyc@aol.com

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PSYCHOANALYSIS OF CULTURE & SOCIETY
The Association for the Psychoanalysis of Culture and Society (APCS) announces a Call for Papers for its 2008 Annual Conference, “Ethics in an Age of Diminishing Distance: The Clash of Difference,” which will be held at Rutgers University, October 24-26, 2008. This conference will address the ethical implications of psychoanalysis in the contemporary world. In an age when technology seems to have diminished social and physical distances, encounters with the Other take on new forms. We are seeking proposals that investigate what psychoanalysis—both in its theoretical and clinical forms—can offer for an understanding of these encounters. Please think broadly about issues that arise in your discipline in relation to these questions. We are particularly interested in roundtables that discuss these issues and also invite you to think of alternate formats that promote discussion. Please see the web site for additional information: apcs.rutgers.edu

AMERICAN PSYCHOANALYTIC ASSOCIATION
Prudy Gourguechon, president-elect of the American Psychoanalytic Association sends along the following announcements: The first resource is a compendium of syllabi and other materials collected by Andrew Gerber and is available at http://www.apsa.org/research/empiricalstudiesinpsychoanalysis/tabid/449/Default.aspx

The second, quite remarkable resource was a joint project of APsaA’s 10,000 Minds Project, which is our outreach to undergraduates, and Division 39. Greg Lowder created a downloadable 45-minute PowerPoint presentation, which any presenter or teacher can use and adapt to present the empirical underpinnings of psychoanalytic treatment and concepts to classes and other groups. http://www.teachpsychoanalysis.com/recommendedresources/enduringsignificanceofpsatheoryandpractice/tabid/480/Default.aspx

Finally, www.teachpsychoanalysis.com is another project of our 10,000 Minds Project. It is designed as a resource for anyone wishing to teach psychoanalytic concepts to undergraduates, and includes successful techniques, reading lists, film lists, and all sorts of other material. Please browse and contribute!
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