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FROM THE PRESIDENT: **MORE OF THE SAME**

Mary Beth Cresci, PhD

President Barack Obama won his campaign for the White House on the promise of change. I am beginning the presidency of Division 39 with a very different message—more of the same.

The voters in our national election chose new leadership in Washington to provide our nation with a different direction at a time of severe political and financial crisis. In contrast, our Division is thriving and fulfilling its commitments to its members. It has benefited for many years from the shared vision and dedicated service of its officers, board members, and committee members. In particular, the Division has had the good fortune to have Nancy McWilliams at the helm for the past two years. Her devotion to the profession of psychoanalysis and our Division is matched only by her unflagging energy, sound political vision, and generous spirit. She has set a remarkable standard for leadership that I hope to emulate.

In keeping with Nancy’s thoughtful and enlightening remarks to Division members in previous issues of this newsletter, I would like to use this column to enumerate the accomplishments that have marked our Division over the past decade and tell you how I hope to continue to provide you with more of the same.

We have many reasons for being members of Division 39. For those of us who are psychologists by profession and have undertaken psychoanalytic training or subscribe to the principles that underlie psychoanalytic thinking, Division 39 is a natural home within APA. For many of us, whether psychologists or mental health professionals from other disciplines, the stimulating way in which Division 39 has presented thought-provoking psychoanalytic ideas at its meetings and in its publications has been paramount. For others, the Division’s special services, such as a low-cost means to access psychoanalytic articles through the PEP database, make Division 39 an important addition to their intellectual lives.

Underlying these tangible benefits of membership in Division 39 are a number of important policy decisions that were made over the years by the Division leadership. One such decision was made about 10 years ago regarding our Division’s role within the larger world of APA. Rather than being marginalized as a group of professionals whose interests and training were outside the mainstream of psychology, our leaders determined that we needed to become actively involved in the workings of APA and the APA Practice Organization. The reasons for this decision seem obvious in retrospect. As the national organization for psychologists, APA’s policies regarding practice issues and social justice issues, as well as its perspectives on scientific and educational issues, have considerable weight in many arenas. Our leadership wanted to have a voice in APA commensurate with our status as one of the larger APA divisions as well as a voice within the APA Practice Organization in keeping with the financial support our members provide through the extra dues assessment for practitioners.

Thus, a conscious decision was made to become active participants in the governance and activities of APA. Our leaders decided to find Division members who would participate in the myriad committees and task forces that establish direction for APA and to cosponsor conferences and other APA meetings that would help us to demonstrate the viability and value of contemporary psychoanalytic thinking. We have, for instance, become one of the sponsors of the National Multicultural Conference...
and Summit (NMCS), a biannual conference organized and sponsored by a number of APA divisions. To lend our support to the NMCS we have planned our January board meetings in conjunction with the NMCS meetings, proposed presentations for the NMCS meetings, and encouraged our board members to attend the conference. We have also appointed liaisons to a variety of APA task forces and representatives to several conferences sponsored by APA on topics of importance to our members. It is our hope that our participation in these APA activities will ensure that psychoanalytic perspectives are included in the presentations and proceedings.

We are now reaping some of the positive results of the decision to focus on strengthening our presence in APA. For instance, in 2007 our campaign to increase our representation at APA Council resulted in our being allocated seven Council seats, an unprecedented number for a division. Our phone campaign to Division 39 members in 2008 was slightly less successful in that we were allocated 6 seats for the coming year. Nevertheless, this is the maximum number of seats allocated to any division and is matched only by Division 42, the Independent Practice Division. In addition, two of the President-elect candidates in the recent APA election were Division 39 members: Carol Goodheart and Steven Reisner. Both had strong showings in the election; and Carol Goodheart was chosen to be the next APA President.

Over the past several years there has been considerable dissatisfaction with APA policies on social justice issues. Members of our Division have worked tirelessly both inside and outside of the governing structure of APA to influence APA’s position on the use of torture and the participation of psychologists at sites where suspected terrorists were being held. As a protest to the APA policies, some APA members established a program to withhold dues from APA. During the 2007 APA convention, the Council of Representatives passed a resolution condemning the use of torture at these sites. Many APA members and Division 39 members specifically, however, were not satisfied with the resolution because it did not condemn the participation of psychologists at these detention centers. They initiated a referendum campaign through which APA members could vote directly to change APA’s policy. The referendum received a majority vote, and APA has announced a change of policy in accord with this initiative. Steve Reisner’s strong showing in the APA presidential election was another sign that members of APA want the organization to speak out for social justice. It is my hope that the APA members who have been withholding dues will now decide to remain as members so that they can continue to monitor social justice issues and influence APA’s policies from within the organization.

One of the strengths of our Division has been the ability to respectfully discuss and consider different approaches to the social justice issues mentioned above. The fact that many of our Division members were withholding dues from APA and yet wanted to be active members in our Division required the Division leadership to review our membership policies. Larry Zelnick led a task force that reported to the Board on various options about the membership status of those who were withholding dues and were considering resigning from APA in the event that their efforts to change APA policies proved unsatisfactory. There were frank and emotional exchanges between Division members who were working on this issue from within the APA structure and those who felt that they could best express their point of view by withholding dues and making other protests to APA policies. The fact that our Division has been able to accommodate various viewpoints and maintain dialogue on such a sensitive issue is a testament to the strength of the Division and the bonds of friendship and respect among its members.

Another important bridging of differences has been occurring through the meetings of the Psychoanalytic Consortium. Our delegation to the Consortium is chaired by Laurie Wagner. Jonathan Slavin and Nancy McWilliams have been representatives, and I joined the delegation this year as President-elect. At the Consortium meetings it is heartening to see that the various professional psychoanalytic groups are working together to promote the value of psychoanalysis and the standards of psychoanalytic training and practice that the Consortium has agreed upon. As the new administration in Washington begins to revamp our national healthcare, we hope this collaboration will enable us to advocate for policies that support psychoanalytic practice.

Moving to one of the more mundane but nevertheless essential aspects of our Division’s functioning, we are fortunate to be in a strong financial position in the midst of the economic crisis that has affected almost everyone. Several factors have contributed to this success. Our treasurer, Marsha McCary, realized several years ago that our reserve fund was not sufficient to ensure our survival in difficult financial times. With the Board’s approval she initiated a policy to add to the reserve fund from our revenues each year. She also chose conservative investments for our reserves so that we have experienced very little loss in the midst of the economic downturn. In addition, our 2008 Spring Meeting in New York City was very well attended and brought in more revenues than we had anticipated. All of these factors have combined to make us financially solvent in a time of economic uncertainty.

With these accomplishments as a backdrop, I have chosen several initiatives for my presidency that will build
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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.
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AND CELEBRATE THE CITY-WIDE

Fiesta!

Fiesta has been a tradition in the Alamo City since before 1891 when citizens wanted to commemorate the anniversary of the fall of the Alamo, and honor the memory of the soldiers of San Jacinto. Prominent local women decorated carriages with live flowers, met in front of the Alamo and threw the blossoms at one another, creating the first “Battle of Flowers.” The Battle was a huge success and in the years that followed many other activities were established from crowning royalty to parades and a carnival to today’s “Texas-sized” 100 events. The 2009 multicultural celebration in April marks Fiesta’s 118th anniversary.
on our past achievements. One focus will be to determine the practice issues that are significant for our Division and utilize the resources of our Division and APA to work for the betterment of our profession. A complementary focus will be to initiate efforts to educate the lay public about the value of psychoanalysis as a treatment modality. The first of these initiatives began in 2008 when the Board approved the business of practice survey created by Steve Axelrod. The survey was distributed online to all members with e-mail addresses and by mail to those without e-mail addresses. The survey is intended to develop a current picture of our practices and to learn how satisfied we are in terms of the type of work we do and the remuneration we receive. The APA Practice Organization took the draft prepared by Steve and his committee, which included Nancy McWilliams, Ken Eisold, Bill Gottdiener, Phee Rosnick, Paul Hymowitz, and myself, and created a survey for our use. Their office will help Steve analyze the data. We hope to have some preliminary reports for the Board and membership this spring. As we move forward with this project, we will consider how to utilize the data to benefit our practice and enhance our professional lives.

We also will be active participants in a Practice Summit that is being organized by James Bray, APA President, and Carol Goodheart, President-elect. The Practice Summit aims to identify areas of concern for psychologist practitioners and determine how APA can help with these issues. Toni Heineman has been our consultant to the Practice Summit task force, and we will have several delegates attending the summit in May. We hope the summit will give due consideration to the needs and concerns of psychoanalyst practitioners and will endorse the value of long-term psychoanalytic psychotherapy for people at all economic levels of our society.

The second initiative I hope to undertake is finding ways to educate the general public about the value of psychoanalysis. Too many characterizations of psychoanalysis in the media provide an outdated, stereotypical view of our profession that is grossly inaccurate. We need to do what we can to counter the idea that quick fixes, whether through medication or short-term therapy that aims for symptom relief, are the only beneficial treatment solutions. To begin to look for ways to reach the public with a different message, I have established a Public Relations Task Force chaired by Nina Thomas who has worked through APA to provide media training to psychologists. The members of the committee include Steve Axelrod, who can help us integrate information from the Practice Survey in our plans; Susan Parlau, who has recently set up an e-newsletter in New York State to provide the public with health information that is psychoanalytically informed; Bill MacGillivray, who is active as our newsletter editor and with the National Coalition of Mental Health Professionals and Consumers; Jaine Darwin, who is a co-founder of the SOFAR project that provides mental health services to the families of reservists who are serving overseas; and Larry Zelnick, who handles the details of our Division Web site. Some of the projects that this committee will explore include obtaining more press coverage for the papers presented at our Spring Meetings, finding online options to disseminate information about psychoanalysis, and gaining consultation on our marketing efforts through a graduate business school.

As my presidency continues, I will report back to you about these initiatives and the many contributions being made by the Board members and committee members who work on behalf of the Division. I anticipate that we will be able to provide you, our members, with more of the same service that has characterized our Division over the years. Thank you for this opportunity to serve you and the profession of psychoanalysis.

---

**Upcoming Events**

October 3 & 4, 2009

**International Symposium at the New York University of Medicine:**

**After Freud Left: Centennial Reflections on His 1909 Visit to the United States.**

Guest Speakers: Ernst Falzeder (Universität Innsbruck and Philemon Foundation), Elizabeth Lunbeck (Vanderbilt University), George Makari (Weill Medical College of Cornell University), Louis Menand (Harvard University), Dorothy Ross (Johns Hopkins University), Sonu Shamdasani (Wellcome History of Medicine Unit, University College, London), Richard Skues (London Metropolitan University), Hale Usak (Universität Innsbruck).

For information: www.nyam.org or contact John Burnham, at burnham.2@osu.edu
HERBERT J. SCHLESINGER, PHD

Chicago. I had extracted a promise that I would not have any administrative duties in the department, but two years later the Dean of the Medical School asked me to become Acting Chairman of the Department of Psychiatry and Superintendent of Colorado Psychiatric Hospital, positions I held for two years while recruiting a permanent chairman.

In 1984, I moved to New York to become director of the Clinical Psychology Program at the New School and Alfred J. and Monette C. Marrow Professor of Psychology. I was appointed a clinical professor at Cornell University Medical College in 1984 and did teaching rounds at New York Hospital for several years. As training and supervising analyst, I began teaching at the Columbia Center about the same time. When I retired from the New School in 1991, I moved my primary affiliation to Columbia as Professor of Clinical Psychology in Psychiatry and am now Director of Clinical Psychology and Psychologist-in-Chief at New York Presbyterian Hospital, Columbia Center.

There were two publications prior to the one Jeff mentioned as my earliest; they opened the movement that came to be called “The New Look in Perception:”


TO THE EDITOR

I am pleased that Jeff Golland liked what he read, as well as my earlier books, and I hope his readers will become mine as well. I have been nursing the fantasy that there is one copy of each out there that is being passed hand to hand with high praise. The biographical material included in the review is only approximately correct and I appreciate this opportunity to offer these corrections.

My clinical training was at the Menninger School of Clinical Psychology, which ran parallel to the Menninger School of Psychiatry, and I attended many courses that were held jointly. The school used the facilities of the Topeka VA Hospital, the Topeka State Hospital and the C.F. Menninger Memorial Hospital for clinical training while the academic portions of the doctoral curriculum were conducted at the University of Kansas in Lawrence and at the Menninger Foundation.

I did take my analytic training at the Topeka Institute for Psychoanalysis beginning in 1947, but it was several years earlier than the American Psychoanalytic Association’s program’s decision to admit to training a few presumably non-practicing researchers. Karl Menninger thought it important to defy the American’s prohibition against training psychologist researchers who could enrich psychoanalysis and he encouraged the Topeka Institute to accept four psychologists enrolled in the School. In 1960, after I did some years of teaching and administration in the Institute, the American approved my appointment as Training and Supervising Analyst.

In 1969, I moved to the University of Colorado Medical School in Denver as Professor of Psychiatry and training analyst to help open the Denver Institute which, until then had been a training center under Chicago. I had extracted a promise that I would not have any administrative duties in the department, but two years later the Dean of the Medical School asked me to become Acting Chairman of the Department of Psychiatry and Superintendent of Colorado Psychiatric Hospital, positions I held for two years while recruiting a permanent chairman.

In 1984, I moved to New York to become director of the Clinical Psychology Program at the New School and Alfred J. and Monette C. Marrow Professor of Psychology. I was appointed a clinical professor at Cornell University Medical College in 1984 and did teaching rounds at New York Hospital for several years. As training and supervising analyst, I began teaching at the Columbia Center about the same time. When I retired from the New School in 1991, I moved my primary affiliation to Columbia as Professor of Clinical Psychology in Psychiatry and am now Director of Clinical Psychology and Psychologist-in-Chief at New York Presbyterian Hospital, Columbia Center.

There were two publications prior to the one Jeff mentioned as my earliest; they opened the movement that came to be called “The New Look in Perception:”


GUIDELINES FOR SUBMITTING MATERIAL
Submissions, including references, need to be in APA style. E-mail your submission in an attached Word or WordPerfect file to the Editor. If you do not have attached file capabilities, mail the disc to the Editor. Hard copies are not needed. Please write one or two sentences about yourself for placement at the end of the article and indicate what address information you would like published. Submissions should be no longer than 2500 words. All materials are subject to editing at the discretion of the Editor. Unless otherwise stated, the views expressed by the authors are those of the authors and do not reflect official policy of the Division of Psychoanalysis. Priority is given to articles that are original and have not been submitted for publication elsewhere.
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INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR RELATIONAL PSYCHOANALYSIS & PSYCHOTHERAPY presents:
The 2009 IARPP International Conference

The 2009 IARPP International Conference

THE SHADOW OF MEMORY
Relational Perspectives of Remembering & Forgetting
June 2009, Tel Aviv

The David Intercontinental Hotel, Tel Aviv Beachfront, Israel
June 24 - June 27, 2009

Program, registration and information available at iarpp.org

We hope you will join us for an exciting conference exploring relational perspectives on the interplay of remembering and forgetting in the clinical situation and beyond.

IARPP Conference Co-Chairs: Hazel Ipp, Rina Lazar, Chana Ullman
IARPP 799 Broadway, Suite #305 New York, NY 10003 USA +1.212.669.6123 office@mem.iarpp.org
**THE ETHICS FORUM**

The Ethics Committee now sponsors an Ethics Forum in the *Psychologist-Psychoanalyst*. All members are invited to submit ethical questions or dilemmas you encounter in your professional practice. The Ethics Committee will invite various members of the psychoanalytic community to respond to questions in the *Psychologist-Psychoanalyst*.

Members submitting vignettes will be anonymous in the newsletter, while respondents will be identified. Vignettes should be relatively short and concise, stating your question or dilemma as clearly as possible. We hope that this exchange will open up a lively conversation about ethics within the Division. Vignettes should be sent to: Jane.Tillman@austenriggs.net

**ETHICAL QUESTION**

I was recently invited to write a paper for publication in a special section of a peer-reviewed journal. I worked with the editor on several drafts of my paper. When the final draft of my paper was returned to me the editor had inserted citations for three of her previous papers. I protested this late addition, stating I did not want to include references to papers I had not read. The editor became forceful about the point, sending me the papers to read over the weekend ahead, and insisting that I ought to include citations of her previous work. The papers in question were not major contributors to the subject area I was writing about, and one was only tangentially connected to my topic. I thought this was stepping over the line, but several colleagues I consulted with thought I was being “difficult” and should simply follow the editor’s recommendations and insert the references. Other colleagues thought I should not yield to such a request. Are there agreed upon standards for editors and authors in this situation? Does the author have an ethical obligation in this case?

**RESPONSE FROM MARTIN A. SCHULMAN, PhD**

The editor of a psychoanalytic journal mirrors in some manner one of the executive functions of the ego. He or she must tactfully work out compromises between authors (who often do not want a semi-colon changed on their submission) and Editorial Board readers, whose function is to make the article stronger and more acceptable for publication. Most articles are sent to 3-5 readers in order to balance possible theoretical bias and diffuse whatever narcissistic investment a Reader might have in either accepting or rejecting a submission. It is incumbent upon the editor to select readers that are familiar with the content area of the article, the literature in that area, and have standards for scholarship. These reviews, which are sent anonymously or in capsulated form to the author, become the basis for eventual acceptance or rejection. According to Steinsaltz (2006) The Talmud (Sotah 2:a) states, “To match a couple is as difficult as the splitting of the sea.” The same holds for the dynamic between an editor and his or her Editorial Readers. To do otherwise; to send out articles on a “who wants it” basis or randomly may be fine preparation for a career change to taxi dispatcher but is not editing. I emphasize this because during my fifteen-year tenure as editor of the *Psychoanalytic Review*, the number of articles accepted without revisions could be counted on two hands (and maybe one foot).

A solicited article, as is the case in the vignette presented, falls within a different category of editorial treatment. One requests a solicitation for several possible reasons: the author is someone whose presence in an issue would enhance the prestige of the journal, the author is an acknowledged authority in a specific area, or this is for a special issue, usually guest edited by a member of the Editorial Board, where it is felt that the solicited author has something to contribute. Soliciting a contribution does not guarantee acceptance of the article, it is always contingent on copy editing and editorial suggestions. However, in general a solicitation is a commitment that if the author takes the time and spends the energy to write the requested article it will be published. After all, suggestions, like Freud’s recommendations, are just that, and not mandates. Rangell (1990) writes about the “responsibility of insight” namely that after an interpretation is presented it is in the analysand’s hands as to what to do with it. From another perspective, Renik, (1993) posits that “...an analyst’s aim in interpretation is not to have it accepted by the patient, but rather to have the patient consider it in making up his or her own mind” (p. 567). The same holds for suggestions to solicited contributions. If we do not respect the judgment of the author we have asked to contribute, why were they asked? Once again, in my 15 years at *The Psychoanalytic Review* I only rejected outright one solicited article and in the case the author, a major name in the field (now deceased) refused to make changes without which the integrity of the journal would be compromised (not to mention possible legal ramifications). Furthermore, in this exceptional case, the author was using the journal as a voodoo doll, to settle grievances, real or imagined, rather than to make a scholarly contribution. While differences of opinion and intellectual controversy are desirable, venom never adds to the value of a contribution.

The Editor in the vignette presented seems...
to be using the journal as a venue for her narcissism (beyond the inherent narcissism of editing a respected journal). It is a general policy for American as well as most “foreign” psychoanalytic journals (with the exception of several sectarian in-house publications) for the Editor not to contribute articles to their own publication. It is also generally accepted that books either written or edited by the present Editor of a journal to not be reviewed in that journal. It is not a far leap to extend this to suggested citations to the editor’s own writings as a prerequisite for acceptance. Most editors assiduously adhere to these standards. Historically, those that have not, have had a limited tenure in their editorship. An article is cited not to build up one’s reference section but because the author strongly believes that the article is a precursor of his or her own work, or that it is a publication that calls for a critical evaluation. If we accept my assertion that solicited authorship is based on perceived expertise, then the non-citation of an article implies that the author did not feel that the article was relevant to his or her present contribution. The editor’s “suggestion” as to inclusion of citations to their own work (it is not clear if this is a quid pro quo for acceptance) while not unethical is petty and in extremely poor form.

The author has been given two sets of advice by colleagues: Tell the editor to “shove it” or “play the game” and get published. The ultimate decision is up to the author and one is not privy to all the variables involved including how desirous the author is to publish in that specific journal. Usually solicited authors are not trying to fatten their resume or page count of published writings. Therefore one possibility is for the author to retract the submission and send it elsewhere, thereby not submitting to the bullying narcissism of the Editor. To do otherwise does not add to the strength or integrity of the submission. As for the Editor, as previously stated, while their stand is not an ethical violation it is an offense to scholarly integrity and psychoanalytic standards and protocol.

Schafer (1983) added the personal factor to the concept of neutrality. (I am well aware that this concept is not currently in vogue for large elements of the American psychoanalytic community). If we substitute the word “editor” for “analyst,” however, his conclusions sums up my position to a tee. He states, “... To achieve neutrality requires a high degree of subordination of the analyst’s personality to the analytic task at hand” it also requires “... the curtailment of any show of activity of a predominantly narcissistic sort” (p. 6). So in summary (pardon the cliché): Ethical violation? No. Against the grain of psychoanalytic editorship? Yes. Abuse of power? Probably. Recommendation for author? Retract article or insist on its publication “as is.” Recommendation for Editor? Try another analysis to modulate your narcissism.

REFERENCES

ENDNOTES
1 Jane G. Tillman, Chair, Philip Blumberg, Andrea Celenza, Margaret Fulton, Stephanie Sasso, and Frank Summers.
2 Martin Schulman is a psychologist and psychoanalyst, and was the Editor of the Psychoanalytic Review for fifteen years.
Here’s another lively example of poets and psychoanalysts working the same dysfunctional family terrain.

This Be The Verse

They fuck you up, your mum and dad.
They may not mean to, but they do.
They fill you with the faults they had
And add some extra, just for you.

But they were fucked up in their turn
By fools in old-style hats and coats,
Who half the time were soppy-stern
And half at one another’s throats.

Man hands on misery to man.
It deepens like a coastal shelf.
Get out as early as you can,
And don’t have any kids yourself.

Since the great contemporary English poet Philip Larkin (1922-1985) published This Be The Verse in 1971, it has gone on, for obvious reasons, to be one of the most quoted of contemporary poems—recitable in full by many who probably couldn’t name its author. Larkin, who in his lifetime gave the world a large body of memorable sardonic, seriously despairing and anti-sentimental poems, joked that he expected this one would be intoned at his funeral by a chorus of a thousand Girl Guides.

Larkin was a prodigy when young, unmarried all his life, a lonely librarian in the small provincial city of Hull, a man who remarked famously that deprivation was for him what daffodils were for Wordsworth. “They fuck you up….” is Larkin at his clear, tough and anti-romantic best. There’s a rude giggle, a recognition, and, it would seem, not much mystery in this poem. But then there’s the title.

“This be the verse” is a quote from Robert Louis Stevenson’s Requiem, some lines of which you no doubt will recognize:

Under the wide and starry sky,
Dig the grave and let me lie.
Glad did I live and gladly die,
And I laid me down with a will.

So in This Be The Verse Larkin is presenting the world with his own anti-romantic epitaph. But note the source of the quote: the barely submerged emotional subtext is a sweet, sad longing, the longing for home. And what about the longing for home? Here’s another Larkin poem, written some years before—and this one’s not so funny:

Home Is So Sad

Home is so sad. It stays as it was left,
Shaped to the comfort of the last to go
As if to win them back. Instead, bereft
Of anyone to please, it withers so,
Having no heart to put aside the theft

And turn again to what it started as,
A joyous shot at how things ought to be,
Long fallen wide. You can see how it was:
Look at the pictures and the cutlery.
The music in the piano stool. That vase.

Most of us these days would like to think, perhaps romantically, that we can do better by our children than our parents did by us. No, says Larkin, it will not be so!

But—no surprise to psychoanalysts—hidden in his anti-romanticism and just under the surface of his ironic joking about the impossibility of an improving family life, one finds a self-protective distancing. Distancing from what? In these two poems, it becomes clear, from profound sadness—from the mourning for the idealized home which was “a joyous shot at how things ought to be,” a shot now “long fallen wide.” Someone once said, “a cynic is a disappointed idealist.” An anti-romantic, one would have to think, is a romantic in despair.

Endnotes:

1 “This be the Verse” and “Home is so Sad” are in Collected Poems by Philip Larkin. Copyright © 1988, 1989 by the Estate of Philip Larkin. Reprinted by permission of Farrar, Straus and Giroux. All rights reserved.
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One of the most unsettling things I discovered as a fledgling analyst was that the patients who entered my consulting room were not alone; they brought their dead along with them. And today, many years after completing my own analysis, and despite Leowald’s (1960) claim that, in the course of psychoanalytic treatment, our ghosts may be “laid to rest as ancestors,” my dead still come along with me. After reading Haunted Subjects by Colin Davis, I understand more clearly why we ignore these revenants at our own risk.

Although Colin Davis is not an analyst, his remarkable book guides analysts to a fuller appreciation of the extent to which their patients’ haunted subjectivities, as well their own, inform the analytic process. In his examination of our highly ambivalent and complicated relation to the dead, Davis, a professor of French at Royal Holloway, University of London, draws on his studies of modern French thought, literature, film and Holocaust testimony.

Insofar as the dead and the undead are omnipresent in contemporary films and on television, Davis contends that they “walk among us now as much as ever” (p. 1). Why do the dead return? Are they trying to settle unfinished business on earth? Do ghosts lie or do they tell us the truth? Do they speak to us or do we speak for them? Do we want to keep them with us, or do we want to be rid of them, the better to get on with our own lives? Is their function to reassure us that there is some higher order overseeing our lives? To address these provocative questions Davis turns both to psychoanalysts including Freud, Lacan, Abraham and Torok, and to leading philosophers such as Sartre, Heidegger, Agamben, Levinas, de Man, and Derrida.

Davis not only elucidates the ways in which our relation to the dead has come to assume great importance in deconstruction and psychoanalysis but he also reveals how both disciplines contribute to our views on death and the return of the dead. He claims that Derrida’s investigation of ghosts in Spectres de Marx (1993) helped to make “hauntology” respectable. Today it is much more than merely respectable. “Hauntology,” he notes, “supplants its near-homonym ontology, replacing the priority of being and presence with the figure of the ghost as that which is neither present nor absent, neither dead nor alive” (p. 9).

He also sees hauntology as having a role in the ethical turn of deconstruction and believes that the ghost occupies the place of the Levinasian Other “whose otherness we are responsible for preserving” (p. 9). Moreover, he notes that it was Derrida who called attention to the psychoanalytic explorations of Abraham and Torok into transgenerational communication.

Davis’s examination of Derrida’s obsession with death seems to me eminently analytical. He contends that Derrida’s Chaque fois unique, la fin du monde (2003) is “as much a work of mourning as it is a work about mourning” (p. 129). Puzzling over Derrida’s virtual silence about melancholia despite his volubility on the topic of mourning, Davis suggests that Freud’s (1955/1917) essay and the reworking of it in the thought of Abraham and Torok (1976) influenced Derrida’s text. Yet, he contrasts Freud’s contention that mourning can normally be brought to an end with time, with Derrida’s account of mourning as interminable and “always already begun” (p. 132). According to Davis, Derrida’s mourning is closer to Freud’s melancholia, which occurs when the normal process of mourning is blocked.

I found Davis’s sensitive examination of Holocaust testimony very moving, particularly his disagreement with those who claim it is impossible for survivors to bear witness to it. For example, Elie Wiesel (1958) contends, “Those who have not lived through the experience will never know; those who have will never tell . . . The past belongs to the dead” (quoted in Agamben, 1999, p. 33).
Similarly, Felman & Laub (1992) argue that the Shoah has no witnesses because those who were present were either destroyed or deprived of their ability to bear witness.

The witness who cannot bear witness is, according to Giorgio Agamben (1999), embodied in the figure of the “Muselman,” that is, the corpse-like prisoner, drained of all vitality, who gave up and was in turn given up by his or her comrades. Davis argues that survivors do serve as witnesses for those who perished insofar as the dead speak through “the mouths of the living” (p. 121). Nevertheless, he criticizes the certainty with which Agamben (1999) claims to tell us how to listen to the voices of dead. Noting that Levinas (1991) had suggested that if there were any meaning to be had from the dead it would be a meaning that surprises, Davis complains that Agamben does not seem very surprised. Listening to the dead, according to Davis, entails attending to signs “which signify without any ascertainable signifying intention” (p. 126).

It seems to me that Davis’ words might just as well be directed toward analysts who are called upon to serve as witnesses to unspeakable traumas. After all, we too must deal with “a gap or lacuna which signifies but does not mean” that is often to be found in the dissociated experience of our patients. We too must be surprised by what we find there.

Having read Davis’ riveting introduction to Levinas’ writings (Davis, 1996), I expected nothing less than his lucid and succinct account of Levinas’ quarrels with Heidegger’s views on death. Heidegger insists that there is no dialogue or relationship with the dead, and that the only death which authentically concerns Dasein is its own. Passionately disagreeing with both claims, Levinas proposes that in love we discover that the death of the other matters more to us than our own. He argues that the self is constituted by the living other and by the dead other.

This book will undoubtedly hold special appeal to analysts with a strong interest in film. As Davis notes, “To watch film is to be in the presence of spectres . . . (p. 21). While he touches on recent films such as Ghost, Truly Madly Deeply, and The Sixth Sense, he examines two vampire films in great depth: Louis Feuillade’s serial film of 1915 Les Vampires, which he discusses in light of Freud’s work from around the same period, and F. W. Murnau’s Nosferatu.

Readers turning to Davis for clear answers about our relation to the dead will be disappointed, and possibly, frustrated. To a very large extent Davis has achieved his goals of resisting a “tidy restoration of moral and epistemological orders,” and “a clear delineation of the domains of the living and the dead” (p. 157). However, as someone who locates existential uncertainty at the heart of the psychoanalytic enterprise (Brothers, 2008), I find much to applaud in his refusal to grasp at certainty. Through his example, he encourages his readers to reflect on the “gaps and inconsistencies” in our discourses, and the “fault lines” in our knowledge. By preserving the veils that shroud our relation to the dead he helps us to appreciate that which is unknowable in our relation to the living.
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I begin this review with an acknowledgement. I am not a Kleinian scholar. Like most analytically oriented therapists, indeed like most practicing therapists in general, I am familiar with the concepts of splitting, the paranoid–schizoid and depressive positions and projective identification. Yet being familiar with is not the same thing as understanding the nuances and depth of these terms especially within a theoretical, historical and philosophical context. Fortunately in Other Banalities, Jon Mills’s brilliant collection of essays, the Kleinian context is presented with scholarship, texture and diversity. Studies in history, clinical practice, child development, religion and sociology present both Klein’s own theory with extensions, revisions and new applications also on display.

Mills sets the tone for this book in his Introduction, which manages to be insightful, creative and provocative. He wisely notes that Klein acknowledged her indebtedness to Freud even as she boldly went beyond his formulations. Anxiety and death became the cornerstones of her theory as they existed in “phantasy” and were tumultuously transformed from aggression to love if circumstances allowed. Mills highlights unconscious phantasy as central to Klein and post-Kleinians as manifested in the central unifying theme of these divergent book chapters: projective identification.

What is fascinating is the insight Mills develops about the need to protect orthodoxy of even such a revolutionary force as Klein. This book project was deemed “misguided” by Hanna Segal and none of the traditional Kleinians participated in these interdisciplinary chapters. The politics of “schools” apparently die hard or perhaps hardly die.

This review will not permit adequate space to review all the chapters so I will select some that were the most intellectually satisfying. I begin with R.D. Hinshelwood’s clear and well-formulated discussion of the historical and psychoanalytic context of Melanie Klein’s work. He correctly notes Klein’s theories were not well articulated theoretically as they grew out of clinical observations of children, which were ever evolving. She clearly valued experiential over scientific writings. What she did discover, which formed the basis of her theory, was the intense, consuming conflict between love and hate expressed in anxiety. When aggressive feelings are stimulated the child becomes terrified of losing love for the good parent and yet, unable to inhibit these aggressive feelings, projects them outward against a perceived/phantazied aggressor. The child’s hatred is then considered as defensive in nature: Projective identification.

In describing this process Klein opened up for study the field of object relations convincingly described by Hinschelwood.

Michael Eigen’s chapter takes the reader into madness defined as the expression of uncontrollable, devouring destructiveness. Written with a poetic feel, Eigen argues psychosis is both the result and attempt to regulate destructiveness that is both inside and outside the individual. At the same time there is the never ending, yet futile attempt to hold onto some goodness in order to survive and offset the death drive. In psychosis this is a losing battle as there is no end to the destructiveness and the primary anxiety of annihilation as the ego splits and breaks apart. Ever elusive, the good object serves to dilute, contain or mute the destructiveness by offering a sense of wholeness and cohesion.

In his chapter Eigen also addresses guilt and reparation, envy and gratitude, introducing Nietzsche, Winnicott, Bion and Lacan. He treats each with an even hand in raising their differences with Klein. One difference he highlights that caught my attention was Bion’s “exploding O” (p. 57) that he believed was active at the beginnings of personality and that Klein’s paranoid–schizoid position was too organized. Bion also believed this psychotic breakdown was different and distributed onto the political/cultural world for later digestion when the capacity was more adequately developed. This latter point has a more dynamic, fluid feel, and a restless energy, than a position, however active, which implies a phase or defined state.
In his chapter Walter A. Davis convincingly and beautifully delineates the unavoidable tragic struggle of the psyche. Resurrecting Freud, Davis defines the central condition of psychic life as “self-torture” (p. 159). For battle we must between the threat of annihilation/destruction and survival/integrity. The pivotal events of such struggles for the young child are manifested through the process of play. Using moving vignettes drawn from his own childhood constructions, he describes the feeling sense of these experiences. Davis also invites the reader to join him:

My hope is that the vignettes will operate like a dream or a day residue to activate processes in the reader’s unconscious that will restore contact with those experiences of childhood that we have lost contact with in psychoanalysis precisely because they cannot be measured or known by behavioristic examination. (p. 166)

What is often forgotten from childhood is the significance of play. In the immediacy of play there is freedom, surprise, creativity and discovery. For Davis such experiences are crucial to the developing tolerance of anxiety and the psychic suffering of the tragic or rather the willingness to bare even embrace the tragic.

In his fascinating chapter Jon Mills brings Hegel into his discussion of Klein’s contributions. While there are many places to enter into these considerations, I would like to briefly begin with Mill’s presentation of the Hegelian unconscious. Hegel believes the unconscious is a nocturnal abyss necessary for imagination and intelligence to develop. This abyss is viewed as the soul that educates itself, “… through it’s various dialectical configurations ascending toward higher shapes of self-conscious awareness” (Mills, p. 133).

These “higher shapes” or forms are restructured, reorganized, and reshaped as each dialectical conflict is sublated (negated yet preserved in part in order to elevate to a higher order) to form the interior of the nascent core of self or ego. Herein lies one of the differences Mills points out between Hegel and Klein. Hegel understands the ego exists prior to birth, emanating from and prepared by the increasing intrapsychic structure of the soul. Hegel posits the first ego object is itself and as such the first experience of splitting seen as the earliest activity of the mind. This process is when the unconscious soul undergoes a separation and projects as external its own internality only then to re-gather it and incorporate it as part of its internal structure. Klein, in contrast, theorized splitting comes later, after birth, with the ego’s first object being the breast. Both would agree, however, that the ego’s original activity is negation: splitting away from what it is not, identifying with and then re-introjecting it in transmuted form.

In his chapter on projective identification, Robert Maxwell Young wastes no time in proclaiming that this mechanism is the single most important and encompassing contribution of Klein’s. According to him it plays the central role in both the paranoid–schizoid and depressive positions from birth to old age. Further he would agree with Pick (1985) that the core of analysis is the projection of the patient onto the analyst with the aim of moving the patient from the paranoid–schizoid to the depressive position. Young refers to this goal rather informally and simply as “tak[ing] back the projections” (p. 61), so that patients reside in the depressive stance where they accept reparative guilt and responsibility for their feelings.

In his discussion of this concept Young is critical of many American analysts that emphasize only the interpersonal aspects of projective identification (Actually, his “instruction” quoted above would suggest this as well). Young notes that such an emphasis diminishes the intrapsychic nature of this mechanism that is a vital component to Klein’s thinking. I believe Young is correct in underscoring the fact that projective identification can occur wholly within the unconscious of one individual with only phantasies of an Other. In other words this form of projective identification is between one part of the unconscious and another. Young helpfully quotes Spillius (1988, p. 81-83) to offer an expanded definition of this mechanism that I find especially pertinent: “The many motives for projective identification—to control the object, to acquire it’s attributes, to evacuate a bad quality, to protect a good quality, to avoid separation—all are most usefully kept under the general umbrella.” (p. 66)

The final chapter I wish to discuss is by James Grotstein, that offers a spiritual and transcendent reading of Klein. Grotstein seeks to integrate Klein’s paranoid–schizoid and depressive positions, Bion’s container/contained and Bowlby’s theory of attachment to offer a comprehensive theory of belongingness that he refers to as the “covenant.” Grotstein, in poetic yet scholarly prose, focuses his attention on the quality of early attachments and primary identification in determining the successful or pathological transition from the paranoid–schizoid to depressive position. Secure attachment is more likely to lead to adaptive challenges being achieved despite the intensity of anxious, persecutory feelings. He succinctly notes that there must be a secure enough “good mother” to hear the complaints about the “bad mother” both by the infant and later by extension the analysand.

Grotstein, however, posits development beyond the depressive position. He suggests that when the necessary mourning and reparations of this position ends, the child is
“‘Ink-a-bink-a-bottle-of-ink …’ A little girl, seated at her grandmother’s dining room table, taps her finger in rhythm with her chant on each of a carefully arranged assortment of candies.” With these words, Doris Brothers begins the preface to her book *Toward a Psychology of Uncertainty: Trauma-Centered Psychoanalysis*. Is this memory, or story? In either case, it is personal.

In writing from a personal perspective, Dr. Brothers formed a pivot for this short and compelling book of important ideas. This pivot solves the difficulty that while some things can be analyzed clearly, other aspects cannot be said directly and must be pictured or enacted, perhaps as poetry or story that can generate a resonating experience. A psychology of *uncertainty* would be poorly served with simple intellectual clarity. So Dr. Brothers weaves intellectual clarity with the evocative power of words. She creates a rhythm beneath the surface, not only in clinical vignette and personal example, but indirectly in the way she constructs and develops her arguments.

It is not easy to present a careful exposition, a thought out analysis, and at the same time evoke something of the subject at hand, but I think that Dr. Brothers has accomplished this. I think it is possible to read this book and enjoy and respect it from a purely ideational perspective; it is logical and clearly argued. But it seems to me to be richer with its evocation of our own experiences of uncertainty.

I have delayed in finishing this review, which I started writing months ago, out of a suspicion that I could not be objective. Perhaps, I wondered, I am more sensitive to this invocation of the undertone of memory because I am writing this review from a personal place of great uncertainty and upheaval—a transition time and space in my private life, in a “sabbatical house” in a small shoreline community. At the same time, I felt that my attempts at a rational ideational cleansing of my words missed communicating something about the quality of Dr. Brothers’ writing. I have never met Dr. Brothers. Yet, it seemed to me she elicited a relationship with her readers and therefore with me. I felt it would be obtuse of me to respond to that unexpected relationship with only an analytic and impersonal critique. Her evocation of the shadow of relatedness between author and reader awakens our implicit understanding of how the relationship in the therapy room lives alongside unsaid experiences outside the room. This dark understanding supports the brighter clarity of her analysis.

This book, about trauma and the discomfort we have with uncertainty, is grounded by case examples and personal perspective that bring her thinking alive with the experience of insight and empathic resonance. In saying that, I do not mean to imply that this book is primarily personal narrative. It is not. Dr Brother’s balanced style of personal narrative and analytic thinking creates a layered exposition of her thesis. Fundamentally, her book is a clear discourse and analysis of three things: the nature of uncertainty related to reality and experience, the tendency of human understanding to withdraw from uncertainty into frozen certainty, and psychoanalysis as a method, discipline and theory that creates an openness, a tolerance for the discomfort of states of uncertainty. “Making the unbearable bearable.” Psychoanalysis can, she argues even welcome the sometimes feared and seemingly dangerous position where “the unique nature of each psychoanalytic relationship is celebrated.” (p. 3)

In short, she believes that it is time to “cultivate a psychology of uncertainty.” To bring psychoanalysis to this new psychology, we must loosen our anxious hold on “all attempts to find authoritative, irreducible, transcendent explanations.” Referring to similar critiques made by others, she restates the need to move more courageously into our own abilities to tolerate uncertainty and to relinquish our faith in the universality of the psychoanalytic theory of technique. As she notes:
Since we are profoundly dependent upon others for our experience of differentiated selfhood, but we cannot fully know them, or ourselves for that matter, experiences of uncertainty are an inescapable feature of human experience. (p. x)

Creating this new psychology involves incorporating two elements that are inevitably known to the psyche: the experience of relational systems and the experience of trauma. Both are aspects of the same thing—the tension and shock that we feel knowing that both the world and the psyches in the world are essentially “other” and also “us.”

Dr. Brothers tells us that her book’s central premise is that “experiences of existential uncertainty emerge from, and are continually transformed within, relational systems.”

The psychoanalyst, committed to see and hold what arises in each analysis, cannot escape facing the “unique” and “irreducible” nature of psychoanalytic relationship. So, Dr. Brothers would argue, psychoanalytic thought must either develop ways to discuss and understand uncertainty or find itself frozen, cut off from what is the basis of motion and change. She weaves her discourse with history, beginning with Freud’s “positivist paradigm with its glorification of scientific certainty,” proceeding to relational theory which forms the grounding of her psychology of uncertainty. Throughout her historical review, she does not hide her gentle, persistent nudge disrupting all the ways psychoanalysis reaches towards the reassurance of certainty, even though we know that certainty is not possible. Dr. Brothers discusses the tensions we feel as we struggle with complexity and uncertainty, how in our reasonable attempts to understand them we reach for simplification, but ultimately lose completeness because in longing for clarity we run toward illusions of sure knowledge.

As she lays out the relatively recent history of self, intersubjective and relational theory, Dr. Brothers uses the historical arguments to compel us to not only tolerate, but cultivate the discomfort of uncertainty in the face of powerful impulses to reduce complexity. She asks us to fight our impulse to feel secure in a “correct” theory, to avoid reification in favor of experience. She tells us to distrust any theoretical belief that “is believed to occur, without exception, at a predictable moment in development.” She asks us to accept that all understandings “emerge and evolve” and to relinquish our wish for eternal and solid rules that become codified, reified, and essentially close down growth. Dr. Brothers notes that we tend to feel anxious that things that are not fixed are formless – but she points out that the lack of certainty does not mean a lack of form, rather that dynamic systems form in evolving ways holding the tension between certainty and uncertainty.

Most importantly to her thesis, this work has the potential to deepen our exploration of the experience of trauma and our responses to it within relational systems. Trauma as a relational, complex phenomenon involving both shattered self and efforts at its restoration goes hand in hand with dissociation and the loss of integrated awareness. We become caught in trying to categorize and separate overwhelming experience into fixed understandings, living a “desperate search for experiences of sameness and difference.”

There is a refreshing and honest quality to her writing that allows the mind to open, freed from the necessity to argue to reach a fixed point within the logical, historical, and philosophical layers of discourse. With this book one can allow analytic criticism to exist side by side with personal and clinical evocations. For instance, I find that as I read, I was struck by certain phrases that reflect concepts for which I have a flexible but not fixed understanding. With such encounters, I stopped and wondered as to my understanding and the author’s use. “What do we mean when we say certain things that we take for granted everyone will understand?”

Let me give an example. When discussing the central role of intense emotional experience she notes, using a common phrase, that “In the absence of intense experiences of this sort, certainty about the likelihood of psychological survival may diminish.” I found myself wondering, what really do we mean by “psychological survival” or “annihilation?” I have my own sense. Many people use these phrases and we seem to find them just right to describe what we hope for and fear during certain kinds of intense, emotionally traumatic pain. But we usually don’t mean it quite literally. If after a car accident we say, “I was afraid that I would not survive,” we mean it literally. When we say someone feared “psychological annihilation” what do we mean? Sometimes there is a specific sense of “I was afraid I was going crazy.” Sometimes maybe we mean a kind of “soul murder.” Sometimes perhaps we mean something like what a person with dissociative disorder does experience: the death of a coherent ego identity and the birth of a new divided one. But mostly, I think, we do not really know exactly what we mean. And yet, we all understand something about what each of us might mean.

In the last chapters, as the triad of faith, hope and death is developed, the psychology of uncertainty takes a clearer but still dynamic form. Faith and hope coexist with doubt and insecurity as they arise out of uncertainty and trauma. We see how our fear of psychological annihilation reflects a loss of faith in knowing anything at all. In the traumatic explosion of established context, we experience the chaotic side of the paradox of chaos/form that is
uncertainty. If form remains opposed to chaos, it is split and dead, and we have no way to move on into an emerging reality of uncertain future. Healing requires openness to uncertainty, which allows in hope and faith. The paradox of uncertainty includes both chaos and form, without the wailing apart of dichotomy. Faith, Dr. Brothers notes, is not a static object, but is instead the experience that essentially one’s soul or spirit is not in jeopardy. Hope, she points out, arises out of uncertainty and healing is a normative developmental process.

In trauma we are exiled from our illusion of certainty and in multiple ways we face the experience of annihilation and death. Death is unknown, yet ultimately certain, both fearful and attractive. Dr. Brothers escorts us into the dilemma—how what seem to be opposites also seem to be intrinsically connected, and, like the magnetic poles of the earth, liable to flip and be perceived in reversed positions. We dichotomize, create opposing concepts, so as to create order, only to discover that our concepts seem now to move on their own, turning over their meaning and refusing to sit still for us just when we think we have a secure understanding. Is it Eros, or is it Thanatos? In our experiences of death—death, symbolic death, desire and fear—we can see and feel how our experiences are not really so fixed. Even the models we construct to bring us clarity reveal unintentional duality and nuance, plunging us again into the uncertainty we are trying to escape. This paradox is the aliveness that underlies our attempts to secure our concepts. It is the place which refuses to stay where it is supposed to be, refuses to follow the outlines of our carefully laid out theories, and frequently reallocates the attributes we’ve assigned to each side.

As she concludes with a case study involving burnout, analytic error, chance, and the meaning of a shrug, Dr. Brothers ends as she begins, reminding us of all the small accidental disasters that liberate us to painful truths that we have warded off, to disruptions in how we understand ourselves and how we work, and the “uncanny” accidents of chance or grace that can bring healing and hope in the precariousness of uncertainty.
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continued from page 14
free to move on with/in his or her life. Grotstein then offers another position for consideration: “The next position stop is the transcendent position, where the non-contingent self can flower at last, after having “paid its dues,” so to speak, as a dutiful contingent self in the depressive position.” (p. 115) Explained another way, Grotstein refers to this position as the “addiction to being alive.” (p. 115)

As I conclude this review I am aware I have not done justice to the complexity and originality of the chapters I have cited. I hopefully have provided a taste that will whet the intellectual appetite of the reader and result in a more fully detailed and personal reading of this impressive book. I am also aware I have neglected chapters by Marilyn Charles, Michael Rustin, Keith Haartman and C. Fred Alford, and for this I apologize. These omissions do not reflect on the quality of the writing or ideas yet may inadvertently offer the reader another compelling reason to purchase and savor this book.

Richard Raubolt PhD
Ada, Michigan
r.raubolt@gmail.com
In mulling over Feeling Matters, I find myself concurrently thinking this is an easy and difficult review to write. Easy because I feel that anyone who has taken the time to read my opening sentence should read this book. Why? Well, if you know Eigen and like him then I am happy to report that his voice continues to be steadfast. If you don’t know Eigen, you should. He is well worth wrestling with for any reader of this newsletter. Allow me to make clear why the review feels difficult and how in reading Eigen, words such as wrestling come to mind.

As a reviewer, I note that I am in good company regarding this joyful conflict of the easy and difficult or a dialectic of the simpleminded and muddleheaded in regard to Eigen’s work. For example, Abbasi (2003) finds it difficult to capture in words the experience of reading Eigen. This is in part due to the manner in which Eigen can pinpoint what is referred to as “trauma clots,” and in so doing present a vivid description of being at home with what cannot be tolerated. Like Abbasi, I find that to read Eigen is to find an opening in which thinking is possible and thus have a space to reexamine my own technique. However, some (e.g., Ahumada, 1998; Galatzer-Levy, 1988) find that Eigen’s writing illustrates a technique that appears wrongheaded and uncritical. If it is not already obvious, I will confess to being biased. In my reading of Feeling Matters I re-experienced some of the most difficult moments in my current caseload. This made for slower reading than I expected, as it engaged critical thinking in regard to honest and good technique. As Anshin (1988, p. 550) has noted, Eigen’s presentation of cases that are not neat, but are vivid illustrations of “struggle, confusion, pain, and growth” is helpful.

It occurs to me that the negative reviews are based on an essentialism of method and technique that borders on the rigidly absurd. In that narrow view however, there is a point to be made that Eigen does not follow a metric standardized for technocratic deployment. There is abundant evidence regarding that in his recent work. For example, the last chapter entitled The Annihilated Self, draws on postings from a PsyBC seminar. Here I was struck by the style of citation, which is far from typical. Simply, when Michael refers to colleagues he uses their first name. Last I checked this is not APA style even when it is followed by a last name with a date in parenthesis. Frankly, the shock of the first name intimacy was enjoyable and at first led me to wonder who was being referred to—a patient or a colleague. Throughout the book I continued to be struck by Eigen’s ability to render people in human terms that challenge asymmetrical safety in part by a style of writing in which the person who is speaking shifts in a subtle manner.

Eigen cautions that the tendency to view science as a technique that makes details known in an apparently objective fashion—an arid botanizing—is not where he wants to be, as such a manner of knowing can occlude knowing in a felt or experiential sense. As the title of this book indicates, Eigen is utilizing a method that favors the felt, in that felt is the struggle to come to terms with finding a capacity to sing “in the center of our gnarled selves” (p. 92). In this regard, Strenger (2004) has considered Eigen’s work to fall within a Neo-Platonic tradition whose emphasis is a mystical journey from agony to ecstasy that has no truck with normalizing, but favors the pain of being an outsider with a willingness to go one’s own way. As Strenger writes, to read Eigen is to find a case of fringe theatre that has conquered Broadway.

After reading Strenger’s take for another review (Rothschild, 2007), I was motivated to pick up a copy of Lust (Eigen, 2006), and I found myself remembering a paper given during an APA film program a few years ago (Eigen, 1995). What struck me was that in 1995, I mainly heard that paper because it afforded a cheap night at the movies in New York, a major event in light of having just finished my first year of graduate school. I deeply enjoyed the experiential quality of the paper, and was struck by Eigen as a thinker. However, as a student in the masters program at the New School for Social Research (knee deep in feeding on good cognitive psychology while simultaneously longing for psychoanalytic PhD life and
missing my undergraduate readings in psychoanalysis and philosophy) it did not feel it was a time safe to embrace fringe theatre. I was finding it challenging enough to exist on the other side of the margin (i.e., science of the mind—although captivating in its own right). My point in telling this story is not only to highlight that maintaining a wider view of what constitutes a valid empirical engagement is not always easy, but also to note the unique quality of Eigen’s voice. That night in 1995, I went to the movies. I did not know who it was that gave that paper until October 2008 when in planning to write this review I contacted APA’s Convention Office in hopes of proving my fantasy that the person who gave that paper was the same person I was meeting in print.

That Eigen’s voice carries such a recognizable consistency across the spoken and written word and over a decade is due to his ability to be himself in being his self, Eigen eloquently writes on working with trauma. He refers to therapy as a place where monsters can be at home, as therapy invites sharing what is not easy to see. He considers this a place in which containment may not be found, but company is present. Personally, to sit with that limitation as a clinician is, I think, to be challenged in a very good way.

In a chapter entitled Alone Points, he writes about his chair. The vignette begins with a patient stating that the chair is “disgusting” (p. 101). Eigen writes that in his choice of a chair he made it easy for his patient to hide (via projection) his [patient’s] self-disgust in his own [Eigen’s]. He then shifts focus slightly to note that many damaged people feel at home in the same environment, and that although he did eventually get a new chair, that “new furniture will not make what is off kilter go away” (p. 101). Instead Eigen recommends dipping into stuck points in order to potentially change one’s relation to them. This seems to me an essential ingredient of good analytic technique.

In addition to writing about therapy, Eigen also focuses on projection in other contexts, specifically war and politics. Here he considers war to be a creation of disaster in order to make one’s deadness seen. While this may not be novel to those who think psychoanalytically, I appreciate his capacity to speak about war and what he calls “election rape” in reference to the manner in which the Bush/Gore election rekindled a patient’s own rape. In this regard, the political scene exists as an end in itself and also as a vehicle in which a patient re-experiences her personal developmental history. Here Eigen’s use of the death drive as a concept in some way may be considered to run parallel with Kleins’ (both Naomi [Klein, 2008] and Melanie), but in each case moves a step beyond in his articulation that feelings do matter and that the manner in which our society is structured makes this assertion necessary.

Lastly, while the work reads in an experiential manner, the chapter “Boxes of Madness” engages Winnicott, Klein, Lacan, and Bion in a rich manner. To this reader, it is meta-theory that affords a good feed. The richness of the chapter is beyond the scope of this review. However, one example will allow a dip into the importance of a good feed. Here Eigen plays with the cliché “life sucks” by unpacking it as a description of a chronically disappointing feed in a time before teeth or oral castration. He then proceeds in a few sentences to describe the manner in which we can learn to nourish what is vital and not destroy it, and takes a brief tour through Nietzsche in a manner that runs along the lines of Paras (2006) and will hold the attention of any student of poststructuralist thinking and psychoanalysis. This is a good feed. I recommend that you feed on it too.

References:

Louis Rothschild, PhD
Providence, Rhode Island
LRothschild@verizon.net
This is a powerful and important book for all practitioners, not only for those of us who work with young children. We all are faced at various points in our career with patients whose needs are such that we cannot fill them, who in turn fill us with the type of despair being written about in each chapter of this compelling volume.

The literature is full of stories of treatments gone well. It is far more difficult to talk together about those treatments that do not go so well, the ones we think back on with regret or sadness. We often feel as though “if only we were better practitioners . . .” or “if only there had been more resources . . .” then, somehow, things might have gone better. In this way, we create in our imaginations a perfect world through which we rescue ourselves from despair but also persecute ourselves in the process. More importantly, we work against what is perhaps the more fundamental dilemma: to help our patients to learn to cope more competently and with greater equilibrium with whatever challenges they face, and to be able to obtain some pleasure and satisfaction from even the small steps and milestones they (and we) are able to achieve.

To work with those in most need, we must be able to face the fact that, at some level, in this work we are always up against the limits of resources, both internal and external. Knowing that—and forging on in spite of that fact—is something we all can share. Failing to acknowledge that limiting edge, and the terrible price we and our patients sometimes pay in the face of it, leaves us each alone in our despair, feeling personally implicated by what we experience as an internal failure rather than an inevitable edge of therapeutic action.

In refreshing contrast, in this volume the authors come together to acknowledge that whereas work with infants and their families can be tremendously rewarding; it can also be intensely painful and disappointing. Each author offers a case history from his or her experience to “explore the limits of the tools of infant–parent psychotherapy and reflect on what can be learned from the sometimes excruciating distress of failures. This is not an exercise in despair, but an effort to grow our field into a new maturity, in which failures and limited outcomes can be acknowledged and endured without despair” (p. 8). Each case is then followed by a commentary by one of the other authors. In this way, the form of the book provides a conversation between the therapist, who is able to reflect back on what went well and what went badly, and an outside observer, who is able to bring another perspective to bear. While talking about our failures requires courage, it enables us to learn from those experiences and also to encounter the respect of other seasoned clinicians who can imagine being in a similar dilemma and inevitably struggling as well.

This volume counters the tendency to believe that “if we just knew enough” or “did it well enough,” that all would be right in the end. For those of us who work with more severely disturbed patients, or individuals in the types of dire straits described in this volume, this is simply not the case. While we always hope to alleviate pain and despair, we also come up against the very real damage and limitations of resources that bound our ability to provide assistance or relief. Failing to recognize the inevitability of our own limits provides an impossible model for our patients, perpetuating a manic fantasy rather than encouraging a more realistic coming to terms with limits, and finding satisfaction in what one is able to achieve.

The cases in this volume are all heart-breaking in some measure and yet we can also see that good work was done in spite of the limits which kept the treatment from coming to an optimal end. In each case, we can see how the therapist’s investment in providing care, recognition, and opportunities for learning provided support for parents or provided sustenance for a child in spite of whatever internal or external limits were also at play.

Editor Marian Birch’s ability to wonder about alternative methods provides a useful frame for the therapist who, while using the skills and conceptualizations available, must also be open to what he or she might be missing. For those who have been marginalized by social systems, it may be particularly important to affirm areas of competence by allowing the patient to lead and teach us rather than applying our theory in ways that may further dehumanize and alienate the patient from him or herself. Recognizing real limits and real strengths helps to provide traction for those who are feeling awash in impossible circumstances, offering the possibility of mourning losses rather than resisting them such that the resistance itself becomes a stopping point.

Birch ends the volume by addressing two central questions that run through all six cases. First, “What are the limits of a supportive, strengths-based approach?”
Far too many therapists and analysts tend to think about ethics from a paranoid–schizoid position. Necessary, but somehow cast with an unsavory and unwelcome tinge of Other, our ethics codes are apt to feel more like intruder than companion, certainly not something easy to fold comfortably into our charged and busy days. When I teach ethics workshops to colleagues, some come with a stoic attitude—in local jurisdictions, six hours a year are required for license renewal—and the braver enter with a note of defiance, as if it were offensive to the analytic enterprise that the rules of our professions should apply to us.

Would it have been easier to live in an earlier, simpler time, when we dissociated the frequency with which some of our colleagues hurt their patients? Not if we work toward integrating the highly disturbing reality that ours is an inherently dangerous enterprise, in which we are well served by guidelines, warning signs, checks and balances. The excellent volumes under review will serve well those in our community who appreciate how difficult, and how necessary, it is to work ethically in our complex contemporary circumstances.

I would caution the reader at the outset that it is far too easy, and perilous, to read on as if the topic under consideration did not apply to oneself. To think about our work as if it were impossible for us to violate a boundary—a even a sexual boundary—with a patient places us at risk not just for being blind to early warning signs that we may be losing our footing, but at the even greater risk of not attuning to the wrenching needs and desires our patients bring to us routinely: the living fire out of which significant therapeutic change, of necessity, emerges. What attunes us to possibility, paradoxically, holds potential to position us at the abyss.

Andrea Celenza, a psychologist and psychoanalyst, has worked for many years treating therapists, analysts, and members of the clergy who have violated sexual boundaries, or who have been referred (or self-referred) to her because they were at risk of such offenses. Her work spans training, consultation, supervisory, therapeutic, rehabilitation, and research contexts, and thus she is able to write from a position of highly specialized experience and expertise; for example, her book includes both a Rorschach investigation (conducted with Mark Hilsenroth) of some of the characteristics of known transgressors and samples of letters that could be written to a licensing board about the treatment/rehabilitation status of a clinician who has transgressed.

Celenza’s thinking combines a frank acknowledgement that it is impossible to know the full scope and dimensions of the problem of sexual boundary violations by helping professionals and a tone that speaks with confidence and conviction about what we do know. Much as some within our professions have worked to make it safe for abuse to be disclosed, reported, discussed, and sanctioned rather than sheltered, there is still no way we can know systematically how many therapists violate sexual boundaries, much less gain detailed knowledge of the operative dynamics in the full variety of kinds of offenses that present. Celenza ably summarizes the available empirical and dynamic literatures, and extends these, from her own clinical experience, by developing categories, outlines, and profiles of what is likely to present in transgressing therapists presenting for assessment and treatment. She also usefully highlights precursor conditions that can make therapists prone to transgress, such as isolation, overwork, limited personal supports, economic strain, and failure to seek necessary consultation and supervision when a treatment reaches impasse. She lends
significant evidence to the growing body of data suggesting that therapists who abuse their patients are, in their overwhelming majority, not “bad apples” who cleverly have escaped detection by those charged with selecting and monitoring the progress of candidates for clinical training, but intelligent, competent, empathic clinicians with personality vulnerabilities that come up against the intense demands of clinical work with patients with their own intense needs and weaknesses. She also marshals substantial support for the corollary proposition, that many (not all) helping professionals who transgress can, through adequate treatment, become able to practice safely again.

Several of Celenza’s chapters are re-workings of previously published papers. While this introduces a certain amount of overlap and repetition into the volume, in the end I found it more welcome than intrusive. In the challenging effort to internalize the complexity and charge of the material under discussion, it facilitated my working through Celenza’s lesson to us. The lesson is that we have no choice but to engage in a sustained, reflective manner with issues we would like to avoid. Our responsibility for avoiding therapeutic transgressions is both highly personal and roundly collective, and not at all tangential to, but intricately interwoven with, the essential nature of our work.

I would have liked to see Celenza engage a bit more with two issues that seem to arise from her work. One has to do with how recent history affects the work of contemporary clinicians, particularly those of us whose work has been enlivened by intersubjective and relational thinking. (I am not referring to the fact that managed care and insurance companies hate and exploit us; part of the problem, but too cheap a shot.) By happenstance I wrote part of this review while listening to music on You Tube, and allowed the associative stream of my selections to find its own course. A man of my generation, I wandered for a time into music of the 1960s, where I heard quaintly dated but contextually stunning phrases, such as “We are all outlaws in the eyes of America. . . . . We are forces of chaos and anarchy and we are very proud of ourselves. . . . Tear down the walls; we can be together” (Jefferson Airplane, We Can Be Together). To what extent do the historically recent democratization of hierarchy, welcoming of diversity of sexual exploration and expression, and challenging of conventional certainty open contemporary therapists to unique challenges in our attempts to hold to necessary boundaries? Celenza makes passing mention of some of these factors; I hope she will help us explore them more deeply and thoroughly in future work.

Celenza, as I do, seems to practice in a setting
that does not question her right to exist and work. When she, rightly, speaks of the inescapable importance of working clinicians seeking ongoing supervision and frequent consultation, her unstated assumption is that this is possible, echoing the classic Freudian assumption that fees for therapy should easily enough provide the therapist a comfortable living and avoid presenting such a burden to the patient that the transference becomes structurally skewed. Yet many of our colleagues train and work in settings and climates where access to necessary resources and supports is a luxury, attained at best with sacrifice. We should have no doubt that space for the psychodynamic therapies, and reflective living more broadly, is under assault. Celenza helps us frame a very worthy intellectual counter-assault; an equally compelling, and complex, concomitant task is to work out its practical implications.

The Gutheil and Brodsky volume takes a useful step in this direction by framing its primary task as the prevention of boundary violations, which it defines as inclusive of, but not limited to, sexual boundary violations. In adopting such a wide scope, and additionally stating its intention to speak to counselors and psychotherapists of varying theoretical orientations and working in a wide diversity of settings, its goal is ambitious. Admirably, it meets its self-defined task, not by writing at a lowest common denominator level, but in challenging readers to think into the inherently complex and slippery nature of clinical work, and to meld that with a grounding in the principles that the patient’s well-being must always remain central; that the therapist has disproportionate responsibility for maintaining professional boundaries; and that when lapses occur they need to be understood and addressed.

Therapists reading this volume, it is safe to say, will have the uncomfortable experience, mirroring the experience of good therapy, of being simultaneously deeply understood and soundly disrupted. Unlike many treatments of ethical issues, this book does not hold out a distorted oversimplification of the therapeutic encounter as somehow less ambiguous and subtle than we know it to be. Gutheil and Brodsky acknowledge, and help us think very seriously about, the changes in social values, practice contexts, and therapeutic approaches that are part of the modern landscape. But they are insistent that this cannot be grounds for throwing out—does the notion sound as old-fashioned as the Jefferson Airplane?—professionalism.

Several things consistently and systematically reflected in both the tone and the content of this book are unusual and striking. At no point will the reader have any doubt that the writers are working, and very seasoned, clinicians, who both deeply enjoy and deeply think about their clinical work. While their erudition is impressive—the variety of literatures they summarize and evaluate with critical authority is magisterial—we are never far away from the texture of everyday clinical life. The rich case illustrations have the ring of the familiar; if we have not experienced the exact dilemmas the authors discuss, we have experienced something very similar, or heard of someone who has. Thus, they do not leave to the reader the task of working from geometric abstractions to the messier realm of the mundane. They meet us where we live.

I also very much liked that chapters draw out essential axioms and principles, stated plainly as such, simple but far from simplistic. The middle section of the book explores themes such as therapeutic roles; parameters of the therapeutic setting; money and gifts; intentional, unavoidable, and unintentional self-disclosure; extra-therapeutic contacts; physical contact between patients and therapists; and sexual boundaries. Each chapter is followed by a brief series of “Key Reminders.” These are impressively mindful of context and devoid of rigidities, and in this sense more classical than conservative in orientation. Repeatedly echoed themes include the centrality of therapists taking responsibility for their actions and orienting them toward therapeutic intent, consultation early on when we have questions about something that has happened, documenting boundary crossings, and examining and processing their meanings with patients in a forthright manner, as soon as possible after they occur—as they will. The authors draw distinctions between boundary crossings (such as meeting a patient in the community, or offering an extra session during crisis) and counter-therapeutic violations of boundary, but stress that even the latter often lend themselves to repair, if the therapist does the work of exploring and taking responsibility for what has happened,
including understanding how it came to occur, and what must change.

I find it especially commendable that Celenza and Gutheil and Brodsky write from an identification with psychodynamic and psychoanalytic therapy, while seeking to address a broader mental health audience—something that does not happen often enough. In doing so, they make a kind of gift of the riches of our tradition, one that I hope will be widely appreciated both for its practicality and its fine crafting. I would think that any student looking for an initial grounding in professional issues in therapy, and any study group of experienced clinicians working on refining and deepening their mastery of ethical issues, would be well served by reading these volumes—as our editor commended to me—together.
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and second, “what is it in work with infants that makes us so partial to being supportive and makes it so difficult to tolerate, metabolize, and use therapeutically the intense countertransference feelings that are evoked when we see children suffering and we cannot stop it?” (p. 255-257). In considering these questions, the reader is invited to think more deeply about some of the very complicated feelings engendered in us all as therapists who come up against the limits of what we can and cannot do for with individuals in our work. Further, we are invited to consider how our own difficulties in tolerating those limits impede our patients’ efforts to successfully mourn real losses and to celebrate developmental achievements.

The contributors to this volume have offered us a very rich and compelling invitation to think together about our successes and failures and thus to consider how to better support one another in this very difficult work we do. Finding Hope in Despair makes a powerful and important contribution to the field, inviting the types of conversations that are likely to be valuable to practitioners at any level.
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I would like to begin this review with a phrase from Grotstein’s dedication. It captures the spirit of imaginative inquiry that Bion advocates through his writing: a spirit and a sensibility that is essential to psychoanalysis and that infuses this book with life; a spirit that Grotstein wholeheartedly conveys in his expression of gratitude to Bion for “… encouraging me to play with your ideas as well as my own” (unnumbered page). I feel welcomed by Grotstein, into a creative reading. Space exists for one’s own Truth to evolve through one’s relationship with the text. Grotstein exemplifies this approach to being with and responding to Bion through his own creative peregrinations throughout. He notes, “it is not so much a faithful rendering of his ideas as my digestion of his work at the moment!” (p. 5).

The book is a welcome addition to a expanding number of thoughtful reflections and creative extensions of Bion’s work that have appeared over the past decade including Eigen, 2004; Ferro, 2005; Lopez Corvo, 2006; Ogden, 2005; Rhode, 1998. Grotstein’s edition is a challenging, but extremely rewarding book. Despite my ongoing interest in Bion’s work, the challenge for me resides in Grotstein’s approach to the subject matter, which, to paraphrase his expression, “disturbs my universe” through a generous offering of an incredibly comprehensive, at times exhausting, personal and creative text that operates successfully on a number of levels stretching out between informative and performative writing.

Grotstein provides an encyclopedic, occasionally repetitive elaboration of all of Bion’s key ideas, too numerous to list here. The text at once becomes biographical, autobiographical, exegetical, critical and creative and goes beyond simple renderings of Bion’s concepts. The reader will note hints of idealization sprinkled generously throughout the text despite Bion’s repeated warnings and protestations. For instance, from his analysis with Bion, in response to an interpretation, Grotstein said, “I follow you.” He [Bion] responded with, ‘Yes, I was afraid of that!’” (p. 32). I am reminded of Bion’s caution to “Beware the charismatic individual” (1975, p. 251).

Grotstein goes straight for the heart of Bion’s epistemology through the latter’s notions of Faith in “O,” uncertainty, “at-one-ment,” negative capability, and Language of Achievement, to name a few. He details how these notions, which are central to Bion’s psychoanalysis, engender a radical change in psychoanalytic model building and in working out precise clinical interventions. In so doing, according to Grotstein, Bion points to the mystical potential in all of us. He writes “Bion has enfranchised mysticism as an invaluable and obligatory component of psychoanalytic epistemology” (p. 3). In this way he carefully charts a middle-ground in Bion’s work that balances seemingly disparate cognitive, intuitive, scientific, biological, philosophical, and mystical elements into a cohesive whole. Despite this wide-range of influence, he clearly emphasizes Bion the psychoanalyst and non-religious mystic; more the creative dreamer living in the undefined uncertain infinity of psychic experience than the thinker who simply discovers within the limitations of what can be defined as limited, which Eric Rhode describes as lexical: as if “there is a dictionary, call it history, possibly, which can fill any gap” (1998, p. 20). In this process, Grotstein proceeds to unpack Bion’s key concepts, often with his own spin and elaboration. Chapter Twelve on the “transcendent position” exemplifies one creative elaboration worthy of the reader’s repeated attention.

One aspect of this volume that I would like to comment on is the seamless integration of abstract ideas with experience. Bion’s inventive use of language is complex and unique. As the literary scholar Mary Jacobus notes, “At times he writes like a lucid cross between a latter-day Wittgenstein or Beckett and a 1960’s new-math teacher—analytically, laconically, abstractly, unstopobably” (2005, p. 259). In this respect the difficulty for the writer seems to lie in the common pitfall of over-quoting and simply paraphrasing Bion. Grotstein has negotiated this problem beautifully. Rather than working through a vicariously lived paraphrasing
or “re-interpretation” of Bion’s “O.” He operates, as I see it, through multiple ongoing realizations and expressions of his own experiencing “Being O,” which he seems to embrace and then willingly lets go of. Grotstein then moves on before the experience becomes reified and over saturates the psychic space from which his creative insights seem to have evolved from.

As text, this process evolves out of Grotstein’s autobiographical narrative, which I experienced as moving, playful and often quite intimate, especially as Grotstein brings the reader into his analysis with Bion. I find these self-disclosures to be deeply personal, touching but not overbearing. They seem to highlight experientially rather than distract from the points under discussion. This autobiographical orientation reflects a refreshing trend that has increasingly filtered into contemporary psychoanalytic writing. In this manner, Grotstein’s personal narrative exemplifies, through his own experiences, the subtle and elusive concepts that he writes about. It is through this autobiographical narrative, the significance that Bion attributes to the relationship between self and other as a crucial facilitator of the deepening and expanding evolution of inner exploration characterized by Grotstein as a movement from impersonal “O” (Truth) to personal “O” (truth) that makes the abstract aspects of the discussion come alive. With this autobiographical groundwork in place, Grotstein proceeds to weave a seamless connection to Bion’s theory of thinking by linking the impersonal and the personal to beta elements (raw sensory stimuli of emotional experience) and alpha elements (“the elementary alphabet of thoughts” p. 68) respectively. In this manner he establishes a clear connection to an important discussion of Bion’s radical conceptualization of psychoanalytic technique. For example, he emphasizes the ongoing oscillating dynamic between projective identification and the analyst’s capacity for reverie as a successful or unsuccessful communicative function. This movement away from an exclusively linear and positivist model in turn anticipates contemporary relational models in fundamental ways. Clinically, this perspective attunes the analyst to often subtle shifts in the analysand’s communications in relation to the analyst’s shifts in attention to the analysand and to the analyst’s own internal experience as the analyst “dreams” the session.

Evolution, in its infinity is unending. In this respect, this book serves as both a culmination and as a starting point for further “dreaming” psychoanalysis into the future. The multi-level approach to the format and content renders the work accessible to a wide readership, including the educated non-professional public, graduate students, psychoanalytic candidates, clinicians who are increasingly becoming interested in Bion’s ideas, long-time Bion scholars, and psychoanalytic educators. Selected readings from the book that I assigned stimulated an animated and fruitful discussion among advanced candidates in the Bion reading course that I teach for the Institute for Expressive Analysis in New York City. Personally, I find myself inspired by the passion and integrity that Grotstein brings to this work.
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On first flush the fields of neuroscience and psychoanalysis would seem to have little in common. They differ in epistemology and purpose. Neurobiologists are primarily devotees of the laboratory who enthusiastically embrace the natural science model; hence they focus heavily on basic research, and its guiding ethos of creating control. Psychoanalysts are almost all practitioners; they often harbor considerable skepticism about the natural science model; and they insist on creating meaning. Though neurobiology and psychoanalysis are frequently viewed as being worlds apart, the (purported) chasm is actually less pronounced than appears. Both lean towards determinism. Conventional psychoanalytic and neurophysiology literatures acknowledge the anatomical and functional reality of human development. Further, both psychoanalysts and neuroscientists seek causal links between anomalous structure (often arising during the developmental period) and pathological function (e.g., adult symptoms). Freud adhered to his medical roots by emphasizing that drives are biological in nature, and posited that neuroscience would eventually lend support to his psychoanalytic theory.

_Biology of Freedom_ epitomizes the growing interface of neuroscience with psychoanalysis. This text, authored by Francois Ansermet, a psychoanalyst, and Pierre Magistretti, a neuroscientist, opens with a broad overview of the book’s thesis: that experience leaves a trace, an inscription, that results in neurophysiological modifications. The authors explain how such inscriptions have an impact on the neuronal level. Though experiential processes result in physiological alterations, the trace effects are not static. Neuronal plasticity underlies the basis for one’s internal reality, or unconscious. Plasticity also forms the ability for an external-based reality via memories of tangible, objective (i.e., non-ideational) experiences. Ongoing experiences and their subsequent physiological inscriptions, the authors report, are simultaneously deterministic and freeing. Specifically, such synaptic modifications impact a person’s internal and external perceptions.

Following the introduction the authors describe the concept of plasticity vis-à-vis neuroscience and psychoanalysis. Anserment and Magistretti explain how the traditionally reductionistic qualities of each field are limited in their understanding of human functioning. Experience creates structural and functional modifications. Neuronal plasticity shifts our understandings of neurological and psychological functioning beyond a fixed entity—it now allows us to comprehensively view humans and human functioning as fluid. This makes it easier to account for idiography. Plasticity suggests that the bifurcational methods of searching for constitutional or psychological etiologies are insufficient. The concept of neuronal plasticity means the putative delineation between genetic or environment (or phenotypical vs. genotypical) expressions of humanity are less distinct, and that they are actually mutually facilitative. This scientifically grounded approach demonstrates the interactive processes between genetics and the environment. Perhaps the most significant implication of plasticity is that the fields of neuroscience and psychoanalysis share significant overlapping principles.

Another early focus of _Biology of Freedom_ is providing a concise overview of neurophysiological principles. The authors cover the structure, functions, and the communication of neurons. Following basic neuron descriptions (complete with easy-to-read diagrams and illustrations) Ansermet and Magistretti focus sharply on the mechanism of plasticity: synaptic transmission. They devote substantial attention explaining the functionality of neuronal communication and the ways in which this allows for plasticity. This is followed by a discussion.
of the neurobiological underpinnings of learning (and learning theory) and memory. The authors contend that the neurophysiological concepts of associative learning, long-term potentiation, and the effects of experiential traces within the hippocampus form the basis for neuronal plasticity. Ansermet and Magistretti further state that such concepts relate to psychodynamics. The authors reason the existence of a reciprocal relationship between neurobiology (and neuronal plasticity) and the unconscious, and demonstrate how this colors the lens through which we interpret our external world. For some this section is a necessary revisiting of basic neurophysiology, while for others it is a review and extension of biological principles. Regardless of one’s familiarity with psychobiology, this part will serve as an informative section upon which the thesis of the psychoanalysis–neuroscience relationship is built.

Whereas the beginning chapters focus on neuroscience, the middle sections address the neurobiological aspects of psychoanalytic drive theory, somatic experiences, and interpretations of the external world. Ansermet and Magistretti apply the groundbreaking neurobiological works of Damasio (1994) and LeDoux (1996) to psychodynamic concepts. Specifically, the authors demonstrate how psychosomatic reactions (e.g., agitation, blushing) have not only the commonly accepted psychodynamic etiology, but that they are further linked to a neurophysiologic factor (e.g., somatic marker), thus establishing the existence of biological substrates for psychological phenomena. They demonstrate how fantasies are firmly linked to unconscious bodily experiences, also known as somatic markers. Furthermore, this section addresses the neurobiological aspects of psychic tension, drive theory, and the mechanisms by which homeostasis are maintained.

Ansermet and Magistretti later parse the complexities of violence. They first explain the fantasy-driven impetuses of behavioral acts of violence. The authors then distinguish proactive, life-striving forms of violence (e.g., potency, self-protecting) from destructive types of violence (e.g., murder, domination, rape). Though each has a different individual and societal impact, the origins of these two behaviorally different methods of violence are more similar than unique. They explicate how the confluence of soma and psyche result in the manifestation of aggressive actions. This intriguing discussion of violence is followed by a discussion of the external–internal reality relationship. Ansermet and Magistretti provide everyday examples which highlight the overshadowing influence of one’s internal word. They provide information on how the unconscious—not bound to reality, temporal limits, or parameters—expands an individual’s range of behavioral and psychological reactions. The authors cogently report on the somatic foundations of psychoanalytic concepts of instincts and drives, and how these internal phenomena are more figural than internal stimuli in generating actions. They also explain how neurosis develops via stymied internal discharges, not the inaccessibility of external objects. The notion that unconscious, internal factors outweigh external and conscious factors in generating psychological and behavioral reactions is nothing new to psychoanalysts. What is new to many is the association with a psychobiological explanation. The authors, complete with diagrams, provide numerous examples highlighting the biological–psychological–behavioral relationship.

Ansermet and Magistretti later shift their focus to the experience of pleasure and unpleasure. They explain how neurosis develops via stymied internal discharges, not the inaccessibility of external objects. The notion that unconscious, internal factors outweigh external and conscious factors in generating psychological and behavioral reactions is nothing new to psychoanalysts. What is new to many is the association with a psychobiological explanation. The authors, complete with diagrams, provide numerous examples highlighting the biological–psychological–behavioral relationship.
words, conscious cognitive processes in concert with the more potent unconscious fantasies fuel somatic experiences (which stimulate the need for drive discharge) with the external object as the supposed trigger for discharge. However, the actual somatic marker is the true source. Ansermet and Magistretti lend biological (not to mention scientific) support to these classical psychoanalytic tenets.

The later focus of the text works to securely connect the concept of plasticity with psychoanalysis. Ansermet and Magistretti explain how experience modifies synapses. Such transcriptions impact (and modify) somatic markers, which influence the ways in which external reality is viewed while simultaneously modifying one’s internal reality. In other words, experience modifies the internal while the internal modifies our experience of the external. Neuronal plasticity (via experience), therefore, alters our neurobiology and our unconscious. This concept of inscription, however, marks a modification of another kind: determinism. From this perspective, neurobiological and psychological determinism is not fatalistic. Quite the contrary, experience produces functional and structural changes. Therefore, people are not narrowly confined to their psychology or biology. Though deterministic factors exist, experience breeds possibilities. The more one experiences, the more expansive parameters become. A person’s subjective perceptions and ever-changing internal word is born out of neuronal plasticity. This lends scientific support to the adage “existence proceeds essence.”

Ansermet and Magistretti discuss how, through the mechanisms of plasticity, experience inscribes traces on the neuronal circuits on the conscious, preconscious, and unconscious levels. The authors reference research demonstrating that certain sensory stimuli bypass the primary cortical areas and ascend directly from the thalamus to the amygdala. The amygdala is associated with the endocrine and autonomic systems. Ansermet and Magistretti provide procedural information indicating that stimuli going directly to the amygdala are unconscious from the outset, and that these inscriptions are related to somatic states (e.g., somatic markers). Such experiences remain unconscious, that is, unless psychoanalytic treatment occurs. This explains how a presumably innocuous external stimulus can trigger strong somatic and psychologically evocative reactions, often without the individual knowing why. The authors state this neurophysiological–psychological concept accounts for psychophysiological reactions experienced by people with drug addictions and sexual fetishes when exposed to certain external stimuli. This underscores the notion that motivations are to be found within internal reality, not external stimuli.

The central theme of **Biology of Freedom** is the provision of a neurophysiological foundation to psychoanalytic theory. The text closes by attempting to link theory with psychoanalytic practice. The goal of
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Psychodynamic therapy is to access a patient’s unconscious and to work through his/her fantasies. This information is not noteworthy. What is noteworthy in this section is what that authors claim insight-oriented treatment does on a neuronal level. Ansermet and Magistretti highlight how the working through of analytic therapy creates new traces via the treatment experience. Specifically, plasticity modifies synapses, which facilitates the alteration of internal reality. This provides new traces, which create a new window through which a patient interprets his or her world. By addressing a patient’s fantasies, associations, and somatic reactions, plasticity provides a modification, or freedom, from historical patterns and penchants. As the authors state:

In short, we can define the psychoanalyst in a new way as a practitioner of plasticity, that is, someone who is counting on the potentialities of plasticity to reopen the field of possibilities, not by rejecting what came before, but on the contrary by using what came before to enable the patient to do something else with it (p. 240).

Biology of Freedom represents an important movement in psychoanalysis. It offers a fresh outlook. Over the last 100 years, psychoanalysis has experienced a diversification of theoretical approaches (e.g., object relations, self psychology, and relational analysis). Integrating neuroscience with psychoanalysis allows for proactive expansion of our field. Buttressing psychoanalytic thought with psychoneurology enables psychoanalysis to advance via the incorporation of the broad psychophysiological literature.

Ansermet and Magistretti provide a successful bridging of two academic worlds. More rooted in neurobiology than psychology, some practitioners may feel intimidated by the biological focus. This is unnecessary. The authors’ clear writing style makes often dense material easily accessible to those psychologists without a solid understanding of neuroscience. Another significant strength in exploring the biology–psychoanalysis relationship is linking psychoanalysis with science. Much to the chagrin of scientifically oriented psychodynamic clinicians (not to mention the detriment of the field), psychoanalysis has often sidestepped controlled empirical examination. Neurobiology’s scientific foundation provides a much needed scientific approach to how we conceptualize psychoanalysis. Therefore, it behooves the psychodynamic practitioner to embrace the endeavors of Ansermet and Magistretti (and others).

A possible shortcoming of Biology of Freedom is its limited applicability to the consulting room. This book’s focus is on metapsychology, not technique. Also, the authors emphasize drive theory (i.e., pleasure principle, secondary principle) in addition to more controversial concepts like the death instinct. Therefore, those psychoanalytically oriented psychologists exclusively looking for neurology savvy treatment of non-drive theory approaches and/or for a practice-oriented text might find this book disappointing. However, the advantages far outweigh any shortcomings. Biology of Freedom: Neuronal Plasticity, Experience, and the Unconscious is a worthy read for any psychologist wishing to broaden his/her psychoanalytic thinking.
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One of the transformative moments in my analytic education happened in a class on analytic writing when I was exposed to the advice of Stephen Bernstein (1995). Describe what happens, Bernstein (p. 7) advised, show how you the analyst helped it happen and how you understood what occurred by selecting and integrating “verbal activities, affects, experiences, and responses by both the patient and the analyst over time.” Bernstein provided a light-bulb experience for a not-so-young new candidate: something happens in analysis for both patient and analyst; I as analyst have something to do with what happens; I as analyst can feel it and learn to see it and possibly write about it.

Therese Ragen does all this in The Consulting Room and Beyond, but she also breaks the rules. Ragen begins her book by describing a patient who wonders if he could possibly have killed his twin brother when he climbed into his crib during their naptime. Something clearly happened to Ragen as she listened to this patient and yet we do not hear about this patient again and we do not hear what happened between Ragen and the patient. Instead Ragen takes us into her psychoanalytic process and tells us the story of her soul.

Ragen titles this opening chapter “Legacy” and it is statement of her writing’s impact on me that I found myself wondering about the meaning of legacy: for Ragen, for our patients, for ourselves. The chapter is in many ways a meditation on and association to the meaning of legacy. Ragen describes how her musing on whether her patient could have murdered his brother sent her into a fragmenting, dissociative state that she could only make sense of months later when she found herself crying over pictures of a murdered man when she is called for jury duty. Ragen uses her affects, experiences, and responses in communication with her consult group and family and the psychoanalytic literature on transgenerational trauma to make sense of her reaction.

Legacy, according to my dictionary, means either property or money left by will or bequest or anything handed down from ancestor to descendent. Ragen’s patient has a legacy of trauma, not yet resolved, and Ragen describes how she discovered her own legacy of trauma:

When there is little communication about the parent’s trauma, children split off what they do not know along with the fantasies they have generated to fill the gaps into a dissociated part of themselves. Later events in their own life can break open what’s split off and throw them into bewildering and upsetting feelings and images that flood their bodies and minds.

For psychoanalysts, these later events importantly include the events that transpire in psychoanalysis with patients. What is unnamed or unresolved in patients “goes in search of an echo, in this improbable other [the analyst], of what official history has marginalized or trivialized, evoking in the analyst details and anecdotes that have been unclaimed, even in his or her own analysis” (Davoine & Gaudilliere, 2004, p. 11). A remnant of something that I hadn’t fully claimed was stirred in the consultation group. It took full form in and after my day in the courtroom. (pp. 13-14)

If trauma echoes on in our lives, as Ragen has demonstrated, what then is our responsibility for ourselves, our children, and our patients after the trauma of September 11th? Having been traumatized ourselves, how do we work and do no harm? This is a question that runs through the remaining chapters of Ragen’s book. As she listens to her patients and herself, she is willing to ask how psychoanalysis works with this sort of trauma.

Indeed, her second chapter is titled September 11, 2001 and in it Ragen describes listening to office workers close to the World Trade Center and her patients in the days following the attack. Trauma echoes in these passages and Ragen works to help her patients connect what they are feeling with what is happening in the world. She listens to herself as well, noting when her back and legs ache at the end of a long day of listening. In her entry for September 27th at 4 am, she writes of her longing to speak from a raw core into a quiet space where it is simply received and absorbed by someone who sits with her. And it struck me that Ragen was both describing what she was doing—providing a quiet space where patients’ primitive feelings were simply received and absorbed—and identifying a need in herself that she has not yet figured out how to meet. By the end of the chapter, she has found that quiet space.

In her third chapter, “Longing,” Ragen makes clear that she longs for more than quiet space:
Love . . . souls . . . these are not words in my psychoanalytic vocabulary. These are not realities through which we work and speak and have our psychoanalytic being—not often, anyhow. I miss these words, these realities. I miss them in and with my patients, in my colleagues and myself. Rank talked about love. Freud talked about the soul. How and when did we lose these parts of ourselves? (p. 36)

Ragen tells us of her younger self, named after Thérèse of Lisieux, playing being a priest performing the Eucharist with her brothers and sister. It is not only trauma that has been split off but access to spiritual and religious experience. And once again Ragen breaks the rules. Love and souls are not in the psychoanalytic vocabulary, she writes, but then she extends the psychoanalytic vocabulary by finding analysts who will talk about them. And even in stating that love and souls are not in the psychoanalytic vocabulary she uses words that echo from the Book of Common Prayer’s collect for guidance: “O heavenly Father, in whom we live and move and have our being.”

Ragen had acknowledged Carole Maso, author of “Break every rule: Essays on language, longing and desire,” and her continuing influence on Ragen’s writing. Now as I experienced Ragen breaking rules by talking about herself rather than a patient and by using words that she was saying were not in the psychoanalytic vocabulary, I got curious about what Maso had meant by “breaking every rule.” “If language is desire,” Maso (p. 158) had written, “if syntax and rhythm and tone and color create worlds of desire, if we see, if we live out on the margin, then how come we so often write between the lines?” Maso encouraged her audience to write outside the lines, to break that language contract and to “refuse to accept our limitations” (p. 159).

Ragen (pp. 43-44) writes about her patient Ben seeking a breakdown that is also a breakthrough and it strikes me that breaking the rules also seeks this sort of breakthrough, for both writer and reader.

Thomas Ogden (2005) has written that analytic writing is . . . equal parts meditation and the experience of wrestling a beast to the ground. As a meditation, writing constitutes a way of being with myself and of hearing myself coming into being in a way that has no equivalent in any other sector of my life. This “state of writing” is very similar to my experience of reverie in the analytic setting. (p. 117)

Ragen’s writing, like Ogden’s sends me into an experience of reverie. Perhaps breaking the rules can break open experience and allow us to discover and recover split off experiences.

In commenting on a paper by Pizer, Stern (2005) wrote:

So there are two kinds of good psychoanalytic writing, and the kinds of reading they require are, in a way, mirror images of one another. In the first kind, you have to work hard to read well, and then, later on, you finally arrive at an understanding good enough that you can go back and allow the words and meanings to wash over you. In the second kind, you have to allow your imagination free rein; you have to begin by letting the words wash over you; and if you read well and imagine deeply, you may be able to think hard about it later on and understand something different. (p. 87-88)

Ragen’s writing falls in to this second group: it is very accessible and I found that when I sat down to read, I could not stop until I had read the whole book. The words washed over me and it was only at the end that I could begin to wonder what had just happened to me. It was at this point that I went back to read again, this time as poetry or sacred text, the way teachers and colleagues and students have helped me to read Freud and Winnicott, Bromberg and Ghent and Ferro: line by line, aloud to a listening other. This sort of close reading is also a close living of the text. Ragen’s writing invites this close reading and close living.

In breaking the rules, Ragen reclaims the tradition of other psychoanalytic mystics like Jung and Milner, Ghent and Eigen and Ulanov. She is in good company and she invites her reader to join her.
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The revised edition of Talking with Patients: A Self Psychological View of Creative Intuition and Analytic Discipline is a gem of a book. The work is an updated compendium of the author’s reflections, insights and instincts about psychoanalytic work. It is also an autobiographical narrative of how one highly gifted and deeply intuitive psychoanalyst evolved in his approach to psychoanalytic practice.

The original edition of this book, first published in 1996, considered the theoretical turn in psychoanalysis to self psychology from classical psychoanalysis. This revised volume includes more recent theoretical developments. Dr. Shapiro’s years of practice of psychoanalysis have taken place concomitant with the seismic shift of the profession from classical ego psychology to the theories of self psychology and then to intersubjectivity theory, relational psychoanalysis, control mastery theory and the cognitive neuroscience related integration of neurobiology and psychoanalysis. The author has culled the most essential aspects of these orientations and summarized them succinctly. He then illustrates these with clinical material. An added dimension to the narrative is the link to the wider realm of intellectual ideas by the inclusion of aphorisms and quotations in the chapter headings.

Dr. Shapiro believes that the practice of psychoanalysis is challenged by the need to maintain “a balance between analytic discipline and creative intuition” (p. 1). This “creative intuition” influences his view of psychoanalytic practice and is a major theme of the book. His analytic work using creative intuition is, well, quite creative! Dr. Shapiro, a psychiatrist psychoanalyst, reveals his creative intuition with elegance and parsimony. In doing so, he deepens the understanding of what it means to be a psychoanalyst.

The author details the path taken by use of classical theory and then charts how the turn to self psychology and beyond changed these aspects of psychoanalysis for him. This thread runs through his discussion and is an important and valuable quality of this book. The distinctions between classical and contemporary psychoanalysis are often misunderstood; and as a consequence contemporary theories can be overlooked by those who wish to pursue psychoanalytic training.¹

The pervasive influence and reductionism of Freudian metapsychology in the culture as well as in mental health domains has often obscured the recent exciting theoretical and practical advances. In particular, the idea of working with patients in analysis in a two–person system is a departure from what is commonly believed about psychoanalysis. The one–person system more closely reflects traditional hierarchical social structures. Thus, the juxtaposition of classical and contemporary views as taken from the author’s own experiences is very valuable. Moreover, the author’s voice, resonant with compassion, empathy and intuition, mirror what transpires in psychoanalytic therapy.

The essential elements of the “analytic attitude” (Schafer, 1983), that lens from which a psychoanalytic therapist approaches professional practice, are considered. These include issues in evaluation and diagnosis and with the question of “analyzability” (see Freud, 1964/1937 and Stone, 1954); the varying levels of therapeutic intensity (psychoanalysis versus psychoanalytic psychotherapy), as well as transference, countertransference, resistance dreams ¹

¹ Many graduate students in psychology and early career psychologists who I have supervised have become dissatisfied with cognitive behavioral therapies yet find that beginning psychoanalytic practice is difficult and overwhelming. This reaction may be due to the complexity of the field, its competing languages in describing clinical phenomena and the effects of training in the scientism dominated context of the American health care system.
Dr. Shapiro describes a model for supervisory consultation derived from contemporary practice. In one example, he agrees to participate in the treatment of the patient of a therapist whom he is supervising to provide additional containment of the patient’s seemingly intractable mental turmoil. He also provides a self psychological approach to couples therapy. The pitfalls of psychoanalytic practice such as isolation and the risk of litigation also are considered.

Dr. Shapiro has made this work compelling by liberally integrating the discussion with patient encounters which demonstrate the difficult aspects of clinical work. For example, in discussing an impasse during his work with “Jill,” the following account is provided:

When I did not know what to say, I remained silent, and she felt I was not there. It did not occur to me to tell her I didn’t know what to say so she would at least feel I was present. At one point, her feeling of disconnection led to a breakdown.

It happened during an hour where she was unable to talk, and I felt anguish and confusion as I watched her struggle and I felt helpless as she became more agitated. I thought that something would eventually occur to me, but she couldn’t stand it any longer, and without a word, she got up and started to walk out.

I have had patients walk out, come back the next day, and talk about it; but this scared me. If Jill walked out I expected I would never see her again. As she opened the door, I said, “Wait, please.” None of my rules was working, and I was operating on pure intuition. Jill returned and sat at the foot of the couch with her back to me. I felt I had only a moment to act before she would leave again.

I was in turmoil, I wanted to be helpful, yet I feared I would make a technical error and ruin everything. My reasoning processes failed me, but my intuition came to the rescue. I suddenly had a strong image of myself sitting next to her on the couch. Without thinking, I got up and went to her, sat next to her, and put my arm around her. I had never before touched a patient during a session. For one thing it was against the “rules,” and for another it was foreign to my reserved nature, but I held Jill and she relaxed. Neither of us talked, but I felt out connection was reestablished. Five minutes later the hour ended, and I said, “We’ll continue next time.” She nodded and left, and the next day she resumed the analysis as if nothing had happened.

Over the next six months we talked much about the experience. We both felt that my reaching out to her and holding her helped us get through a difficult period when neither of us had the words to connect with each other. That situation never recurred. (p. 77)

This poignant clinical moment reminds of us the poetry of clinical intuition in psychoanalytic work and the benefits of applying a two–person phenomenology. It also demonstrates how a psychoanalyst will struggle to understand herself as well as the psychological processes within the patient. This dimension derives from philosophical subjectivity and not scientific objectivist reductionism.

In the decades since Freud created psychoanalysis, the psychoanalytic literature has expanded logarithmically. Paradoxically, the many diverging voices of this expansion have oftentimes obscured explanation of what psychoanalysis actually is about. The revised edition of Talking With Patients is an addition to the literature that explains psychoanalysis clearly and concisely (examples of this trend are: McWilliams, 1994, 1999, and 2000; Mitchell & Black, 1996). We are indebted to Dr. Shapiro for taking the time to revise the previous edition. This book will be of interest to both those entering the field as well as seasoned practitioners who seek a jargon free and user–friendly understanding of the practice of contemporary psychoanalysis.
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Psychoanalytic Books

Clinical Applications of the Adult Attachment Interview. Edited by Howard Steele and Miriam Steele. New York: Guilford Press, 2008; 501 pp., $48.00.

Katie L. Fitzpatrick, MA

This book provides the reader with detailed yet concise information about the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI) with respect to theory, research, and clinical practice. The contents of the book were contributed by theorists, researchers, and clinicians and written in a way that does not assume that the reader has in-depth knowledge about the measure. At the same time, the book offers plenty of new thought regarding the theory and use of the measure that is useful and stimulating to the reader with AAI experience. As a trained interviewer and coder of the AAI as well as an AAI researcher, I found the book to be a source of the most recent research as well as a great comprehensive review of the AAI scoring and classification system.

The first part of this book provides a solid foundation for understanding the origin and development of the AAI, as well as the scoring and classification system. The disclosure of the details of the system was surprising given that the coding manuals are unpublished and can only be obtained through participation in an AAI training institute. What I found particularly interesting about this section of the book was the authors’ way of taking the reader through the interview protocol at times from the perspective of the interviewer and at other times from the perspective of the interviewee. In this respect, the reader can come to know both the intentions of certain questions and an understanding of the possible meanings of responses to these questions.

The remaining parts of the book offer a variety of clinical applications of the AAI with infant, adolescent, and adult populations and includes research on the treatment efficacy of such applications. Given the depth and breadth of information in this book, I decided to focus on one area of clinical application of the AAI: trauma. Within this section of the book, the perspectives of the contributing authors varied in clinical focus so that some chapters seemed more clinically applicable than others.

In my opinion, the most clinically relevant and experience-near chapter related to trauma work was the chapter entitled “The AAI and Its Contribution to a Therapeutic Intervention Project for Violent, Traumatized, and Suicidal Cases.” It is a highly thoughtful and coherent account of the authors’ use of the AAI in a non-traditional clinical context with difficult to engage, impoverished, and traumatized teenagers in Mexico City. The chapter conveys how useful and therapeutic the measure can be, not just for the interviewee, but for all of the individuals who gain knowledge and understanding from the experience of the interview and the information it brings to light. In this case, a team of psychoanalysts utilized the AAI with at-risk teenage mothers who participated in an outreach program that included a drop-in center run by community art instructors who provided art classes as well as child care and meals. The AAI was used predominantly as a kind of supervisory tool, as information and experience gained from the interviews was shared with the non-clinical instructors in order to help make meaning of their day-to-day interactions with the teens. This understanding of the teens’ attachment relationships, both historically and presently, enabled the instructors to understand their own feelings toward the teens. Subsequently, the instructors became more emotionally accessible to the teens and more tolerant of the sometimes highly intense and explosive interactions. Several case examples are given, which illustrate the nuances in individual responses to the AAI and how they relate to the context of the person’s early attachment-related experiences. The authors articulate how and why each case example fits into a certain attachment classification and how this information enriched their conceptualization of each case.

The chapter on adult attachment and PTSD in women with histories of abuse in childhood seemed to be written more from the perspective of a researcher and coder than of a clinician in that it focused more on the technical aspects of the AAI and the procedure of the study. The authors utilized the AAI to track the treatment outcome for symptoms identified as related to abuse in women ages 18 to 65 with histories of prolonged abuse (physical and/or sexual) during childhood. The study explores possible associations between AAI classification of “unresolved

Continued on page 37
Illusion and Ubiquity: Psychotherapy and Elsewhere

Ten years ago Stanley Teitelbaum published a book on “illusion and disillusionment.” A new paperback edition has recently been issued. It as relevant today as when it was first written; in fact, given the current economic climate, perhaps it is more relevant. Many believe that current economic and social issues are due to illusions about wealth and greed that have ruptured into disillusion and cynicism. In fact, much of contemporary interest in narcissism and related phenomena is based in distortions of social reality in service of individualistic perspectives. Teitelbaum offers us a discussion of various perspectives on the all-too-human experience of heightened and dashed expectations.

In our consulting room, we regularly work with examples of illusions and disillusions. Many patients who present with anxiety and depression regarding relationships, career choices, separation from parents, mid-life crisis, marital and family issues, aging and deceased parents, and other life crises are more explicitly presenting their disappointments and disillusions in their daily lives. Generally we expect life to go a “certain way” and seek treatment when “life doesn’t go according to our plans. Other patients present with intractable defense systems are often dealing with implications of disillusionment. These are often individuals who are fearful about the illusion/disillusionment process and have developed defensive strategies in an attempt to avoid this awareness. As Teitelbaum states:

Throughout their lives individuals maintain illusions about themselves and their world that sustain them and serve as organizing principles and the loss of these illusions in the harsh light of reality requires a psychological negotiation with the impact of disillusionment. (p. x)

Although Teitelbaum’s subtitle is “Core Issues in Psychotherapy” much of the book is not about psychotherapy per se. I would say the book is more of a psychological compendium on the themes illusion/disillusion across the life cycle, and across human experience. He begins with a consideration of the role of illusion/disillusion as a universal human experience. He introduces the topic by presenting the role of illusion/disillusion across the human life cycle, including “paradise lost” of infancy, then adolescence, mid-life crisis and concepts of immortality. Teitelbaum reminds us illusions about one’s self and one’s world are part of normal development and are necessary for emotional survival. Optimally these illusions are dismantled through a gradual, tolerable mourning process.

A later chapter takes a novel perspective, focusing on the ramifications of illusion/disillusion on popular culture, including examples in politics, theatre, music, movies and sports. He includes such historical references as Lyndon Johnson, Kennedy, Napoleon and Hitler. He even notes the disillusioned fans of the Brooklyn Dodgers when they moved to Los Angeles. He references movies such as Titanic, Lost Horizon, and Fatal Attraction, and songs such as “Over the Rainbow,” “The Land of Make Believe” (Camelot), and “I Dreamed a Dream” (Les Miserables). This chapter is highly “entertaining” and also points out the ubiquitous nature of his theme.

The author provides a survey of psychoanalytic theorists’ view on the subject, including material from Freud, Mahler, Jacobson. Fromm, Winnicott, Kohut, and Modell. Notably absent are Melanie Klein and, arguably, Eric Erickson. Both these theorists address stage/phase development that suggests the illusion/disillusion process. Both theorists propose “developmental tasks” that should be mastered and involve a change of perspective (Klein in regard to the “breast,” Erickson in regard to psychosocial demands) with subsequent a sort of “grief” and “working through.” Including the work of these writers, and perhaps others, would enhance the historical approach of the topic.
The bulk of the book includes chapters on the psychopathology of illusion/disillusion covering such topics of the role of defense, the power of illusion, illusion as an organizing principle, and the specific applications of depression and narcissism. He lists varieties of illusion, including necessary illusions, persistent illusions, shattered illusions, adaptive illusions, and positive illusion. Using clinical examples, he argues that psychic defenses can lead to the falsifying of inner perceptions, and thus promote illusion. In addition to this perceptive statement, Teitelbaum alludes to splitting, as the difficulty integrating positive and negative as a component of the illusion/disillusion process. He explores fantasy, idealization and grandiosity as other aspects of this process. Teitelbaum excels in this more abstract and conceptual presentation. His work brings to mind a flashlight, shedding light on all corners to the complexities of illusion/disillusion; it continues to open up this process in all its facets.

Of particular interest to clinicians are the chapters on narcissism and depression, with topics such as narcissistic wounds, narcissistic defenses and narcissistic illusions. Regarding depression, he lists five types of depressive response, that is, illusions leading to disillusions, leading to varied reactions including acceptance of reality, denial of reality, replacement illusions, defensive hypervigilance and despair. These distinctions can guide clinical assessment and interventions. In addition, general anxiety, borderline personality disorder, antisocial personality disorder substance use disorders, even aspects of bipolar disorder, and other diagnoses. Teitelbaum’s work can be fruitfully expanded in many other diagnostic and treatment applications.

Teitelbaum concludes with a chapter on psychoanalytic psychotherapy. While this topic is quite appropriate given the subtitle of the book, I believe it is also the weakest chapter. Unfortunately the theme is discussed in generalities, where more clinical specificity would be valuable. There is a discussion of patients’ illusions about psychotherapy and therapists’ illusions about psychotherapy; he then reviews psychotherapy process, transference, and the relational aspects of patient/therapist interaction. Although he clearly states that the clinical task is to accept and mourn the loss of illusions, he does not present specifics on how this would be accomplished. The chapter begs for vignettes and session transcripts to illuminate and illustrate this process. Although the author has given brief transcripts in other chapters, such as that on depression, the chapter specifically dealing with psychotherapy needs more concrete examples of clinical technique.

This review began with a reference to macro level issues in the current world economy; it then focused on micro issues of the clinical consultation room. I believe that Teitelbaum takes an important theme and approaches it from many levels. One is tempted to say that his book is not disillusioning. Although the material was quite informative, comprehensive and even novel, I feel disappointed in the crucial area of clinical application. There is almost something formulaic about the illusion-disillusion-mourning paradigm; I would rather a more creative process. Perhaps, however, I am merely avoiding my own disillusionment.

Dolores McCarthy
New York, NY
psychworks@msn.com

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 35

state of mind with respect to abuse” and diagnosis of PTSD. In particular, thinking about the discourse of unresolved speakers in the context of psychological responses to trauma (such as dissociative processes, re-experiencing and avoidance) is a new and interesting contribution of this chapter. Findings of the study suggest that PTSD symptoms, more than dissociative symptoms, predicted unresolved abuse classification. The authors then promote a “PTSD-informed” approach to the treatment of individuals with unresolved histories of abuse, particularly through the use of prolonged exposure techniques. This clinical recommendation lacks a detailed explanation and description of the application. In addition, the benefits of using the AAI and attachment theory in the treatment of individuals with PTSD is unclear.

I reviewed these two chapters within a single section of Clinical Applications of the Adult Attachment Interview in an attempt to convey the variation in what is meant by the term “clinical application.” Given the variation of clinical interests and styles of the contributing authors, some of the papers seemed more readily applicable to clinical work than others that resembled scientific manuscripts. On a similar note, this book reminded me of reading a volume of a psychology journal in that the structure is a compilation of individual papers, some of which are particularly relevant to my clinical work and interests. The common thread throughout the book is, of course, the use of AAI. That being said, there is repetition from one chapter to the next of explanations of the measure. This information could serve as a reiteration or refresher for some readers, but I found it redundant.

Overall, I feel this book is a great resource for orienting clinicians to the Adult Attachment Interview and a good reference for ideas on how to apply the measure once used solely for data collection in clinical settings.

Katie Fitzpatrick
Knoxville, TN
kfitzpa1@utk.edu
It is appropriate for a book that discusses psychoanalytic technique to emphasize the major aspects of a therapeutic process that aims at long-lasting changes. What characterizes this book is the combination of already well-known techniques and the new approaches made possible by Jacques Lacan, a psychoanalyst who introduced controversial changes, like the variable duration of the psychoanalytic session.

Bruce Fink discusses topics that are often overlooked by other textbooks, and also particular techniques on how to approach specific difficulties encountered during a psychoanalytic session. Its chapters could be read separately according to the interests of the clinician. Still, the sequence of the chapters follows the order of the problems that come up in a non-orthodox therapy, such as a Lacanian therapy.

One of the threads of the book is that the Imaginary (one of Lacan’s categories) is an obstacle to understanding the analysand. Yet, understanding does not come in a single moment; if it did, that would be an indication that some prejudice is at work in the mind of the psychoanalyst. Alternating general considerations and specific, technical recommendations, Fink mingles together these two facets sometimes using a colloquial language that makes the narrative persuasive but also too casual. Considering that, for Lacan, in the psychoanalytic setting, language is basically metaphorical, and its function is to evoke, communication is problematic. This is probably why Lacan denied that the psychoanalytic practice is a science. What is it then?

Reading this book, the impression is that psychoanalysis is a trial-and-error activity, during which precision in language is valuable because it raises issues to the surface; the important thing is that the analyst must not take offense at the analysand’s words, which would make the therapeutic process fail immediately (pp. 26-27). Furthermore, Fink writes: “The more open-ended the question, the more unexpected, unpredictable, and often more productive the answer” (p. 33).

When Lacan wrote: “I do not discover the truth—I invent it,” he was making an important point indicating psychoanalysis’s empirical and tentative side, due to the difficulty of finding out what is repressed and why, what analysands avoid and deny because of their fears. But above all, the many desires of the analysand must be taken into account; indeed for Lacan desire is a vital part of us human beings.

Not all chapters of Fink’s book are of equal importance. The fourth chapter endorses the variable-length session. It is a debated topic that has many detractors. Fink’s overall approach is flexible, probably more than Lacan’s was, in that Fink keeps usually longer sessions at the beginning of a therapy, and with the passing of time, he keeps them shorter. They are punctuated to mark the important points to be worked out by the analysands themselves after the session, so that the following one will bring new, important material to be analyzed. There are different techniques for punctuating, and Fink provides concrete examples on this topic.

One danger, Fink warns, is that technique becomes an end in itself to the detriment of what is important, namely, the identification of the desire(s) of the analysand. But sometimes in the course of analysis, symptoms worsen because of the libidinal, dual relationship that is established during the sessions. Another danger is the resurgence of jouissance, considered by Fink a negative “enjoyment or satisfaction people derive from their symptoms” (p. 69n).

On the practical side, Lacanians charge by the session independently of their length, which, for Fink, makes the treatment more affordable. This may be true, but short sessions do not leave time for analyzing dreams, an additional inconvenience is that the analysands must wait because of the different length of the sessions of the previous analysands. This, in my view, can only add to the anxiety of the analysands. And indeed Lacan’s office was
always crowded with people waiting for him to beckon them to enter the room where the actual session would take place.

As to interpreting, it should have an impact, whereas accuracy is less important given that it is only by approximation that we can understand another person. Besides, to explore and find new meanings is no panacea, they could be fantasies or even rationalizations—or simple clichés. Without giving a univocal definition of meaning, Fink insists that the analyst does not provide definite answers, the analysands must find them themselves and internalize them. Even less should psychoanalysts impose their values and views on the analysands: that would make them authoritarian. Another important technique consists in not interrupting the flow of language, keeping in mind that too much interpretation can jeopardize an analysis; interpretations should be polyvalent and, therefore, remain ambiguous. As long as interpretations elicit new material, they are productive, but they can also cause anxiety and disagreements between the analyst and the analysand (pp. 84-85).

The fifth chapter on interpreting concludes with some reflections on the role of wit in therapy, which is a way of unblocking a stalemate. Dreams, like wit, are creative and “potentially inexhaustible” (p. 106), that is why analysts seldom explore wishes in dreams; it would be “like finding a needle in a haystack” (p. 110).

Whereas the sixth chapter, on dreams and fantasies, is the least innovative of this book, the seventh chapter on transference and countertransference explores the most intricate psychoanalytic notions. It is the most dense of the entire book. Since the aim is to “cure” the analysands who resist symbolization, psychoanalysis is not simply a matter of making them able to function in society. However, the analyst is a distorted mirror for the analysand, so that the danger is to initiate a comedy of errors whereby transference can become a resistance to the work of analysis. The analyst then, should keep their countertransference to a minimum and rely instead on the symbolic triadic structure that must be reconstructed in order to transcend the dual, imaginary mirror-like relation. The Imaginary, though, remains indestructible in the human psyche of almost anyone. Fink suggests that when the negative transference of the analysand is unmanageable, the analyst could refer the analysand to another psychoanalyst, while the analyst will consult a supervisor who could unravel the imaginary impasse. Other important points are raised by Fink: the sex of the psychoanalyst and also his or her sexual orientation are mentioned as being relevant, but how relevant his or her age is is not mentioned.

In this book several case histories are touched upon; and they are useful within the limits of a second-hand narrative. Besides, Fink does not claim to give a complete guide for each case, since each one is different and should be treated differently. The author also discusses alternative theories, those of Wilfried Bion, D. W. Winnicott, and Melanie Klein, to name just a few. He insists also that there is no objectivity in the psychoanalytic practice, at the most there is the objectivity of the symbolic, linguistic order.

As to emotions, Fink distrusts them, although the analyst is not neutral and plays an important role in the repetition that happens in analysis. For Lacan, transference reactions are indicative of a failure in symbolization; Fink agrees, adding that analysands should put themselves in the position of the symbolic Other.

The protagonists of an analysis are of course two, but there is also a third element: the symbolic Other that ideally keeps at bay the possible distortions due to the prejudices of the analysts themselves. Fink writes that the more thoroughly the analyst’s training has been, the better able s/he is to analyze other people. For Lacan, though, there is no distinction between a personal analysis and a training analysis.

In the eighth chapter, Fink deals with the sessions by phone, a useful complement to the in-person sessions when the analysand is incapacitated. These sessions eliminate some imaginary aspects of the normal session. Furthermore, visual contact is not indispensable, considering that a blind person can be analyzed. This type of analysis, though, is not for everyone, including both the analyst and the analysand (p. 202). It is no more than a possible alternative to the standard sessions.

The ninth chapter, on analysis that normalizes, criticizes such an aim; for Fink it would be tyrannical, the work of a pedagogue (p. 207). Also Lacan discouraged mediocrity. Bion, for instance (who is not mentioned in the book on this point), tried to normalize Samuel Beckett, but to no avail. If there were a universal theory of human nature, the term “normalization” would be acceptable; instead, women and men differ, they have different desires, and even different logics (p. 213). This is a controversial point that would deserve further study. Even fantasies, which in analysis are re-configured, are different in different people. There is no universal view on how humans are or should be. In this sense the author consistently adopts a postmodern attitude. Fink prefers to use the terms “appropriate and inappropriate” rather than “normal,” but aren’t these terms quite similar? To perform better in society is the goal of many analysts, Freud included. Reality testing, whether it is social or economic, is another attempt at normalization; yet, human reality is mediated by language and it is nonobjective, since it depends on perception. For Lacan what is real is the unconscious, its reality is sexual and also traumatic (p. 227).
The last and final chapter, on treating psychosis, begins with the accurate claim that Lacan sharply differentiates it from neurosis. In neurosis the three categories of the Imaginary, the Real, and the Symbolic are linked together, although in a lose way, whereas in psychosis the three categories (or, using Freudian language, the Oedipus complex) have never been linked together. Because of this, in the case of psychosis, Fink uses alternative techniques and aims, thinking that some form of therapy is advisable even in severe cases. In a note Fink quotes Lacan’s puzzling comment: “The unconscious is there but it does not function.” (p. 232n), which was his way of saying that it has no role to play in the therapy of psychotics, who have not gone through the primal repression typical of neurotics.

Given this structural lack, the approach taken by the author consists in saying what analysts should not do: “Primum non nocere.” (p. 236). The therapist must avoid a recurrence of the initial breakdown by being calming and nonpersecutory. Punctuating is unnecessary because “The majority of the work with a psychotic analysand takes place during the session itself, not in between sessions as it is often the case with neurotics.” (p. 236). Since the Other, as understood by Lacan, stands for an ultimately unexplainable ontological void, it is counterproductive to “remind” the psychotic of this lack by insisting on the importance of the symbolic, polysemic linguistic system. To make the differential diagnosis, the psychoanalyst must consider the “transferential relationship.” With the psychotic, the Imaginary and the Real registers (or categories) predominate in the transference; in Fink’s words: “Transference in psychosis tends to involve passion, not knowledge (except insofar as it is related to passion), whereas in neurosis it tends to involve both” (p. 247).

Fink stresses the practical aspects of a cure for psychotics, but does not mention in detail Lacan’s theory of psychosis; that would have meant starting from his dissertation of 1932 on paranoia. Following Lacan’s well-known dictum that the unconscious is structured as a language, the author quickly identifies the unconscious with the symbolic dimension (p. 248). The symbolic Other finds no place in the mind of the psychotic, and it would be foolish for the therapists to act rigidly, because, then, they would be perceived as persecutory and cruel, like the Other the patient was accustomed to. Such an approach, plus the stress factor, could trigger a second break. The relationship between analyst and patient should be based on the Imaginary; analysts should avoid speaking about themselves and the sessions should be face to face to stabilize the morbid state of jouissance in which psychotics finds themselves: “[The analyst] must do his best to dispel any of the psychic’s projections that seem to situate him as this dangerous Other who enjoys at the psychotic’s expense” (p. 253). Given the fragility of the psychotic’s ego, the analyst will alleviate or, ideally, demolish the delusional systems of these ill people by finding for them a project, some meaningful way to occupy their lives, and a belief system replacing the explanatory principle which is the Symbolic order. But this is why the analysis of psychotics can last a very long time, almost indefinitely.

There are different types of psychosis, but there are also borderline cases. If the outbreak of psychosis happens to an adult, the breaking point can be the loss of a dear person or a particularly stressful situation; in these cases Fink encourages the patient to engage in traveling or in an artistic activity, which somehow reactivate the link between the Imaginary and the Symbolic. The solution advocated by the author is that the therapist should help “the analysand find a way back to the former stability or find a new situation that will lead to stability of the same or of a slightly different kind” (p. 265). Stabilization is the aim or, minimally, amelioration. In the end, to find and fix meaning, limiting jouissance will improve the patient’s life. Ultimately, the patient must accept the fact that, if the past cannot be changed, it can be given a different interpretation; he or she must accept human finitude without disregarding the important role of desire. Fink’s final comments are that “the work with psychotics is unpredictable” (p. 271). Being so different from neurosis, Lacan did not believe it possible to make neurotics out of psychotics; instead Fink believes that sometimes it is not easy to distinguish between neurosis and psychosis.

Considering the book as a whole, one does not find a detailed discussion of Lacan’s theories, but most exergues at the beginning of its sections are by Lacan. Their purpose is to function as points of departure for what follows.

Being an introductory book, Fundamentals of Psychoanalytic Technique is a useful and detailed work for the professionals who want to familiarize themselves with Lacan’s psychoanalytic theories. In my view, the length of the many footnotes sometimes blocks fluent reading of the text. Some of them are informative, some go beyond what is necessary to grasp a given concept or technique. More concision would have been desirable, although the notes, per se, are an indication of good scholarship.

Finally, since for Lacan the Symbolic structure is linguistic and psychoanalysis is based on language, it is perhaps appropriate to ask whether the psychoanalyst or the analysand has the last word.

Macella Tarozzi Goldsmith
New York, NY
marcellatarozzi@verizon.net
Violence or Dialogue? Psychoanalytic Insights on Terror and Terrorism, Edited by SVERRE VARVIN & VAMIK VOLKAN. London: International Psychoanalytical Association, 2003; 274 pp. $59.95. Arlene (Lu) Steinberg, PsyD

This book focuses on psychoanalysts’ attempts to comprehend terrorism, posing the modern-day version of the question “Why war?” that Einstein presented Freud in 1932, in this case “Why terrorism?” Freud was particularly interested in observations of the impact of the collective violence of WWI on understanding the human psyche and the unconscious, with the psychoanalytic community later becoming silent on this topic, despite or perhaps because of it’s own close encounter with collective violence during WWII. A comprehension of terrorism, and the book presents the caveat, can be colored by the psychoanalyst’s own cultural and political leanings. Terrorist acts are seen as dramatic gestures provoking powerful emotions, which can serve as symbols for the group’s identification. The contributors to this volume have tried not to construe terrorism in terms of good and evil, with some having succeeded in this more than others. This present volume has attempted to create space for thinking about terrorism. This work came out of an IPA working group of diverse membership, who have attempted to conceptualize the issues in a broad way, trying not to see things in terms of us vs. them and allowing controversy.

The contributors focus on the ever-evolving definition of terrorism from viewing it as a social phenomenon, which includes rationalizations and justifications for this violence, to viewing it within it’s historical context, including addressing a context for these justifications. They additionally address the strange roots and unintended consequences of terrorism, beginning with Robespierre’s Great Terror of the French Revolution leading to the Napoleonic dictatorship. In addition they address the changing impact of terrorism via the more recent technological innovations with the immediacy of media exposure. Shankar Vedantam, Senior Scholar at the Woodrow Wilson Center, focuses on terrorism’s aim to induce others to take sides rather than tolerate diversity. He also speaks of the evolution from terrorist acts of the past (e.g., high-jacking), whose main goal was to open up negotiation, to more recent attacks, including suicide bombings, which serve as the ends themselves, seeking the other’s destruction. He described the utopian thoughts and visions that can underlie these attacks, with violent struggles invariably leading to moderates moving into warring camps. Leopold Nosek points out the lack of consensus about a definition for terrorism. He extends the psychoanalytic notion of “where id was there ego shall be” to this domain, reversing it, he considers the terrorist act as action without thought, seeing these actions as offering exits from pain which bypass reflection. He describes the absence of reflective elaboration as commonly observed among those that have been traumatized.

Sverre Varvin differentiates between two types of terrorism. The first one is perpetrated for religious or political reasons, while the second is connected to state terror, as it is committed in response to the authority or out of fear of punishment. In both cases, there can be group regression, with leaders ultimately thinking for the group, and the group dissociating from the pain of the victim. In addition, he notes that terrorism has its maximum effect when committed against the backdrop of a peaceful society. His understanding of the reasons some groups resort to violence has to do with certain large group dynamics, perhaps a felt humiliation, and fundamentalist ideologies with utopian features. J. Anderson Thompson attempts to dispel certain myths, including the myth of a peaceful past with the violence attributed to colonialism and/or capitalism.

Nancy Chodorow examines the intersection between violent nationalism, misogyny and a desire to humiliate a male enemy, explaining the frequency of women being raped among the other violence. She sees violence in terms of pathology of masculinity rather than attributing it to the social ills of poverty or illiteracy, given noted descriptions of many terrorists as having been educated and coming from
middle-class backgrounds.

The next series of writers address the factors leading up to terrorism. Werner Bohleber, seeing this venture as a first for psychoanalysts, focuses on the religiously based, collectively held ideology underlying attacks like September 11th. The religious fundamentalism, he describes, is not seen as anti-modern, as modern technology may be employed in the service of the terrorist act, but with modern technology not employed to bring about democratization. As a German, he compares Islamic fundamentalism with post WWI ethnocentric nationalism in Germany, with their both sharing 1) The myth of an idealized earlier age, 2) Animosity toward the corrupting West, 3) The ideal of a homogeneous whole; and 4) An emphasis on sacrificing one’s life for the Fatherland or for Islam. This includes a valorization of violence and an inability to tolerate uncertainty or ambiguity, with purity achieved through exclusion. The outside world is demonized with blame for societal ills and difficult living conditions attributed to the evil West. He barely mentions the common animosity toward Jews, perhaps including them among the corrupting influence of the West.

Salman Akhtar addresses the potential for dehumanization in us all, and emphasizes the importance of diminishing the rage, and enhancing the empathy and thinking capacity of opposing groups. The mind of the terrorist, according to the Israeli psychoanalyst Shmuel Ehrlich is not marked by gross deviance. He discusses the phenomenon of martyrdom, involving the submerging of oneself into a greater cause. He cites interviews of Hamas activists who refute the attribution that their violent acts were reactions to poverty or personal despair, instead positing an immersion into a wider ideology as fueling their acts. He describes prejudice and violence in terms of a projection of the impure aspects of the self onto the other, going onto say that as long as the group’s purity requires the other’s destruction, violence remains.

George Awad, a Palestinian-Canadian psychoanalyst who passed away since this book’s publication, describes the need for psychoanalysts to help build bridges of understanding between groups, and move beyond generalizations to viewing one another as human beings from varying cultures and having experienced different realities. He compares religious Islamists with Islamic secular nationalists. Their commonalities include an idealized, reconstructed past, and a tendency to remain tribalistic, not having developed sufficient consensus for nationalism. Other commonalities include a lack of appreciation and respect for the individual member or citizen, with the leadership acting paternalistic, seeing themselves as guardians for the uninformed masses. Also, neither has achieved viable systems to sustain economic development. He describes the Islamists as antidemocratic but the nationalists as undemocratic. He then goes onto blame Israel for Arab anger and underscores a need to understand the trauma of Palestinians, blaming the undemocratic mindset on their tragic history with the West. He also considers the loss of land as akin to object loss. It is not clear to what extent he is generalizing from a Palestinian experience to the general Arab one. While he presents a balanced understanding of the motivations within Arab nations, the picture becomes increasingly myopic when viewing the Israeli-Palestinian issue, with his careful analyses becoming more generalized, and yet an exploration of the impact of his own cultural heritage on this analysis, as with many other contributors to this volume, is not available.

Genvieve Welsh-Jouve describes the contradictory roles of silence as both a means of survival for victims as well as to enslave, when in the hands of perpetrators. Abigail Golomb extends this, focusing on the transgenerational impact of trauma, describing the children who have grown up in an atmosphere of terror with their overwhelmed, traumatized parents (Steinberg, 1998).

Focusing on treatment, Varvin then addresses the need to work with groups and to restore the emotional meaning of the traumatic events that was ruptured by the traumatization. This rupture in symbolization can be aroused for traumatized victims encountering later stressful episodes. Mistrust of others can lead to difficulty turning to others for help. Overall he focuses on the need for treatment to enhance the mentalizing capacity, including the temporal fragmentation (e.g., time collapse), of traumatized individuals so that they are better able to integrate the painful affects connected to the trauma aroused by it’s memory and by later experiences that may stir them up. He stresses the important role of the listening other in enhancing the symbolization of the trauma and restoring the victim’s ability to trust. He does not address, however, if there is a unique aftermath for terrorist victims as opposed to other traumatized individuals. He mentions as an afterthought the roles leaders can play at a collective level to help groups heal. I wish he had delved into this aspect more.

Volkan, on the other hand, in the next chapter, addressing the relative neglect in the PTSD literature on the societal aftermath of trauma, discusses the societal impact of terrorism, and describes his therapeutic involvement in the field working at the macro-societal level. He discusses both a societal response that reflects a shared group reaction, and the transgenerational transmission that both keeps the trauma alive and leaves the psychological task to future generations. The shared group reaction includes an intensification of bonding within the group, with a greater separateness between the group and its enemy. This enhanced group identity can encourage greater projections of unwanted features onto the enemy, ultimately even leading to their

Mia Weinberger Biran, PhD

Separation Individuation Throughout Life

I was drawn to reading this book because of my long-standing fascination and appreciation of Mahler’s contributions to psychoanalysis. Studying her writings about the process of separation–individuation in the life of the toddler and the centrality of the rapprochement crisis helped me understand the dilemmas of many of my borderline and other personality-disordered patients. I perceived her as a sensitive and insightful observer of the mother–child interactions.

The book managed to mar the experience of learning about Mahler’s life and her numerous professional and personal encounters. The writer of the book worked with Dr. Mahler as a participant observer trainee in her research projects at Masters Children’s Center in New York (see chapter 12: “Alma Bond, Participant Observer, 1966”). She started with great excitement and devotion and ended leaving the Center with bitterness and profound criticism of Mahler’s alleged arrogant personality and harsh treatment of most everyone around her. I cannot imagine that Alma Bond was neutral in collecting and editing pieces of information about Dr. Mahler.

Eleven of the 17 chapters of the book review different stages in Mahler’s personal and professional development in a chronological manner. From the beginning of the book we are introduced to the perception of Mahler as a girl rejected by her mother and invested in a doting father who served the needs of the child for both a mother and a father. We are told that due to her attachment to and identification with her father, Mahler pursued the then perceived “masculine” path of training as a physician with determination and persistence, in spite of many obstacles in her way. Bond describes Mahler as “stubborn” and “rough” due to lack of adequate symbiotic tie with her early mother. According to Bond Mahler exhibited the fixation Freud (1961/1923) described as a “masculinity complex.” Britton (2003) explained that this fixation is often at the expense of the daughter’s relationship to her mother and thus, her relationship to herself as a woman. Britton perceives that the problem derives from difficulties in the infantile maternal relationship and hence the need for compensatory idealization of the relationship with the father. The above interpretations of Mahler’s personality do not take into consideration her deep interest in child psychology and child analysis, and her devoted relationships with her analytic student candidates, many of whom became prominent figures in the field of child development and child analysis. One of her star students was Selma Kramer, a prolific writer and analyst. The relationship between the two was loving and mutually supportive.

The early relationship with the mother notwithstanding, it is quite possible to understand Mahler’s “roughness” as an outcome of the many battles she had to fight throughout her career. She was a female student among male students in medical schools and residencies. Her interest in research was often blocked by other academicians. She had to immigrate to the USA and leave behind family and personal connections, never to see them again. She never lost her Hungarian accent and style, and was likely perceived as a “foreigner” by Americans surrounding her who could not understand this intense woman. She was treated horribly by her first analyst, Helene Deutsch, who abruptly dismissed her from treatment, and by other female analyst competitors (e.g., Berta Bornstein). She was dismissed and rejected by classical analysts who saw her work as deviation from the pure “drive” approach to the mind (including Anna Freud). She married a man who proved to be a very disappointing husband and had all her life to manage her financial and practical matters by herself. And she was getting older and sickly while still working hard carrying her research, writing, and students.

While Bond makes references to all of the above, she persists throughout the book in depicting Mahler as suffering from early childhood problems and from “acquired narcissism.” The picture is balanced only by...
demonization. The transgenerational effects may shift from one generation to the next with the first generation grieving and yet the next generation seeking revenge. His term for this generational solidification of the trauma is “chosen trauma.” He speaks of the need for increased psycho-political dialogue so that the wounds can be re-opened in a therapeutic context and their development into “chosen trauma” can be forestalled. Volkan poignantly describes his work, sharing the difficulty of getting groups at the societal level to let in those working therapeutically with them. Yet he only touches on the possible group resistance (including their fears and concerns) to this kind of help.

Varvin, in conclusion, reviews the findings of the various contributors to this important volume. He stresses the need for greater reflection and encourages psycho-political dialogue. As the volume’s contributors were internationally represented with many seeming to have very personal connections to their work, I would have like to hear more about the impact of their personal stories on their varying perspectives. Varvin also mentions that while some victims may turn into perpetrators, not all do, and mentions the description in Christopher Browning’s (1993) *Ordinary Men* of those who do not appear to have been touched by trauma yet joined the Nazi movement, underscoring the potential for inhumanity in everyone. I would have like to have read more about this. In general, there seems to be certain generalizations about the propensity or possibility for victims to turn into perpetrators, but as in many volumes of this kind, it was unclear whether this assumption has been systematically addressed and validated. However, the need for greater reflection about terrorism and the feelings engendered by it, whether for the victims, for groups within society or for us, as this work encourages, seems paramount. This book provides a necessary space to reflect on the impact of terrorism, not only for those societies that live with its daily threat, but for the rest of us who on September 11th lost our buffer from the threat of this violence.
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The Northern California Society for Psychoanalytic Psychology (NCSPP) had a very active year in 2008. We grew as a community, we made progress on key strategic initiatives, and we enjoyed success with a wide variety of educational and professional programming.

One of our goals this year was to increase the involvement of, and opportunities for, graduate students in NCSPP. This year our Pre-licensed Clinicians Committee supplemented educational offerings with social events and professional development programs. These included a Training Year Kickoff Picnic, where students, interns, and postdocs met in a relaxed, non-clinical setting. The committee also offered a movie night, in which we screened Almodovar’s All About My Mother, followed by a discussion led by committee members. In addition we had a screening of the provocative film, Shortbus, followed by a discussion led by Vivian Dent. This event led to continued online discussion on our new listserv for pre-licensed members.

The Pre-licensed Clinicians Committee also held two “Beyond the Consulting Room” salons, one in the spring and one in the fall. Hosted in a private home, the salons were conceived as a forum in which pre-licensed clinicians and interested others could enjoy some food, wine and conversation with an esteemed seasoned clinician. The programming included an interview of the guest speaker by a committee member. For our Spring Salon, our guest was Sam Gerson; for our Fall Salon, Maureen Murphy. All of the events were very well attended and reviewed. As a result, over 60 new graduate students joined NCSPP this year, an 800% increase from 2007. Graduate students now comprise over 10% of our total membership (650).

NCSPP offered its usual variety of educational programming in 2008, including three Intensive Study Groups, two scientific meetings, and a multitude of other programs. One of the highlights was a one-day program with Ruth Stein entitled “A Deep Well: Ruth Stein on the Feel of the Unconscious.” Using case material, Dr. Stein spoke eloquently about the ways we, as clinicians, become involved personally in the clinical process, necessitating an encounter with the deep wells of our own unconscious psychic lives in order to make contact with those of our patients. Peter Goldberg, the invited discussant, did a wonderful job of engaging Dr. Stein in conversation following the delivery of her paper. His response and ensuing discussion among attendees focused on how the unconscious manifested in the presented material. The discussion was continued the following day in a case conference format led by Dr. Stein.

Another highlight of the year was the spectacular 21st Annual Lecture delivered by Lew Aron, “Rethinking Psychotherapy Versus Psychoanalysis: What Does Feminism Have to Do With it?” In his talk, Dr. Aron used feminist principles to reexamine the ways in which psychotherapy and psychoanalysis traditionally have been defined and differentiated. He detailed the ways in which psychoanalysis traditionally has been defined as in opposition to, and as distinct from, psychotherapy, and he then challenged this splitting and examined it in terms of gender and culture stereotyping. Throughout the day, Dr. Aron’s thinking provided a new and extraordinary lens through which to view our work, our place, and ourselves in the larger culture. His presentation evoked lively discussion, and as we delved into the material, mixing intellectual rigor with light-hearted play, we experienced a heightened sense of community and fellowship. This topic could not have been more fitting for our organization, as we have been working to strengthen our sense of community, including the bringing together of psychoanalytic psychotherapists and psychoanalysts spanning all levels of training and experience.

NCSPP’s collaborative effort with the Bay Area Couple Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy Group (BACPPG) was another important event for our chapter. We hosted Dr. James Fisher, an esteemed psychoanalytic couple therapy expert from the Tavistock Center for Couple Relationships. In his presentation, “The Macbeths in the Consulting Room: Proleptic Imagination and the Couple,” Dr. Fisher drew from both Freud’s and Bion’s ideas, linking them up for the purpose of understanding couples in general, and the tragic couple of Shakespeare’s Macbeth in particular. After the event the discussion continued through NCSPP’s online message boards. NCSPP plans to continue to offer programming that addresses couple psychotherapy from an analytic perspective.

Finally, NCSPP’s annual Holiday Party was a special occasion for the community. Generously and graciously hosted, as always, by Maureen Murphy, the party was packed with people, food, drink, live music, and engaging conversation. Many different generations of Bay Area colleagues were in attendance, including many of our new student members. NCSPP was especially proud to present its 2008 Annual Community Service Award to a group of distinguished colleagues whose tireless work to secure the passing of the recent APA Torture Referendum, which placed a moratorium against the use of psychologists in the interrogation of detainees at Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib. This group included Ruth Fallenbaum, Jeanne Wolff Bernstein, Diane Ehrensaft, Rachel Peltz, Tom Rosbrow, Alice Shaw, Stephen Seligman, Neil Altman, Ghislaine Boulanger, and Alix Sabin.
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