The Fierce Urgency of Now: An Appeal to Organized Psychoanalysis to Take a Strong Stand on Race

Dorothy Evans Holmes

The first words of the title of this article were spoken by the Reverend Doctor Martin Luther King, Jr. in his “Letter from the Birmingham Jail” (April 16, 1963), his “I Have a Dream” speech (August 28, 1963), and in his protests of the Vietnam war. His 1967 quote presents his prescient words in a fuller context.

We are now faced with the fact that tomorrow is today. We are confronted with the fierce urgency of now. In this unfolding conundrum of life and history, there is such a thing as being too late. This is no time for apathy or complacency. This is a time for vigorous and positive action.

I am calling on national and international psychoanalytic organizations, such as the American Psychoanalytic Association, Division 39 of the American Psychological Association and the International Psychoanalytical Association—guided by our field’s liberating principles and values and as an obligation and duty—to act now by formulating, adopting and promulgating a firm position on “the race issue.” In our Association and in many others, this issue continues to be manifested in racism, in which one racial group claims superiority and targets other racial and ethnic groups as inferior, thereby justifying inhumane treatment of the “othered” races. The inhumane treatment includes ongoing institutional racism and discrimination, mass incarceration of blacks, especially men, and indiscriminate shootings and killings of blacks. This issue and the two preceding TAP issues trace the history and institutionalization of racist practices in society and relate how theory, supervision and practice as taught in psychoanalytic educational and training centers are tainted by racism.

Scholarly publications are now frequently published that address the various ways our psyches are damaged by racism, both of the perpetrators and those on the receiving end (e.g., Salman Akhtar, 2012; Katie Gentile, 2013; Pratyusha Tummala-Narra, 2013; and I, 2006, 2016, have addressed this subject). There are also some positive larger institutional efforts to include race in psychoanalytic curricula, such as the new initiative within the American Psychoanalytic Association that awards small grants to psychoanalytic centers to develop required curriculum offerings that address race. Up to now, however, the organizing bodies in psychoanalysis,
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The Waldorf Astoria as we knew it will have closed by the time you receive this issue of TAP, but the memories of the 2017 National Meeting remain fresh. It was a very good meeting, dominated by a range of strong feelings, an excellent scientific program and substantial progress in governance. The meeting occurred in the context of the Inauguration and the Women’s Marches. Many members took early trains to Washington for the main march January 21, others left the Waldorf to join the march in New York City. In settings ranging from Executive Council, to the symposium on “The Scientific Standing of Psychoanalysis,” to the ceremony inducting Honorary Members, we gave serious consideration to what we face as citizens and how we must participate.

On the level of the APsaA meeting itself, there were sad goodbyes to familiar places that have felt like home. The Waldorf honored APsaA’s long association with the hotel at their “End of an Era” party at the Starlight Roof. Hundreds of APsaA members and guests enjoyed a generous array of hors d’oeuvres and wine, conversation with old and new colleagues and a last look at the Art Deco elegance of the hotel. Other lost “homes” included the settings of Board on Professional Standards (BOPS) committees that are completing their work by June 2017. Many of those committees have worked together for years as tight-knit groups of educational stewards.

At the Joint Meeting of Executive Councilors and BOPS Fellows, the Six Point Plan was further realized through a focus on APsaA’s continuing vigorous educational mission, which is now fully under membership control. Excitement was generated about new structures and important new initiatives. The BOPS leadership, Dwarakanath Rao and Dionene Powell, described the external regulatory options available to members and institutes/centers. The new Department of Psychoanalytic Education (DPE) was represented by its recently appointed head, Alan Sugarman, and associate head, Britt-Marie Schiller, plus the chair of the DPE Task Force that conceptualized the department, Erik Gann. In their presentation of the future of psychoanalytic education in APsaA, Alan and Britt-Marie envisioned an inclusive, rigorous, creative approach to analytic training. The DPE’s mission, vision and organizational structure is posted on the APsaA website under http://www.apsa.org/content/resources-january-2017.

How APsaA standards will be defined and how training will differ when BOPS sunsets: Within APsaA, the Executive Council will set educational policy based upon recommendations of the Institute Requirements and Review Committee (IRRC). The work of the DPE will be consultative. The DPE Steering Committee will advise the IRRC on revisions of the current training standards. Per the Six Point Plan, APsaA will adopt the IPA Eitingon standards as guidelines. This means that APsaA-affiliated institutes and center training programs will have the option to use IPA standards. Those standards, for example, do not include certification as a requirement for training analyst appointment. Institutes and centers are free to continue or not continue to use the standards as currently defined by BOPS. They may even choose a training structure that uses features of both plus creative new approaches. In any case, the IPA Eitingon standards will be APsaA’s baseline standards.

The opportunity for choice is exciting but it brings with it a new level of local institute and center responsibility, which may cause anxiety insofar as training programs have traditionally turned to BOPS to establish rules. In this new approach there will be an emphasis on APsaA psychoanalysts thinking through an institute’s approach to training and making conscious choices about local standards. Many institutes will elect to add features to the IPA Eitingon standards that suit their local context and reflect their specific training and academic goals. Institute and center training programs may choose to join the American Association for Psychoanalytic Education (AAPE), which will mandate the current BOPS standards. APsaA standards can be maintained locally without mandatory oversight and the DPE will actively consult to institutes regarding best practices. To the extent it is useful and desired, the DPE leadership, the elected officers and former BOPS leaders plan to consult to APsaA training programs regarding their transition to greater local responsibility for maintaining and continuing the growth of excellence and diversity in psychoanalytic training.

The new energy in several aspects of APsaA’s mission is reflected in the work of all seven APsaA departments. In the area of psychoanalytic research, for example, Mark Solms, the new head of our Science Department, gave a Presidential Symposium on “The Scientific Standing of Psychoanalysis.” He presented in lucid and compelling terms the substantial existing evidence for the efficacy of psychoanalytic psychotherapy and psychoanalysis. A vigorous, lengthy question and answer period reflected the intense interest of members and their recognition of the importance of research for the future of our profession.

Mark began his talk with acknowledgment of the Inauguration, which was going on at the same time. He did that, he said, lest we be dissociated as we sat together considering science. The recognition on the part of our international colleagues of the importance of our sociopolitical reality and the threats to democratic values that face us was echoed in many of the scientific sessions.

The theme of citizen responsibility and the importance of internationalism was captured during the ceremony to induct Honorary Members. Three different types of scholar-activists accepted Honorary Membership in APsaA: Louis Rose, Eric Plakun and Bessel van der Kolk. They spoke eloquently about our responsibilities through citizenship, professional liaisons and the understanding and treatment of trauma, respectively.

Lou Rose, a historian of psychoanalysis, spoke about his introduction to psychoanalysis through the reading of

Continued on page 4
Civilization and Its Discontents. He first emphasized the deep responsibility each of us carries as a citizen of our nation to monitor and insist upon the values our form of government is designed to ensure. He also emphasized—again following Freud—the importance of internationalism and constructive, collaborative participation in the global community.

Lou’s comments offer us a “container” for our individual and our organizational activity now and for the foreseeable future. Each of us as citizens and also APSaA as a professional, mental health organization must take clear positions and plan for action on such issues as ethnic, racial and gender equality; fair and humane policies regarding immigration; and access to mental and general health care. A new Task Force on Advocacy Priorities started meeting in February to define and recommend to the Executive Council the best use of our organizational resources. I urge you to follow and contribute to APSaA’s efforts. We need to support a renewed commitment to the values of our country and to the principles of our own professional organization.

Strong Beginnings
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Teaching a Critical Perspective on Psychoanalytic Knowledge

Ellen Rees

Psychoanalysts have learned so much in the years since Freud founded our discipline. We have so much yet to learn. A pluralistic perspective has helped us try to contain new knowledge within a psychoanalytic frame of reference. However, psychoanalysts no longer agree on what constitutes this frame of reference. Our fundamental concepts have been stretched to include heterogeneous and contradictory ideas. Our theories are no longer coherent with one another. These are the growing pains of a relatively young discipline but how are we to help our candidates find their way, steady their orientation and take heart in our changing landscape? How are we to equip them to establish and to communicate the rationale for our ideas and our therapeutic activities both to other disciplines and to the community at large?

Teaching candidates a critical perspective on psychoanalytic knowledge offers them an orienting framework. The critical perspective I will describe is an epistemological perspective, a focus on knowledge itself, its grounds, limits, forms and validity. This critical perspective teaches candidates to think about thinking and about the process of knowing as distinguished from believing.

An educational goal of a critical perspective is to help candidates appreciate the influence of competing epistemologies in our field. Is psychoanalysis a science, of a special kind? Is it rather a hermeneutic or interpretive discipline? A kind of relationship or an art? If candidates understand that epistemological values shape the methods we use to investigate, the evidence we accept, the phenomena that interest us, the inferences we draw from our observations, and the way we define our field, they can understand our knowledge is not only discovered but is also constructed. It will give them conceptual tools to think about the assumptions and intentions that underlie these constructions, to evaluate psychoanalytic knowledge based on them, and better grasp the nature of the controversies that have left psychoanalysts unable to agree on what psychoanalysis is. It is crucial for candidates to understand that epistemological values shape the methods we use to investigate, the evidence we accept, the phenomena that interest us, the inferences we draw from our observations, and the way we define our field, they can understand our knowledge is not only discovered but is also constructed. It will give them conceptual tools to think about the assumptions and intentions that underlie these constructions, to evaluate psychoanalytic knowledge based on them, and better grasp the nature of the controversies that have left psychoanalysts unable to agree on what psychoanalysis is. It is crucial for candidates to understand that epistemological values shape the methods we use to investigate, the evidence we accept, the phenomena that interest us, the inferences we draw from our observations, and the way we define our field, they can understand our knowledge is not only discovered but is also constructed.

It will give them conceptual tools to think about the assumptions and intentions that underlie these constructions, to evaluate psychoanalytic knowledge based on them, and better grasp the nature of the controversies that have left psychoanalysts unable to agree on what psychoanalysis is. It is crucial for candidates to understand that epistemological values shape the methods we use to investigate, the evidence we accept, the phenomena that interest us, the inferences we draw from our observations, and the way we define our field, they can understand our knowledge is not only discovered but is also constructed.

Teaching Candidates to Consider the Process of Knowing

Established traditions from other disciplines offer methods that can help us clarify and critically evaluate the state of our knowledge. Two of these are: empirical methods, particularly from the life sciences, and interpretive methods from the hermeneutic tradition. They can be used separately or be combined. While each has had a complex history of debate and controversy, they could be roughly summarized as follows:

Empirical methodology strives for theoretical unity, precision in defining theoretical terms, and the capacity to test hypotheses and to predict the consequences of hypotheses. It relies on rules of evidence that constrain the ways we move from observations to inferences about these observations, and it demands some capacity for disconfirmation of our hypotheses. The goal is to refine our knowledge of the real world so it progresses over time. Adopting this epistemological stance allows us to test our ideas in order to see if one idea is better than another.

In contrast to this, interpretive methods from the hermeneutic tradition strive to understand meanings as they are embedded in changing contexts.
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Knowledge expands through the plasticity of language and meanings and by the extensibility of concepts and theories. It is not progressive but rather is dependent on its context, historical time and culture. The logic of hermeneutic methods relies on intelligibility, coherence, consistency, accuracy, inter-subjective reliability and narrative fit in judging one interpretation against another. Adopting this epistemological stance allows us to preserve concepts that have different meanings in different theoretical schools.

These two epistemological strategies represent different perspectives on knowledge and different contexts for distinguishing knowledge from opinion or belief. A working familiarity with these differing strategies allows candidates to distinguish clinical from epistemological differences in our arguments and to use these conceptual and methodological tools to sharpen their critical reasoning as they develop their own psychoanalytic ideas.

As we try to help our candidates think systematically about our conceptual and theoretical foundations, it is helpful for them to understand that knowing is a process and that a body of knowledge has a kind of structure of its own.

Relevant Epistemological Concerns

A fundamental question of epistemological concern is: What do we want to know about? What phenomena interest us? The negative of this question is equally important: What phenomena will we not include? These questions help us define the boundaries of our discipline, the domain of knowledge that we intend to know about. The question of what is the domain of psychoanalysis is at the center of current controversies and confusions. The growth of knowledge both within our discipline and in other disciplines, the proliferation of our theories, and the widening scope of those we seek to treat have made the task of delineating our domain more complex. This new context raises new questions. For example, how are we to think about the associations of analysands who take psychotropic medications, or who have experienced significant trauma, or who have affective or other disorders? How are we to think about the relevance to psychoanalysis of information coming to us from the cognitive sciences, the affective neurosciences and from the observations of infants and children? Different psychoanalytic thinkers may disagree on what belongs under the purview of psychoanalysis.

A second fundamental question is: How do we intend to know? By what methods do we establish knowledge? It is important that candidates appreciate the kinds of questions and efforts that are involved if we want to establish grounds for knowledge. Here, the hermeneutic and empirical traditions serve as examples. Each tradition seeks correspondence with something in the real world of experience and tries to provide a degree of objectivity in order to give us criteria for judging one hypothesis or interpretation against another. Each tradition attends to the relationship among data, evidence and knowledge. Each tradition spells out the intellectual processes and methods of discovery and justification.

The psychoanalytic situation allows for a fertile process of discovery of meanings. The process of scientific justification within the psychoanalytic situation is more difficult for us. Our interpretations reflect our hypotheses. We have not been able to find reliable ways that our observations and hypotheses can be refuted by experience. We have relied on clinical evidence. However, when we do this, we encounter significant epistemological problems.

One of these is the relationship between our theories and our observations. Theoretical bias colors what we see and what we infer. Consequently, we can’t reliably distinguish our observations from our inferences. What we consider evidence is biased by theory as well. Another epistemological problem is our inability to deal with the problem of suggestion as this may contaminate our data.

Despite the daunting epistemological challenges that face a discipline whose focus is on unconscious phenomena experienced inter-subjectively, psychoanalysts with the help of colleagues in other disciplines, can set out to design an epistemology that is suited to our needs and to devise methods that will help us find a more reliable basis for our inferences and our evidence. We will need the help of our future analysts in this effort.

Curriculum to Foster a Critical Perspective on Psychoanalytic Knowledge

Twenty years ago, the Columbia Center for Psychoanalytic Training and Research introduced classes in methodology and critical thinking in all four years of the core curriculum, the Critical Thinking Sequence. I described this curriculum in my paper, “Thinking About Curriculum: An Epistemological Perspective” (PQ, 2007). What follows is an abbreviated version.

Classes in critical thinking are integrated in both our theory track and our process track. In addition, there are three classes on Controversies about Psychoanalytic Technique for senior candidates in the third through more advanced years. In each year, the critical thinking classes are designed to stimulate questions important for the issues raised in the courses.

Year 1

Critical Thinking I, “The Relevance of Child Observation for Psychoanalysis,” comprises three classes taught at the end of the first year following a yearlong course on child development. The educational goals of these classes are: 1) to introduce candidates to an
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Many candidates are asking “What do the changes in APsaA mean for my education?”  

As the historic Six Point Plan moves forward to sunset the Board on Professional Standards, and change APsaA governance, a number of factors will affect regulation of standards in our institutes and centers. They include choice of educational standards, shifting of educational responsibility to local groups, the externalization of regulatory functions to AAPE (American Association for Psychoanalytic Education), certification of members externally through the ABP (American Board of Psychoanalysis), and the creation of the DPE (Department of Psychoanalytic Education), an internal consultative body.

The Six Point Plan is a nuanced set of compromises designed to reduce decades of tension within APsaA. A main source of tension was between those who felt our standards were inflexible, and those who felt they were appropriately rigorous. As these changes are put into motion, the Board on Professional Standards, along with the rest of the leadership of APsaA, is committed to ensuring a smooth transition for candidate education. This will require transparency and clarity, as well as candidates familiarizing themselves with the changes and their local implications.

What will happen to standards when the Board on Professional Standards sunsets as planned in June 2017? Institutes that choose external regulation of standards by joining AAPE will initially follow existing APsaA standards, and have mandatory joint site visits by AAPE and the Accreditation Council for Psychoanalytic Education (ACPEinc) for the purpose of accreditation. Certification will be encouraged for all faculty, and required for TSA appointment. Seven institutes have joined AAPE so far; several others are in discussion about AAPE. These institutes remain a part of APsaA.

Institutes that choose not to join AAPE will follow IPA standards as guidelines, use local governance of standards, use the DPE for consultation as needed, and will not require mandatory site visits. Unlike current APsaA standards, IPA standards do not require certification for TSA appointment, and require two instead of three cases for graduation. IPA is considering, although this is by no means certain, changing the frequency of supervised cases from 4-5/week to 3-5/week.

It is important to remember that no institute is required to change existing standards. We encourage each institute to study the available choices before making a decision. Unless a local institute has chosen to make changes, or is in the process of modifying standards, candidates should not see any difference in clinical training in the near term. However, as local groups conclude their deliberations, we anticipate some institutes will make the choice of following AAPE standards, others will follow IPA standards as guidelines, and conceivably, some will follow AAPE standards but not necessarily join AAPE. It is important to emphasize that certification via the ABP remains for those non-AAPE institutes as an important professional developmental opportunity for those individuals who choose it. Since there are many standards and accreditation issues involved, and discussion will involve local and national issues, we encourage candidates to learn more by staying in touch with institute leadership. The Board on Professional Standards, the DPE, and AAPE, and APsaA leadership are available to answer questions.

Choice of standards will allow for a respectful and thoughtful discussion within institutes about what is valuable and essential in the training of psychoanalysts of the future. The Board on Professional Standards, which established and monitored standards for seventy years, has strived to ensure that standards be relevant and rational.

Standards are tools of the trade; they are for everyday and lifelong use, not just for passing examinations. We believe that standards should represent a three-fold set of functions—evaluative, developmental, and aspirational. Too often, there is emphasis on one, rather than all three, of these functions, leading to valid criticism of the basic purpose of standards. Standards must also strive to meet contemporary scientific and practical demands, keeping in mind the unusually subjective nature of our profession, inner and outer resistances to self-awareness, and the long period of training and lifelong learning necessary for mastery of this difficult work.

The role of candidates and new graduates is crucial in the discussion about the future of standards. No one is closer to the training experience than candidates, who know first-hand about how standards enrich their learning environment. We hope your teachers and supervisors listen to what you have to say about your training, national accreditation and peer review, as well as the place of psychoanalysis as a modern profession with regulatory demands that are increasingly evident across the nation.

In conclusion, we would like to suggest open discussion among candidates and new graduates about standards and the changes within APsaA. Doubts and questions are natural during a time of change. We want to reassure candidates that we will work with them during this time of transition to a pluralistic future. Here are links on various organizations referenced above: AAPE—aape-online.org, DPE on APsaA website—apsa.org, ACPEinc—ACPEinc.org, IPA—ipa.world.

Dwarakanath Rao, M.D., is chair of the Board on Professional Standards.  
Dionne Powell, M.D., is secretary of the Board on Professional Standards.
SPECIAL SECTION: CONVERSATIONS ON PSYCHOANALYSIS AND RACE

Conversations on Psychoanalysis and Race: Part Three

Introduction

Michael Slevin and Beverly J. Stoute
Co-Editors

At its origins in the early 20th century, psychoanalysis was racialized. The cultural footprint of race on American psychoanalysis is large. Of theory and practice, the literature is thin and sparse. And it is often ignoble, enmeshed as it is with the racial history of the 20th century in America.

Dorothy Holmes begins this last part of the three-part series with a concluding call to arms: “The Fierce Urgency of Now.” She directly and forcefully addresses what, perhaps, has at heart motivated us, the co-editors of this series: At this historical moment in our country and in the development of psychoanalysis, we have an ethical responsibility to heal the wound of racism that afflicts our institutes and psychoanalysis itself. If we do so, with dedication and thoughtful depth, psychoanalysis has the potential to better heal our patients and contribute to the healing of our country.

Beverly Stoute, co-editor of this eight-article series, “Conversations on Race,” has written an elegant and sophisticated overview of that history in a literature review that is yet personal.

Anton Hart then brings to the fore a contemporary perspective on this foundational issue of race that made this series necessary and important: the “othering” of African-American people deeply embedded in our cultural unconscious.

We are deeply appreciative of those who have given so deeply of themselves to write for “Conversations on Race,” and we thank those who have read their contributions. We hope we have contributed in some modest way to the dialogue leading to action that Dorothy Holmes so eloquently challenges us to join.

Michael Slevin, M.S.W., is in private practice in Baltimore and an emergency psychiatric evaluator of patients in crisis in the Emergency Department of Sinai Hospital. He is co-chair of the Social Issues Department Task Force on Income Inequality and Class.

Beverly J. Stoute, M.D., child, adolescent and adult psychiatrist and psychoanalyst, Atlanta, Georgia; training and supervising analyst, Emory University Psychoanalytic Institute; associate child supervising analyst, New Orleans-Birmingham Psychoanalytic Center; graduate of The New York Psychoanalytic Institute.

Fierce Urgency of Now
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like the ones mentioned above, have not acted as a whole, in unison, or at the highest levels, to affirm the core importance of the experience of racial injustice to the formation of intrapsychic life and behavior. I believe such an affirmation is imperative, and the time for it is long overdue. I urge us not to be, in King’s words, “too late.”

Why is such an organization-wide statement important? As much of the psychoanalytic literature on race points out, doing the work that can be done on race in the consultation room is very difficult. Psychoanalysts are themselves encumbered by racism, i.e., conflicted; frightened; sometimes identified with and blinded by the privileges associated with racism; sometimes discouraged from acting or criticized for doing so by colleagues, by those who supervise them or by those who may be idealized. A clear stand on race taken by the national and international psychoanalytic organizations that spawned us, to which we belong, and to which we pledge our allegiances, would provide necessary scaffolding to do the work that can be done on race.

Five Vital Policy Recommendations

The psychoanalytic organizational policy on race I am recommending would have five components:

1. The policy on race would speak for the entire organizations adopting the policy.

2. It would publicly denounce the psychologically harmful and traumatizing nature of racism, with explicit recognition that it leads to intrapsychic, characterological and behavioral abnormalities in those who continue to perpetrate it and those on whom it is imposed.

3. It would affirm the necessity of working therapeutically with racial issues in psychoanalytic treatments.

Continued on page 9
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4. It would support ongoing psychoanalytic scholarship and research on race.

5. It would require that education and training in psychoanalysis and training analyses address race in order for practitioners to develop competence to work on race with patients.

What I am calling for is a tall order. The history of psychoanalysis speaking up positively and with one voice against negative cultural trends is not particularly encouraging. That fact has been widely covered of late. In a misguided view of positivist science, Freud eschewed speaking about the damaging effects of the Holocaust on himself and other analysts (Emily Kuriloff, 2014), believing that a focus on the subjectivities of experience with the Holocaust would taint one’s necessary objectivity as a psychoanalyst scientist-clinician.

Psychoanalysts also have a history of being blind to their own authoritarian tendencies, to the extent that some psychoanalytic research on the subject has been ignored or relegated to sociology (e.g., Theodor Adorno’s psychoanalytic work on the authoritarian personality and my own work, 2016c). Similarly, there is some evidence, that I have also noted, of psychoanalysts’ tendencies to “other” those different from themselves, as in the painful era when those other than medical practitioners need not apply for psychoanalytic training. Even darker, Robert Wallerstein, in 2014, and I, in 2016, documented the “long term corrosive effects on organized psychoanalysis in Brazil” of analysts being involved in torture in South America. This history across many generations powerfully suggests a strong influence on psychoanalytic institutional thinking and practices of the worst trends in the cultures in which psychoanalysts have lived.

Thus, what is being proposed, though difficult, is a golden opportunity for organized psychoanalysis to get on the right side of history regarding race. To quote King again: This is a time for vigorous and positive action. Without organized psychoanalysis taking the strong position recommended, there is danger that the good scholarly, clinical and programmatic efforts I cited earlier in this article will not have the widespread effects they deserve. The organizational position I recommend will give structure and encouragement to all to take hold of race with the same steadfastness and courage we have applied to the other core clinical issues of psychoanalysis (internal conflict; disturbances of self; interpersonal conflict; family conflict; characterological problems). They, too, have their scary aspects. We are emboldened and faithful in our efforts to tackle them because we know we must. We must study the literature in all of these areas; we must learn how to conceptualize them and work with all of them to help our patients, to progress in training and to maintain our competence as practitioners.

Take a Bold Step

The case I am making is that race—that courses through our societal practices, often destructively, and deeply affects us all—deserves the same attention in psychoanalysis as those more familiar factors. It is time for organized psychoanalysis to recognize and ratify these truths. Without providing the policy and values frame around race I am proposing for organized psychoanalysis, the good research and examples of best practices cited in this paper will remain isolated and siloed, and never be optimally effective. We can take the bolder step I am recommending. One recent example of how it can be done was when organizations of physicians, including psychiatrists, social workers and nurses banded together to speak against any practitioner being involved in the degrading and dehumanizing practices of enhanced interrogations. To quote Paul Summergrad and Steven Sharfstein, in 2015, the voice of organized psychiatry, on why it was incumbent on the American Psychiatric Association to speak forcefully for the entire organization and all its members:

First, the American Psychiatric Association must take positions when fundamental issues of science, ethics, or practice are either called into question or need articulation as a matter of public policy. It is our obligation to speak out as a profession.... Actions on difficult issues for our profession require principled leadership from the highest governance of the organization....

Regarding how race works in our society, with its broad, persistent and deeply damaging effects on us all, it is now time for organized psychoanalysis, at the highest governing levels, to formulate a bold, clear policy regarding race. I hope the specific five-point proposal I made above is a helpful starting point. For all of us who have focused our psychoanalytic scholarship and its clinical applications on race and its all too frequent complement, racism, it is gratifying to see more and more focus on the subject in our psychoanalytic journals and in programming at our meetings.

The one missing piece is the larger organizational embrace of the subject, which is the specific next step I have proposed. The development of a psychoanalytic policy on race that would be widely disseminated is a necessary addition to existing scholarly, programmatic and practice contributions on race. Not only would such a policy support those who do this difficult work, it will encourage the necessary education and training to help others include race in their work. It will contribute significantly to breaking a long, unworthy tradition of silence in psychoanalysis on controversial cultural subjects. Let me emphasize, my appeal is that the highest levels of leadership in organized psychoanalysis articulate policy on race.

For psychoanalytic organizations to remain silent at this time in our culture when racism raises its ugly head once again, so very virulently, would be a betrayal. Failure to act now would betray our deep understandings of the anguish and psychological disturbances racism causes, and would betray those who have dared to address these issues without robust organizational support.

Leaders: the time for you to act is now. Please, do not be too late.

Editor’s Note:
For information on the full references cited in this article, please contact the author at crescent@gwu.edu.
Race and Racism in Psychoanalytic Thought: The Ghosts in Our Nursery

Beverly J. Stoute

Race, a biological fiction, is a social, cultural and political construct. The tenor of this reality in the United States is sober and often quietly horrific, interwoven throughout private and public discourse. Race, as the daily news cycle, film and song remind us, is stark and differentiating. It has been so since the early years of the colonies. Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, decided by the Supreme Court in 1954, did not alter that reality; nor did the tandem Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Voting Rights Act of 1965. Affirmative action policies, designed to right a long history of denied opportunity, could not dynamite the bedrock of racism. Not even the election of the first African-American president could shake it. In 21st century America, racism is alive and well. Complex economic, social, political, cultural and psychological forces interact to make it a seemingly intractable challenge in the American conversation. Race is a challenge for us all; and yet, as a profession dedicated to integrity and change, where has psychoanalysis been in this conversation?

In this article, I review psychoanalytic literature and related mental health disciplines for their writings on race, beginning with Freud and continuing to the present. Psychoanalytic literature has historically been fraught with ignorance about race and limited by racism, both overt and subtle. Yet, on a positive note, psychoanalytic thought is growing ever deeper and richer, as it has been influenced by work on race and racism in other fields of the humanities. Yes, psychoanalysis is finally catching up.

During my own analytic training, issues of racial difference permeated my patients’ transference with threads, at times, in the parallel process of the supervision. One supervisor noticed, yet there was only one paper in the literature she could quote. When my training analyst asked me as our work began if our difference in race was influencing the relationship, I snapped back, “You ask the question as if I have a choice.” I noted that at least she did ask, and she quietly tolerated my defensiveness; after all, I was the only African-American at my institute.

My analysis began before Dorothy Holmes (1992) or Kimberlyn Leary (1997) published their seminal papers on race and transference. The published interview of Ralph Greenson, in 1982, with Ellis Toney, one of the first African-American analysts, revealed he and other early African-American analysts were less fortunate than I. Greenson, a self-described “white liberal” who paved the way for the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society and Institute to admit Toney, its first African-American candidate (1948), later confessed that during his analysis of Toney, he became aware of his own unconscious racism. That bias distorted the work and made it more difficult. Toney, for example, requested a change in the time of his analytic session because, being the only African-American on the street in Greenson’s neighborhood at the appointed hour, the police sometimes stopped him (Greenson, 1982; Forrest Hamer, 2002). The response: An Oedipal interpretation of Toney’s “paranoia,” with no awareness of what we now call “racial profiling.” Their disconnected realities damaged the relationship and limited the analysis. At that time, it was also not clear to the psychoanalytic world that establishing trust, a fundamental challenge in interracial analyses, is crucial to a working therapeutic alliance (Marlin Griffin, 1977). It is particularly ironic that Greenson is known for his 2008 classic paper formulating the concept of the therapeutic alliance.

As a mature analyst, I came to understand with greater clarity the traumatic effects of racism in my life, and the family and defensive factors that shielded me. The fantasy that analytic understanding could be a radical tool of individual and social change had made me hopeful, and helped me endure the micro- and not so micro-aggressions along the way. Naively, I did not expect to question whether my chosen field was prepared for the task I expected of it. But a review of the literature makes clear that latent racist attitudes had long impeded the development of psychoanalytic theory on racial difference, the psychological underpinnings of racist thinking, the diversification of the field and, many postulate, also fostered an inhibition of curiosity in many psychoanalysts on the manifestations of race in their clinical work (Anton Hart and Dionne Powell, 2016).

Starting with the Founding Fathers

Where should we begin this conversation about race and racism? A developmental perspective leads us to start even before conception. Do we start with the architects of democracy who wrote, “We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights…” while also creating the Three-Fifths Compromise; namely that each African male slave counted as 3/5 of a white man? As they wrote these words, the architects of our democracy Continued on page 11
owned slaves, voted Africans subhuman, and built the foundation of our democracy on the graves of countless millions dead in the Middle Passage. We must start, therefore, by acknowledging America was and is a racialized society. Everything we are and everything we have become emanates from that split in the foundation of who “We the People” really are. Americans are acculturated and bred in the notions of race, power and projection onto socially sanctioned “others.”

Although propagandized as a great melting pot, acculturation and assimilation to a dominant group followed the rule for the early waves of immigrants, assuming the socially sanctioned position for othered groups created by African slaves. The existence of “the other” as a container for hatred, envy and prohibited sexual fantasies came before Kleinian theory (1946) defined splitting, projection or projective identification and before “otherness” as a theoretical construct existed. “It is always possible to bring together a considerable number of people in love,” Freud wrote in *Civilization and Its Discontents*, “so long as there are other people left over to receive the manifestations of their aggressiveness.”

Freud, as did many Jews in Vienna, endured anti-Semitism throughout his medical training and professional career. In Smiley Blanton’s *Diary of My Analysis* (1971), Freud is reported to have said, “My background as a Jew helped me to stand being criticized, being isolated, working alone.” Sander Gilman’s (1993) well-known scholarly work in this area documents that Jews were thought of as the “Negroes of Vienna,” psychoanalysis was a “black thing,” and Freud was labeled as a “Black Jew” (Neil Altman 2006). Freud referred to anti-Semitism in *Interpretation of Dreams* and to racial self-hatred in *Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious*, 1905. It may be difficult for us in the postcolonial modern era to understand his reluctance to localize psychoanalysis culturally. In *Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety* (1926), when Freud discussed childhood neuroses, he pointed out “from our observations of town children belonging to the white races and living according to fairly high cultural standards, the neuroses of childhood are in the nature of regular episodes in a child’s development,” making it clear he had some awareness of the cultural and socioeconomic status of his patient population, though he chose not to emphasize those factors in his clinical work or theory.

In his 1936 paper, *A Disturbance of Memory on the Acropolis*, Freud identified the “limitations and poverty of our conditions of life in my youth” as contributors to his dissociative neurotic symptom at the Acropolis, indicative of his success neurosis, which Holmes (2006) eloquently reinterprets with reference to social class and the anti-Semitism Freud endured. Freud’s emphasis on Oedipal conflict as a wholly adequate explanation for his success neurosis may have further contributed to the early focus on Oedipal theory over deeper considerations of race and class in the field as a whole. Many believe also that Freud dissected out reference to race and culture from his universal theory of the human mind to avoid psychoanalysis being labeled as a Jewish science (Gilman 1993, Altman 2006).

Although the classic psychoanalytic view posits a universal theory of the human mind, social and cultural influences infiltrated the thinking of early American psychoanalysts in other detrimental ways. At the turn of the 20th century, the scant analytic literature on the subject reveals that many American psychoanalysts adopted the prevailing theories of race inferiority. In 1914, a lead article, “Dementia Praecox in the Colored Race” in the *Psychoanalytic Review*, the first psychoanalytic journal published in the United States, A.M. Evarts (1914) asserted the “colored man” is prone to dementia praecox and “bondage in reality was a wonderful aid to the colored man.” In the same journal, John Lind in his article, “Dreams Wish Fulfillment in the Negro,” explained that the “Negroes’ development is lower than the white race and...similar to those of the savage,” that “their psychological activities are analogous with those of the child,” and “their psychology is of a primitive type.” In a subsequent paper, Lind (1917) cited an 1847 source to support the claim that “Negro children are sharp, intelligent and full of vivacity, but on approaching the adult period a gradual change sets in.... The intellect seems to become clouded.... gives place to a sort of lethargy, briskness yields to indolence” and he concluded “after puberty sexual matters take the first place in the Negro’s life and thoughts.” These examples illustrate the racist undercurrents that undoubtedly influenced theory and practice early on.

**Formulating Prejudice into Theory**

Early theorizing on prejudice followed Freud, who discussed individual and group antagonism at the level of group dynamics and group hatred. In *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* (1922), *Totem and Taboo* (1938), and *Moses and Monotheism* (1939), he discussed the role that the metaphorical killing of the primal father by the sons plays in fostering group cohesion and the binding of aggression within the group. This formulation provided the basis later for the related psychodynamic speculation on lynching of black men by white men in the South (Philip Resnikoff, 1933). In *Taboo and Virginity* (1918) Freud described the “hostility against intruders,” which he termed “the narcissism of minor difference,” and referenced further in *Civilization and Its Discontents* (1930). Early psychoanalytic theory was slow, however, to develop these group formulations into a comprehensive psychology of how we process racial difference, a developmental formulation of racism, or into the work of clinical psychoanalysis. Evolution of Freudian theory to integrate the influence of culture and race especially in a culturally heterogeneous America took decades sparked by social and political forces, including the diversification of the field.

*Continued on page 16*
From Multicultural Competence to Radical Openness: A Psychoanalytic Engagement of Otherness

Anton Hart

“Multicultural competence—I wish that term would be banished from this earth. Competence? We’re going to be competent in relating to the other?”

Of all my lines in the film, “Black Psychoanalysts Speak,” the 2014 PEP video by Basia Winograd, this is the one that has garnered the most response. It seems to have resonated with people’s misgivings about the emphasis in many approaches to multicultural “training.”

I read in this resonance a dissatisfaction with the aspiration of “becoming competent” at relating to human beings who are different from oneself, with studying the other in an acquisitive, non-participatory, and, in all likelihood, objectifying manner. Later in the film, I elaborate:

"I’m very critical of the multicultural competency movement because I don’t think that reaching across cultural or racial boundaries is something to become competent at. I think it’s something to become open to. There’s something about the notion of competency which still keeps people who are different from you as other, like they’re this commodity that we have to get better at dealing with.” I am surprised when psychoanalysts and other practitioners, sometimes those who are black like me or with some different otherness status, seem to embrace such a competency emphasis without sufficient criticism. Multicultural competency might be well intentioned in that it is attempting to help people increase their empathic availability while decreasing tendencies to distance or callously offend. Multicultural training tries to offer a rudimentary script so that necessary conversations across the divides of difference take place rather than the participants fleeing and avoiding those conversations. But this is not going sufficiently deep. This is why many people with whom I have spoken convey they feel a sense of dread about having multicultural competency training required of them in their organization, and why many complain that the training they have received was concrete and, oftentimes, deadly boring. Such training inherently promotes a defended, prepared manner of addressing difference and otherness, with all of their attendant anxieties and defenses, and this represents a major lost opportunity for personal reflections and deeper engagement.

The heart of the matter is learning how to become increasingly undefended around matters of diversity and otherness such that you can be open: open to the other person who will be, in some significant ways, most certainly different from you. A psychoanalytic sensibility suggests to us that genuine openness can only emerge in the context of an unscripted dialogue, one that involves making contact with and participating in an exchange that will, necessarily, threaten the dialogic participants’ understandings, identities and perceptions.

Because it is a talking cure, and because it prizes the continually refined formulations and understandings of its participants (in the context of a relationship between those participants), psychoanalysis holds the potential to open up and enrich dialogue across boundaries marked by racial, ethnic and cultural difference in a way that is deeply personal. It encourages the participants to take the risk of losing understandings they have of themselves and of each other that constitute prejudices. In a sense, a new language must emerge in each dyad, one that is intended to grasp both the overlapping and the contrasting experiences of the two participants, while at the same time allowing for articulation of the emergent, combined experience of the two together.

Continued on page 13
This experience will inherently challenge, threaten and revise the understandings the co-participants bring individually to the conversation owing to their histories and their unique contexts, be they cultural, racial, sexual, socioeconomic or otherwise.

**Unformulated Dialogue**

Cross-cultural interlocutors must grapple with new ways of communicating, not just in the sense that they are encountering an other whose background may be different and unfamiliar, but also in the sense that the deepest and richest forms of contact and conversation between people are emergent rather than fixed. In contrast, the multicultural competency approach emphasizes gaining a form of mastery or at least rudimentary ability in speaking the language of the other, on becoming aware of the other’s customs, vocabulary and syntax. A psychoanalytic sensibility holds that the participants in the analytic dialogue—analyst and analysand, supervisor and supervisee, student and teacher, colleague and colleague—attempt to lose their own senses of mastery-based relating, to relinquish the feelings of cultural knowing and competence they may have held prior to entering into each new conversation with each new other. Psychoanalytic engagement with issues of otherness involves repeatedly trying to not assume understanding and to be open to receiving understandings, insights and formulations—always temporary and limited in their scope. Such trying-not-to-assume-while-instead-trying-to-be-receptive involves the repeated, deliberate abandonment of presumptions, about both self and other while simultaneously maintaining a disposition of curiosity.

This is where what I have come to call radical openness comes into play. Radical openness involves a disciplined psychoanalytic stance of attempting to notice, question and relinquish presumptions about oneself and the other. In order to do this in analysis, the psychoanalyst must be willing to be both curious about his or her own emergent experience and that of the analysand, and also be a responsive subject in relation to the analysand’s curiosity. (And it is important to clarify here that by “responsive” I do not mean “self-disclosing.” While some instances of intentional self-disclosure may serve the cause of fostering an analytic environment of reflectiveness, curiosity and openness, some disclosures may have the opposite effect. The openness here refers to a receptivity to that which is unexpected in relation to oneself and in relation to the other.)

In talks I’ve given about diversity and otherness I have tried to acknowledge the good intentions inherent in people’s attempts to get trained in how to be with people who are different from themselves. But I’ve wanted to urge people to go deeper. Competency in relation to the other might be seen as a starting point rather than an ultimate goal, like taking a crash course in a foreign language before you go to a new country in order to have some working phrases. I would propose that even without that course, you could still find a way to connect.

If you have enough courage, your experience could be more interesting than it would have been if you used your handy book of words and phrases to get what you want more efficiently. Throwing away the book, you would need to approach foreign strangers with a kind of interest, a turning toward their faces, listening to what they say and what you say, and how you both seem to be hearing each other. And you would have to be prepared to listen for the responses, including the negative (unconscious, unformulated), things that have not occurred to you before, then maybe the other can tell you about their problems with what you are asking and how you are asking it. But this useful information can only be conveyed to you if you convey, in your way of both speaking and listening, that you’re interested in hearing about how you misunderstood, how you got things wrong, how you failed to understand, and how you were experienced as presuming rather than listening with an open mind. In this way, you can come to participate in a cross-cultural dialogue that will be stimulating and interesting rather than non-offensively safe, mannered and probably boring (which in and of itself suggests a defensive turning away from the other).

The problem of racism and discrimination largely comes from a defensive process of disavowing one’s unwanted parts, one’s unwanted impulses and insecurities, locating them in the other person and then hating that other person in order to protect one’s self.

Continued on page 26
Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy Research or the Flight of the Dodo

Robert M. Galatzer-Levy

A clinical psychoanalyst and a psychodynamic psychotherapy researcher walk into a bar. They don’t notice each other.

The joke is painfully close to reality, which is a pity. Psychoanalysts have much to learn from psychotherapy researchers but we largely don’t take advantage of this resource. Day-to-day decisions about treatment or the timing of an intervention could be informed and improved by using psychotherapy research, but this rarely happens because the two fields have grown far apart.

The relationship of psychotherapy research and psychoanalysis has been unfriendly for a long time. Those few individuals who have spanned the fields often find themselves marginal in both.

The problem is partly historical. Systematic psychotherapy research originated in attacks on “unscientific” psychoanalysts while psychoanalysts, beginning with Freud, claimed research methods that compared groups of people of one type with groups of another (e.g., patients treated with one form of therapy to patients treated with another) inevitably fail to capture complexities that can only even be approximated in extended case studies.

Equally important, the sociology of knowledge in the two fields is very different. Most analysts come from disciplines that demand students learn supposed facts based on teachers’ authority. Whether it is the physician’s “the hip bone is connected to the thigh bone” or the psychologist’s reinforcement schedules, in the healing and mental health professions the major focus of pre-analytic training is transmission of a body of knowledge accepted on teachers’ say so. This approach continues in psychoanalytic institutes where the discussion of evidence for claims is often absent and frequently unwelcome. In contrast, psychotherapy researchers, by and large, come from a world where questions of how one knows things are foregrounded, assertions of fact are made cautiously, with less attention to the facts themselves than the bases on which the facts are asserted.

This leads to the most obvious difference between psychotherapy researchers’ work and that of psychoanalysts. Psychotherapy research publications are full of statistics. Statistics are almost completely absent from traditional psychoanalytic publications. The power of statistics comes from giving quantitative descriptions of phenomena and quantitative estimates of how likely a proposition is to be valid. In contrast, most psychoanalytic writing is judged on its narrative persuasiveness and usefulness to practicing analysts. Good arguments have been made for both kinds of truth. But conversations across the gulf are hard.

Let’s go back to the bar. A mutual friend of the analyst and the researcher happens in and suggests they sit together. After the usual pleasantries both start whining about work. The researcher says, “Money for psychotherapy research has dried up.” The analyst says, “I know how you feel. No one comes looking for analysis anymore. It’s such a pain! Potential patients keep telling me they’re getting ‘scientifically proven’ CBT or medication. Frankly I’m not feeling great about offering a treatment with no scientific basis, whatever that is.”

The psychotherapy researcher grins, “Well if you’d just kept up on my field you’d know what to say. You’d have a better idea about what treatments work for various problems and what interventions seem to be most effective.” The analyst, trying to be tactful, doesn’t mention he has no idea how to “keep up” with the researcher and that his eyes glaze over whenever the R word (research) is mentioned.

“Yeah,” the researcher says, “in 2017 we have really good data about how well PDT, that’s short for psychodynamic psychotherapy, works to relieve symptoms and the news is good. Jonathan Schedler’s 2010 paper shows PDT is effective by bringing together published research on the question, and it’s at least as effective as many evidence based therapies. You can tell your patients, and yourself, that they have out of date information. Things aren’t quite as rosy as I’m painting them. In the first place there is very little empirical research on psychoanalysis proper. But worse, the Dodo isn’t dead.”

Continued on page 15
“I knew it.” says the analyst, who tended to become morose when he drank. “The part about analysis doesn't worry me that much—most of what I do is, what did you call it, PDT. But this Dodo thing sounds ominous.”

“It is, sort of. You remember the caucus race from Alice in Wonderland, in which the Dodo announces, ‘Everybody has won and all must have prizes.’ That’s pretty much how it is with psychotherapy, and in fact with mental health treatments generally. Once you get to the level where patients are getting reasonable treatment the differences between the effectiveness of treatments become small compared to their main effects. The efficacy research doesn’t show PDT is the best treatment for everything but it does put the lie to the idea that there are a bunch of scientifically proven treatments out there that are winners while poor PDT has been left far behind.”

Noting that the analyst seems to be staring into his beer, the researcher says, “You know, as long as I’ve got you here I should let you know there is a lot more to psychotherapy research than efficacy studies.”

The analyst, trying to be polite, says, “I keep hearing we need efficacy studies to prove analysis and PDT work. Isn’t that what it’s all about?”

“Not really, I understand that for political and insurance purposes you guys would like data that show your treatment works, but there is a whole lot more to psychotherapy research than efficacy studies.”

The researcher who isn’t accustomed to psychotherapy research in the 1960s and ’70s, researchers showed the alliance between therapist and patient was of primary importance in determining whether therapy worked and whether the patient stayed in treatment. It mattered more, for example, than the particular techniques that therapist used. But that wasn’t the end of the story. The next obvious questions were what interferes with the alliance and how can it be repaired if it is damaged? Here, there were findings that really could help in your bread and butter work.”

“I hate to say this but that’s not really news, we were always taught to interpret the negative transference promptly, although I must admit that didn’t always work—half the time the therapy just blew up anyway.”

“Exactly. What a long series of studies showed was that interpreting the transference in the sense of telling the patient that negative feelings about the analyst came from early, unconscious sources tended to make things worse and came across more as excuses than useful insight. Instead, acknowledging the problem and trying to understand it in the present, including the therapist’s contribution, often led to the establishment of a stronger alliance. What was more the experience of working through the problem with the therapist had a positive effect on therapeutic outcome. You would have to admit that would be helpful information for a working analyst.”

“It certainly would. Interrupted treatments are the bane of my existence and I often feel helpless when I see things going down the tubes. I know I should ‘work on the alliance’ or deal with the negative transference but frankly I’ve always wondered what that really means. By the time my patients tell me for the twelfth time, ‘I know what you’re going to say—this reminds me of my depressed mother’—I get the message that transference interpretations aren’t doing the trick but the work you’re describing points to a different approach. Do you have any more tricks up your sleeve?” The analyst, who usually didn’t talk this way had had one too many beers and the whole situation was beginning to feel a bit too friendly.

“Yeah, I have a bunch,” says the researcher, who was feeling pretty good himself. “Here’s one: when works in one situation may not work in others. As Peter Fonagy puts it, the trick is to figure out ‘What Works for Whom.’ (It’s so British to get the grammar right.) There are a bunch of results I wish therapists knew.”

For example, remember how you were always taught psychoanalysis is for people who aren’t action prone? A wonderful study of children treated at the Anna Freud Center showed that while neurotic kids benefited from analysis the biggest therapeutic gains from intensive therapy was seen in the action-prone youngsters.”

Seeing the analyst has a happy smile on his face but not sure if it is the beer or the talk, the researcher, who had been dying to have a chance to tell one of these guys about his work, goes on, “And then there is the work on panic by Barbara Milrod and her co-workers. They showed rigorously that their form of PDT works but that when panic states are part of a complex psychological picture, using PDT makes more of a difference for patients than when the panic states seem to be isolated phenomena. And, of course, there was the late great Sidney Blatt who showed that depressed patients with introjective personality organization are more responsive to psychoanalysis while ananic patients are more responsive to more supportive psychotherapy. Choosing the right treatment for the patient really makes a difference.”

The analyst, who is beginning to feel groggy and a bit overwhelmed says, “I’m sorry but I have to get up in the morning to attend a session on proper analytic techniques. But hey, they never taught us this stuff at the institute. Where can I learn more?”

The researcher who isn’t accustomed to quite this much beer is beginning to rumble something about “latent growth mixture modeling,” but the mutual friend says, “You can find most of this and a lot more in the ‘Open door review of outcome and process studies in psychoanalysis’ on the IPA website https://www.ipa.world/ipa/IPA_Docs/Open%20Door%20Review%20III.pdf.

Whipping out his iPhone the analyst manages to find the review and laughs, “Four hundred eleven pages—do you really think…” continued on page 16
Ghosts in Our Nursery
Continued from page 11

The contribution of latent derogatory attitudes in the literature on the part of some analysts was juxtaposed with a clear effort on the part of others to question theory, reformulate and understand. The literature demonstrates an awareness of the unconscious culturally endemic race fantasies, the latent meanings of blackness (bad, evil, nothingness) and the negative attitudes toward the Negro as they emerged in the fantasies, dreams and minds of white patients, but the limited experience (personal and clinical) with Negro patients and Negro people made the work of elaborating theory slow. Early authors described individual cases of “the Negro,” or of “a Negro” (Philip Graven, 1930), demonstrating a subtle tone describing the Negro people as separate and somehow not part of the universal human experience, indicating a subtle form of othering that created a latent yet palpable racist tone.

Flight of the Dodo
Continued from page 15

“It’s not meant to be read straight through, although it’s a surprisingly good read. But if you want something short, take a look at Schedler’s “The Efficacy of Psychodynamic Psychotherapy’ (The American Psychologist, February-March 2010; https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/releases/amp-65-2-98.pdf). It’s fair to leave copies strewn about your waiting room for the science-minded potential patient. If you want a nice summary of a huge amount of research take a look at J. Barber et al.’s “Research on Dynamic Therapies” in M. Lambert’s Bergin and Garifel’s Handbook for Psychotherapy and Behavior Change. If you get scared by the statistics just do what my yoga instructor recommends when teaching flying pigeon. ‘You can just skip over this part and practice easy seat or some other calming pose for a while.’”

The works of John Dollard, and later Abram Kardiner and Lionel Ovesey, were welcomed into the literature since these authors actually interviewed Negro informants in their works; even the autobiographic work of Lillian Smith made its way into analytic circles for similar reasons. John Dollard, a Yale sociologist with technical psychoanalytic training, studied a Mississippi town he called “Southertown.” His meticulous description in the 1937 Caste and Class in a Southern Town of how the racialized caste structure maintained a hierarchical social and economic division between Negroes and whites, allowing whites, especially white men, to maintain a superior social, economic, political and sexual advantage, remains an important contribution. Dollard et al. advanced the “frustration aggression hypothesis,” and the “scapegoat hypothesis,” stressing that the individual, frustrated in achieving a certain goal, has an aggressive reaction to the person he/she considers to be the obstacle to his/her goal, displacing that aggression onto a (scapegoated) minority group that he/she holds responsible as the obstacle to the coveted goal, which is often economic advantage (John Dollard et. al. 1939, Marjorie Brierly 1944). The working middle class (white) subgroup then metes out its envy and aggression toward Negroes as a displacement from competition and envy of the upper class—a model that may have contemporary relevance.

Lillian Smith’s 1949 autobiography, Killers of the Dream, reviewed in Psychoanalytic Quarterly (William Barrett, 1951) provided an eye-opening account of the splitting, projection, and crystallized fantasy inherent in the racism of the pre-1960s Southern culture in America. She outlined segregation, white supremacy, and how she was taught that “masturbation is wrong and segregation is right.” She explained, “The lesson on segregation was only a logical extension of the lesson on sex and white superiority and God…that…Negroes and everything dark, dangerous, evil must be pushed to the rim of one’s life…” There is no better outline in the literature of the Oedipal drama in which the roles of Southern white men, white women, Black men and Black women are defined by the white man’s defensive need to split and project aggressive and erotic conflicts while disavowing his guilt, laying the historical bedrock for American racism embedded in our collective cultural unconscious.

In The Mark of Oppression, Kardiner and Ovesey (1951) argued that the “Negroes’ wretched internal life” is evidence of the “Negro personality,” which is indelibly scarred by racism. Although thought by the authors to be an insightful consideration of the traumatic effects of prejudice based on the interviews of 12 and the psychotherapy of 13 Negro subjects, it was criticized by African-Americans as a derogatory and oversimplified caricature which led to generalizations about the Negro family that were later challenged. The literature conceptualizing the intergenerational transmission of trauma, the effects of racism on family structure and resilience came much later.

As we struggled in this era with the aftermath of World War II, many theories of prejudice focused on anti-Semitism. Gregory Zilboorg (1947), Gordon Allport (1954) and Brian Bird (1957) all wrestled with how we understand prejudice psychologically, using anti-Semitism and group psychology as a theoretical base to argue that all forms of prejudice have common psychological roots, likening “the fear of the Jew to the fear of the father and tracing anti-Semitism back to an unresolved Oedipus complex.” (Lennard Loeblowitz, 1947). Interestingly, Bird’s (1957) formulation of prejudice involves the case history of a 19-year-old Jewish woman whose “attack of racial prejudice” he fruitfully analyzed along Oedipal lines. Bird interpreted his patient’s erotic hatred of Negro men as an Oedipal displacement and extrapolated, as many did, to group antagonism whereby “by projecting its
own unconscious forbidden impulses onto another race, the active group allows conscious expression of those impulses but escapes responsibility from them.” In the seminal work The Authoritarian Personality (1950), Theodor Adorno and Else Frenkel-Brunswik extrapolated from their research on the roots of prejudiced ideologies to postulate that a characteristic rigid and severe parenting style set the stage for the development of extremist authoritarian thinking.

Richard Sterba’s 1947 widely quoted paper on the Detroit race riots of 1943, Some Psychological Factors in Negro Race Hatred and in Anti-Negro Riots, lent credence to the psychoanalytic framework for emphasizing Oedipal conflict and sibling rivalry. Drawing from the clinical material extracted from the analyses of 42 patients, Sterba revealed the Negro in some dreams represented a “substitute object,” for the newcomer younger sibling, while at others times “being threatened by a Negro [man was]...understood as the expression and repetition of the dreamer’s infantile fears of his father.” Negroes served as displacement objects for aggressive and Oedipal conflicts. The mob chasing the “Negro in race riots, symbolized the hunting down of the cruel powerful father by the sons as did the lynching of black men similarly symbolize the killing of the primal father by the sons. (Resnikoff 1933, Sterba 1947).

The frequently cited case report by Terry Rodgers (1960) of an “anti Negro racist” chronicled the brief analysis of a racist whose family history, obsessional behavior, and defensive splitting mirrored the classic Oedipal formulation in which the patient, a middle-class attorney who had the prototypic “Negro nurse” growing up, revealed his fantasy that the Negro man (from the analysis of a dream) was the displaced figure of his castrating father. As the patient’s unconscious incestuous wishes were revealed in the course of the analysis, his murderous fantasies toward blacks intensified, and he fled the analysis to join a hate group, later sending the analyst pamphlets on race superiority. This is one of the few case reports in the literature in which conscious racist views could be traced back to Oedipal conflict. Lillian Smith’s autobiography, taken with Sterba’s 1947 discussion of the Detroit race riots, Bird’s case (1957), and Rodgers’s case report provided compelling clinical support for the attractiveness of Oedipal theory as theoretical framework for racism—a formulation summarized with great clarity by Joel Kovel in White Racism: A Psychohistory almost 20 years later.

The wave of literature in the 1950s and 1960s on the “Negro experience” emerged, and post-colonialism as a theoretical framework blossomed. Gunnar Myrdal’s famous American Dilemma in 1942 marked this change in the field of sociology emphasizing the Negro experience. Theorizing about prejudice evolved to include literature on anti-black racism, the black experience, the challenge of American multiculturalism, the intergenerational transmission of trauma, and later works Black Skin, White Masks in 1952 and The Wretched of the Earth in 1961, which marked intersecting nodal points for both psychoanalysis and sociology. Emboldened historically by the independence of India and African nations in the 1960s and the work of the United Nations, Frantz Fanon, in his work, drew attention to the social and theoretical importance of understanding colonialism and the colonized mind. In her 1996 encyclopedic review, The Anatomy of Prejudices, Elizabeth Young-Breuhl provides an unparalleled integration of history and theory in this connection.

The Civil Rights Movement catalyzed a social and political shift, so conversations about racism in the fields of sociology, social psychology and the humanities outdistanced the analytic literature. African-American physicians were drawn disproportionately into community work (Ruth Fuller, 1999) and continued to publish in psychiatric journals articles about racism in psychiatric training and racism as a social defense (Walter Bradshaw 1978, James Comer 1969, Charles Pinderhughes 1973, Alvin Poussaint 1980), but few pursued psychoanalytic training (Jeanne Spurlock, 1999).

In his 1966 paper, James Hamilton explained the housing discrimination against Negroes in Ann Arbor as representative of the “anal components of white hostility towards Negroes,” whereby the “Negro represents feces of which money is a displacement or sublimation,” which he justified by reaching back to quote Sandor Ferenzci’s The Ontogenesis of the Interest in Money (1914) and Lawrence Kubie’s 1937 “The Fantasy of Dirt,” as a theoretical base; this was the theoretical foundation of the so-called anal theory of racism.

Personally, I was not sure that this racist “theory” influenced analytic thought until several older colleagues confirmed it, with one reporting that a supervisor had told him that “the Negro in dreams means feces, you know.” Joel Kovel in 2000 similarly reported, “I had presented a patient’s dream in which black people had figured as characters. ‘Oh, don’t you know about that?’ the supervisor had pronounced airily. ‘She means her shit. That’s what black people always mean in the unconscious. It’s the color, you know.’”

Although credited with the exposition of this “theory” in his book, White Racism: A Psychohistory, Kovel (1970) confessed struggling with this formulation, stating, “the idea was grossly reductive, subjectivistic, and, most of all, deeply offensive.” He called this theory the “thingification” of the black man and “the radical loss of humanity,” equating the black man with feces. Kovel revisited this offensive formulation in his 2000 retrospective analysis of his own work stating, “The history of slavery reduced blacks to the level of chattel, and in this way perhaps in racism, a whole category of human beings was being regarded and treated as excrement—.... Could it be that the special association of blacks
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with feces in the racist unconscious is grounded in the historical reality of their enslavement—that they had in fact been considered property..., held as degraded things?” Even if conceding a great deal with this explanation, it is difficult to understand the clinical utility of these crude reductionistic (albeit racist) interpretations, but many analysts did not question this “theory.” Psychoanalytic writers in the 1940s, 1950s and well into the 1960s, however, conceptualized racism from this framework.

In the post-civil rights era, people of color slowly entered psychoanalytic training. By 1999, only 26 African-Americans were members of APsaA.

Kovel’s book brought our psychoanalytic understanding into sharper focus by artfully summarizing the psychoanalytic literature from the 1930s to the 1960s, including the three major lines of psychoanalytic thinking to explain racism: the Oedipal framework “enlarged to a cultural apparatus,” the anal theory of racism, and the race fantasies in American culture that defined African-Americans as the repositories of aggression and hatred. His insightful delineation of the “types” of racists (bigots who act out and liberals whose racism is unconscious), and the unconscious collective race fantasies operative in American culture are still useful conceptualizations and punctuated the emphasis on Oedipal theory that dominated analytic thinking for decades.

Persistence of Racism in Theory and Training

In the post-civil rights era, people of color slowly entered psychoanalytic training. The first documented African-American graduates of APsaA institutes were Margaret Lawrence in 1954 and Ellis Toney in 1958. By 1999, only 26 African-American psychoanalysts were members of the American Psychoanalytic Association (Ruth Fuller, 1999). Data from non-American Psychoanalytic Association institutes is not easy to compile. Veronica Abney (1998) located 57 African-American psychoanalysts for her dissertation study on the history of African-American psychoanalysts including non-APsaA institutes. The groundbreaking work of the African-American pioneer psychoanalysts such as June Christmas (1964, 1974), Jeanne Spurlock (1985, 1991, 1994) and Ruth Fuller (1980, 1988, 1993), all of development on issues of race were contributing factors to the problematically low numbers of people of color in the field (Helen Morgan 2007 and 2008).

As people of color and of different cultural backgrounds sought treatment in greater numbers in the 1970s and entered analytic training, African-American psychiatrists questioned if racism was embedded in psychoanalytic theory (Alexander Thomas and Samuel Sillen, 1972). As these limitations in psychoanalytic thinking were critiqued, some white analysts persistently objected. Although known for her work on race awareness in children, Marjorie MacDonald in her 1974 paper, Little Black Sambo, for example, recommended that “black reader’s rejection ... should be interpreted, since there “appears to be no obvious evidence of racism, and the story of Mumbo and Jumbo, and their little son Black Sambo should be seen as a charming children’s story of Oedipal conflict and childhood sexuality.

Richard Gardner (1975), in his reference to Phyllis Harrison-Ross and Barbara Wyden’s The Black Child—A Parents’ Guide, objected to the expressions of the “black is beautiful movement,” calling them “the substitution of one racism for another,” rather than recognizing the valuable contribution to positive self-esteem and ego ideal, which serve a protective defensive function in counteracting the traumatic effects of racism and discrimination. After reviewing many of these early papers, Farhad Dalal (2000) criticized many psychoanalysts for ignoring how the real detrimental effects of racism limited their clinical understanding of patients and, further, the reformulation of psychoanalytic theory. In her 1974 classic paper, Ghosts in the Nursery, Selma Fraiberg seemed chillingly relevant as she helped us understand that when past trauma is endured but not metabolized for one generation, what is not spoken is embedded in the unconscious and enacted in disturbing ways in those generations that follow.
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epistemological perspective, 2) to clarify the epistemological problems that occur when we try to use data and information from another discipline, and 3) to illustrate a controversy between two psychoanalysts, Daniel Stern and Andre Green, who disagree strongly about the relevance of data from outside the psychoanalytic situation.

We want to highlight that clinical hypotheses based on phenomena in different settings, obtained by different methodologies, and understood from different perspectives, reflect different interests, focus and conceptions of how the mind functions. Consequently, the concepts and theories that emerge from these different perspectives may not be comparable. Daniel Stern is interested in the representation of real experience, the “now,” the “coup,” as he calls it. Andre Green is interested in experience as it is elaborated in fantasy, the “après coup.” Each perspective is formed in observing and drawing inferences about unobservable mental states. This allows us to raise the problem of theoretical bias and projection for both the clinical perspective and the observational perspective. Each also has the problems inherent in reasoning by analogy. In comparing these different perspectives on what might be of interest to psychoanalysis, we are able to show candidates the kinds of problems that face anyone interested in making inferences about subjective states and unconscious states.

The readings are drawn from a dialogue between Green and Stern, in *Clinical Observational Psychoanalytic Research: Roots of a Controversy* (2001) and from each analyst’s view on the child’s psychic representation of a mother who becomes depressed after being a lively presence for her child. The tone of the exchange serves as an illustration of what can happen when psychoanalysts feel pressed to defend their beliefs about what psychoanalysis is.

We try to show the candidates how to put the discussion on another footing, the epistemological differences between an observational and a psychoanalytic perspective. Green thinks there is no real child in the psychoanalytic situation, “The model for psychoanalysis is the dream….Psychoanalysis is incompatible with observation. Observation cannot tell us anything about the intrapsychic processes that truly characterize the subject’s experience.” In contrast, Stern thinks memory traces in the form of schema of being with the other organize subjective experience by providing a foundation for representation of the self and other and for fantasy. He thinks the observation of infants offers generative hypotheses about the functioning of the mind in areas of interest to psychoanalysis, transference for example.

We ask the candidates what they consider the advantages and disadvantages of each perspective. We explore the possibility and the problems associated with combining these perspectives. We pose questions facing our discipline in many areas. How are we to decide if one idea is better than another? How are we to decide when we are wrong?

**Year 2**

Critical Thinking II is “The Pluralist Perspective,” two classes at the beginning of the second year that also serve as an introduction to the second-year theory course, Psychoanalytic Theories. This course introduces candidates to the development of psychoanalytic ideas from ego psychology, object relations and self psychology, as well as the ideas of important theoreticians like Klein, Bion and Lacan. Candidates often experience this course as a dizzying immersion in psychoanalytic thought. The educational goals of Critical Thinking II are: 1) to explore the epistemological dimensions of a pluralist perspective, 2) to provide an orienting frame for thinking about different schools of thought, and 3) to explore the concept of fantasy as an example of a fundamental concept that contains contradictory ideas in different schools of thought, 4) to reacquaint the candidates with the Critical Thinking Sequence. The reading for these classes is my paper, “Thinking About Curriculum: An Epistemological Perspective.”

We encourage candidates to think about each theoretician and school of thought in relation to a set of epistemological questions and a set of clinical questions. The epistemological questions we suggest are: 1) How is the domain of psychoanalysis being described? 2) What phenomena are included and excluded? 3) What mode or modes of investigation are being described? For example, free association, countertransference, empathic immersion are modes of investigation. 4) What is considered evidence? 5) Is there an attempt to explain phenomena beyond meaning?

The clinical questions we suggest are: 1) What model of mind is the reference for theory? 2) What model of pathogenesis is the reference for theory? 3) How is the role of the analyst being described? 4) How is the psychoanalytic situation envisioned? 5) How is therapeutic action being envisioned? We want candidates to be able to distinguish epistemological and clinical issues.

In order to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of a pluralist perspective, we explore the concept of fantasy from the ego psychological perspective and from the Kleinian perspective. These perspectives differ on the nature of fantasy, on the nature of mind and on the mental capacities that contribute to fantasy. I present a case so we have a clinical basis for the discussion.

**Year 3**

For this year, we integrate a critical perspective in relation to clinical process and technique.

One course, “Critical Thinking about Psychoanalytic Process III,” is embedded in the psychoanalytic process course in each year of the core curriculum.
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Critical Perspective
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The educational goals are: 1) to introduce candidates to an epistemological perspective as they learn about psychoanalytic process in an interrupted but continuous case presentation, and 2) to model a collaborative scrutiny and critical attitude toward our theories, our concepts and our rules of inference and evidence.

In the interrupted continuous case design, two analysts comment on the same case for eight weeks in each year of the core curriculum beginning in the second year. Each new second-year class begins with a different pair of instructors who stay with the class for the next three years. One of the analysts helps the candidates deepen their understanding of psychoanalytic process; the other helps candidates deepen their understanding of psychoanalytic thinking itself. An interrupted continuous case allows the teaching analysts to form a relationship with the candidates, with the case and with each other. We hope to provide an opportunity for candidates to identify with a way of thinking about psychoanalytic thinking over time.

A second course, “Critical Thinking about Psychoanalytic Technique,” is for senior candidates beginning in their third year. Three classes are devoted to discussing a controversy that involves technique. Two analysts from differing theoretical orientations present their ideas about a technical issue in relation to a case one of them presents. The educational goals are: 1) to offer candidates an opportunity to hear faculty give their views on controversies and ideas that involve technique, 2) to explore the larger themes that underlie their differences and, 3) to offer candidates an opportunity to hear the ideas of candidates in other classes. Some examples of topics for discussion are: 1) perspectives on the interpretation of aggression, 2) perspectives on interpretation of unconscious fantasy and 3) perspectives on the interpretation of defense. Candidates are strongly encouraged to express their views.

Year 4
Critical Thinking IV, “A Critical Evaluation of Psychoanalytic Knowledge,” is a mini-course of six classes whose educational goal is to help candidates consolidate their understanding of epistemological issues and more particularly to familiarize them with points of view about epistemology and with methods in two traditions, the empirical and the hermeneutic. One class each is devoted to the scientific point of view and to the hermeneutic point of view including their epistemological values and their methodologies. A third class explores a rigorous attempt by the philosopher, Paul Ricoeur, to validate Freud’s ideas. Ricoeur’s paper, “The Question of Proof in Freud’s Psychoanalytic Writings” is particularly useful because he concludes that both hermeneutic and empirical methods are needed, each for a different dimension of theory.

Conclusion
Psychoanalysis is a discipline whose focus is on subjective and unconscious phenomena in both the analyst and the analysand. However, as Freud maintained, psychoanalysis as an activity and as a discipline stands on three legs. Psychoanalysis is a therapeutic procedure, a theory about the nature of mind and development, and a vehicle for research into the nature of mental life. Each leg has a different goal. It is easy to forget theoretical and explanatory goals in the heat of the therapeutic endeavor. Questions of efficacy, case selection and outcome rest on an understanding of therapeutic action or actions that derive from an understanding of the nature of mind, development and mental experience. More than ever before in this country, psychoanalysts need to be able to establish and to communicate the rationale for our therapeutic activities and for our ideas. We can give our candidates the tools they need to do this. We can teach our candidates to tend to psychoanalysis as a discipline and a body of knowledge.
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Our Texas psychoanalytic community is pleased to welcome APsaA’s 106th Annual Meeting to Austin. The Austin San Antonio Psychoanalytic Society, the Center for Psychoanalytic Studies in Houston and the Dallas Psychoanalytic Center will be co-hosting a pre-conference reception for APsaA members Thursday, June 8, at the Palm Door on Sabine. We look forward to meeting you and introducing ourselves to you. We are aware there was some controversy about holding the meeting in Austin due to the recent legislation legalizing the open carry of guns. But despite this provocative legislation, we reassure you that you are unlikely to see anyone marching around the streets of Austin with weapons.

Austin is a thriving, sophisticated urban center known for its music, natural spaces and progressive politics. It was also home to the notoriously funny Ann Richards, the lady with the beehive white hair and the one-time governor of Texas who once quipped that, given the chance, women can do anything men can do, “After all, Ginger Rogers did everything that Fred Astaire did. She just did it backwards and in high heels.”

When I moved to Austin in the mid-'70s, Austin was a sleepy little town with a pronounced regional culture. Home to both the state government and the University of Texas, it was also known as the home of the Armadillo World Headquarters, a music venue, which featured the likes of Willie Nelson, Jerry Jeff Walker, Stevie Ray Vaughan, Asleep at the Wheel and Kinky Friedman and the Texas Jewboys. Whole Foods Market was a small organic grocery store in an old house. Weekends, you could drive on the main streets in town and see few cars. The sign that said Austin City Limits really did mark the limit beyond which the lights faded and the Hill Country began.

Today the population of Austin and the surrounding metropolitan area is around two million and still growing. The Austin city limit sign is just a sign in an otherwise unbroken sea of electric lights. The city now hosts the annual cutting-edge tech/film gathering SXSW (South by Southwest) and the highly popular Austin City Limits music festival where local, national and international musicians come to play. The University of Texas at Austin, with more than 50,950 students, is known as a major research university. In summer 2016, the University of Texas medical school, with an eye on innovative community-based care, welcomed its first class of medical residents. Meanwhile, the city continues to invest in promoting live music venues and bills itself (perhaps somewhat hyperbolically, but what else is new about Texans?) as the Live Music Capital of the World.

The cultural history of Central Texas is the history of three distinct ethnic groups: the original Mexican settlers. (Texas once was part of Mexico, existing briefly as an independent republic before joining the United States), later Mexican and Latino immigrants, African-Americans, and Anglo and Central European immigrants, many of the latter arriving in the 19th century to found utopian communities. More recently Austin has welcomed immigrants from Asia, India and elsewhere around the world. The traces of this history are still evident in Austin although gentrification has unfortunately pushed some of the original populations out into the surrounding area where housing is less expensive. With the population growth in Austin and the influx of people, the distinctive regional culture of old Texas is less evident but still can be found in Austin’s reverence for Texas Bar-B-Q, all varieties of tacos and for two stepping, a form of dancing to a distinctive style of country western music known as Texas swing. (Though there is plenty of opportunity to dance salsa as well.)

To learn more about this history, spend half a day at the Bob Bullock Texas History Museum or visit the George Washington Carver Museum and Cultural Center in East Austin. For those who can afford the extra time, I highly recommend a half-day spent at the LBJ Presidential Library on the University of Texas campus. There you will find, among other things, exhibits that document the civil rights struggles of the 1960s and 1970s as well as the history of American involvement in the Vietnam War and Johnson’s efforts to address America’s poverty and inequality through his Great Society program.
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While these exhibits document a particular time in our national culture, they also portray the history of a man steeped in the culture of mid-century rural Texas.

If you get tired of sitting in meetings and need to stretch your legs, a few blocks from your hotel you will find Lady Bird Lake Trail, a 10-mile trail along the banks of the Colorado River. Early mornings and evenings are particularly nice for running or walking the trail. You can also rent kayaks and canoes if you want to paddle the lake.

One of the most distinctive and beloved features of Austin is Barton Springs, an outdoor swimming area fed by natural springs from the Edwards Aquifer. Particularly in the sweltering heat of the Texas summers, Barton Springs with its year round temperature of 68 degrees feels like an oasis in the middle of the city. Considered sacred by the original inhabitants, the Tonkawa Native Americans, the springs have been protected as the result of a hard fought battle by local environmentalists who for years pushed for zoning and environmental regulations. Today you can swim there along the limestone cliff, see the five-finger and maidenhair ferns, and watch the turtles and small fish swim at your feet. There is a nice democratic quality to this public space where families from all over the area come on weekends to swim, picnic, bar-b-q and play soccer.

While there are many more things I could tell you about Austin, I will mention only one other unique experience Austin has to offer: the flight of the bats at dusk from under the Congress Street Bridge. Luckily this bridge is within walking distance from the hotel where the meetings are held. The underside of the bridge is home to the largest bat colony in North America. Every night at dusk the bats, all 1.5 million of them, emerge en mass in wave after undulating wave for their nightly feeding. In a single night these bats eat an estimated 10,000 to 20,000 pounds of insects. It is a special sight to see people lining the bridge to watch and kayakers floating in the waters below the bridge waiting to greet the bats. The bats fly in only one direction so be sure to stand on the side of the bridge where the crowd is standing.

There is more to see and do in Austin. I have given you only a flavor. Come and enjoy the 2017 APsaA National Meeting as well as our city. I hope some of you will find the time to swim in Barton Springs, visit one of the history museums, see the bats or go hear local music and maybe even try out two stepping to the sound of Texas swing.
How Ideology Can Infuse Psychoanalytic Thinking

Nathan Szajnberg
Arlene Kramer Richards and Arnold Richards, Book Review Editors

I review Freud in Zion hesitantly, as I hope to transmit its intellectual heft, while maintaining its style of a historical thriller, now translated into French, German and Hebrew.

Why should I have been surprised at the scholarly yet engaging style of Rolnik, this Israeli psychoanalyst? During my five years in Israel, I was impressed with the depth of knowledge of some of my fellow members of the Israel Psychoanalytic Society, one of the largest IPA component societies. The Eitingon Institute (yes, that Eitingon, who founded and funded the Berlin Institute mostly from his family’s furrier funds and then escaped the Nazis to found the Israel Institute over 75 years ago) fills its classes every year with perhaps a dozen candidates.

In my years as a member and training analyst, I would hear colleagues such as Eliahu Feldman, trained in Brazil, in an hour give the clearest account of Bion I have ever heard; Yolanda Gampel, in her private study group on Melanie Klein, give a sensitive, thoughtful and carefully critical reading of the Richard case; Yoram Hazan, who died far too young, describe evenly hovering attention and Aprés-Coup (b’dé’avad in Hebrew) with the accent of a knowledgeable self-psychology (via Chicago’s Jim Fisch); and Emanuel Berman speak authoritatively in his rolling basso on almost any subject psychoanalytic—in Hebrew, English or Polish. Berman wrote the magnificent sociohistorical study of the Israel Psychoanalytic Institute’s transformation, Impossible Education.

Rolnik spends the first half of the book tilling the historical soil, before he sows the seeds of Freud in Zion.

Freud’s 1921 Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego was his first work translated into Hebrew (1928), reflecting the early immigrants’ sense that they needed to grasp group psychology to understand what they were doing, and would be doing as strangers in this strange land. The early Zionists did not seem to let themselves realize that psychoanalysis’s “critical, interpretative and individual” perspective might be at odds with the constructivist and collectivist conception, particularly amongst the kibbutzniks, that tiny portion of the population (perhaps three percent) who nevertheless grounded the ideology and became leaders of the land for decades.

In 1905, Otto Rank (né Rosenfeld) insists psychoanalysis could become a Jewish science. Imagine Freud’s dismay.

Let me give some flavor of the overall themes in Rolnik’s book, to encourage you to read the book to understand much about not only the history of psychoanalysis in Zion, but also its cheek-by-jowl pre-history in Vienna, where Theodor Herzl and Freud lived but blocks from each other. Freud in Zion is a challenging account of how ideology can infuse psychoanalytic thinking and technique—at times for the betterment of our patients, at times not.

We are almost halfway through this story before psychoanalysts truly take root in the desolate soil of Zion in the 1930s, that decade of desperation for European Jews. Some 90,000 German Jews alone came to Israel (20 percent of new arrivals). Edith Jacobson is imprisoned; Richard Sterba escapes with his analysand through an office window, the SS on their heels; Bettelheim, not so fortunate, demobilizes his underground army, then is captured at the Czech border and becomes a guest of the SS in Dachau. Rolnik spends the first half of the book tilling the historical soil, before he sows the seeds of Freud in Zion.
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In contrapuntal style, Freud, in 1923, insists in his talk before the B’nai Brith (the only organization outside psychoanalysis to which he proudly belonged) that the historical fate of the Jews provided them with the capacity for free thought, willingness to fight and quest for truth—those components necessary for a psychoanalytic science, and perhaps any true discipline.

The Jewish Science

The Russian psychoanalytic Institute had some 30 members in 1922-23, an eighth of the IPA membership. They pursued experimental (allegedly psychoanalytic) boarding schools, which even one of Stalin’s children attended. These Russian psychoanalysts emigrated to Germany and many ultimately to Israel, becoming nuclei for psychoanalysis. Moshe Wulf, for instance, while a member of the Vienna Society, hailed from Russia and emigrated to Israel (to become a foil for Eitingon).

And, through Frieda-Fromm Reichmann’s Heidelberg school, which tried to integrate psychoanalysis and Orthodox Judaism, came Akiva Ernst Simon, later the director of the Hebrew University School of Education, Erich Fromm, and Leo Lowenthal, later head of sociology at UC Berkeley.

Martin Buber, the philosopher who became head of sociology at the Hebrew University, opposed Freud’s ideas and ultimately the presence of psychoanalysis at the University where Freud was on the board of governors. Buber seemed to fashion himself also as a developmental psychologist, postulating that everyone is born with an “originator” instinct that must be channeled by educators into communion “instinct.” It was an era when many thought they could do it all: A philosopher thought he could make developmental theories and critique a discipline in which he had no training.

Siegfried Bernfeld, later a founder of the San Francisco Institute, was an adviser to a socialist youth movement in Israel. How involved were the early psychoanalysts in social issues of pre-state Israel? Dorian Feigenbaum, appointed the head of psychiatry of the first hospital in Jerusalem, studied the epidemic of suicides among early settlers, some 10 percent of all pioneer deaths in the second decade of the century. The Hebrew University’s animosity towards psychoanalysis came early and endured. But, beyond this perhaps parochial plaint, Einstein, a member of its founding board of governors, weighed in on the University when he wrote to discourage Eitingon from trying to find a place there in 1934:

As for the university in Jerusalem, I am sorry to say that this institution, whose importance for the entire Jewish intellectual world is so great, and whose realization I myself worked so hard for, is not exactly in good hands. I have been fighting to replace the administration for years, but have yet to see results. While I have managed to get a Committee of Inquiry convened I have little faith in the ability of the current powers that be to bring about real change for the better. So far, the university’s best have also been the ones to turn their backs on the place in bitter anger. Why would you want to put yourself through that?

Rolnik, a fine historian, brings the dark corners of our history to light. It is perhaps a wish that such light might cleanse.

Unfortunately, after the first Freud Chair was established in the late 1970s and funded mostly by American psychoanalysts, who insisted the funds be held in New York, not Jerusalem, Joseph Sandler came and left within five years. Anne Marie Sandler recounts that her husband said had he been treated as well in the first four years as he was in his fifth, he might have stayed. A selection committee was established to review all candidates for the chair, who are expected to both training analysts and well-published in psychoanalysis. As best I know, this selection committee has not met in many years.

Refugee Founders

The 1930s, brought refugees, some reluctant, to Palestine, including Eitingon. This is the foundational beginning of psychoanalysis in Palestine. Rolnik says the pre-state needs of the community tended towards collectivist thinking, optimism, highly ideological and anti-intellectual, particularly amongst the kibbutzniks.

Shimon Peres, when asked about his hope for the future, responded that without hope there would have been no Israel. The national anthem, “Hatikvah,” means, “The Hope.” Yet, Freud’s psychoanalysis is fundamentally individualistic, non-political and imbued with a social pessimism, particular after the wholesale slaughter of World War I, after which Freud elaborated his death drive ideas. How to resolve the tensions between these two states of mind?

Matters get more complicated; this is psychoanalysis after all. Freud’s views of analysis arose primarily from his work with adults. Yet, psychoanalytic interest in early education arose at least with Ferenczi’s precocious 1908 paper on education. While psychoanalysis in the office is one matter, its application to early development and childhood education gives it the kind of societal optimism, a manner of applying principles to improve at least the lives of children, if not of society. Therefore, one can see
Birdman and His Mother

Herbert H. Stein
Bruce H. Sklarew, Film Editor

The film Birdman: The Unexpected Virtue of Ignorance, made in 2014, takes the viewer on a wild ride on the edge of mania and psychotic depression through its central character, Riggan Thomson, who is struggling with his identity. On the one hand, he is trying to establish himself as a serious stage performer and director to combat the identity assigned to him by the public and the press as a movie star who played a super hero, Birdman. We see him in the late rehearsals, previews and opening of a Broadway play he has written based on a Raymond Carver short story. But Thomson, himself, identifies with the Birdman. We see him levitating and moving objects at a distance, proofs of either his magical powers or his delusional state. When he stands at the edge of the roof of a tall building, we do not know if he (and we with him) will jump off out of despair or leap off into manic flight.

Here I want to focus on the clues the film gives us to understand Riggan’s unconscious motives, starting with the “play within a play,” or in this case within a film. Leon Balter, in a 2006 paper in the Psychoanalytic Quarterly, demonstrates that like a dream within a dream, a play within a play can give direct expression to a central disturbing idea while disguising it as a bit of fiction. Birdman takes us through certain key scenes in Riggan’s play in rehearsals, previews with live audiences and the play’s official opening on Broadway. The final scene, in which Riggan’s character, Eddie, enters a motel room to confront his former girlfriend and her new lover is repeated three times in the film. With each repetition, we hear Riggan say, “I don’t exist. I’m not even here. I don’t exist. None of this matters,” before putting a gun to his head and pulling the trigger. In the final version we see, on the play’s official opening night, he uses real bullets.

The refrain, “I don’t exist, none of this matters,” is not only repeated three times as we see performance after performance. It is also echoed elsewhere in the film, when Riggan’s daughter, Sam, tells him his play is aimed at “a thousand rich, old white people whose only real concern is gonna be where they go to have their cake and coffee when it’s over,” and finishes, “You’re the one who doesn’t exist. You’re doing this because you’re scared to death, like the rest of us, that you don’t matter. And you know what? You’re right. You don’t. It’s not important. You’re not important. Get used to it.”

And whence comes this fear? We go back to the scene, to the dialogue just before Riggan expresses his existential hopelessness. He is a woman’s former lover, Eddie, barging in upon the woman he still loves and her current lover as they are making love in a motel room. Pointing a gun threateningly, he says, “What’s wrong with me? Why do I end up having to beg people to love me?”

Woman: “Ed. Eddie. Please… Give me the gun. Just look at me. I was drowning. I was not capable of—you deserve to be loved. You do.”

Eddie: “I just wanted to be what you wanted. Now I spend every fucking minute praying to be someone else. Someone I’m not. Anyone…”

Other man: “Put down the gun, Ed. She just doesn’t love you anymore.”

Eddie: “You don’t, do you?”

Woman: “No.”

Eddie: “And you never will…”

Woman: “I’m sorry.”

Eddie: “I don’t exist. I’m not even here. I don’t exist. None of this matters.”

The play within a play tells us the desperation comes from seeking a love that isn’t there. Eddie, Riggan, doesn’t exist because he is not important to the woman whose love he seeks.

In an earlier part of the play, Eddie’s former lover describes him as being possessed by a passionate, violent love.

“Okay, well, he did beat me up one night. He dragged me around the living room by my ankles, yelling ‘I love you, I love you, bitch.’”

This, too, is reinforced elsewhere in the film, in dialogue between Riggan and his ex-wife, Sylvia, whom we come to see he still loves. In answer to his question, “Why did we break up?” she tells him. “You threw a kitchen knife at me… and one hour later you were telling me how much you loved me.” She adds, “Just because I didn’t like that ridiculous comedy you did with Goldie Hawn didn’t mean I did not love you. But that’s what you always do. You confuse love with admiration.”

Continued on page 26
Riggan (playing a different role here) delivers a monologue about an elderly couple badly injured in an auto accident, lying in the hospital in body casts.

“The husband was depressed. Even when I told him his wife was gonna pull through, he was still depressed. So, I got up to his mouth hole and asked him, and he told me it was because he couldn’t see her through the eye holes. Can you imagine? I’m telling you, the man’s heart was breaking because he couldn’t turn his goddamn head and see his goddamn wife.”

This need to win the love and approval of an unaffirming, indifferent mother is expressed in the film through Riggan’s attempt to redeem himself with the play. To be someone other than a cartoon character, to be someone, comes down to his winning the approval of the New York Times theater critic, Tabitha. She is seen in a Broadway bar, a cold, imperious figure who admires the method actor, Mike Shiner, who is devoted to the theater, but despises Riggan, the Hollywood actor. She tells him that there is nothing he can do, that she will kill his play. She is clearly the embodiment of the unattainable woman, mother, whose love and admiration are so desperately needed.

In the end, Riggan wins her admiration, if not her love, by shooting himself on stage. In the sequel to his on stage suicide attempt, he hears her approving review of his act of heroic realism under the title, “The Unexpected Virtue of Ignorance,” the alternate title for the film. Only self-destruction can get the attention of such a mother.

And what of the ending? We see Riggan shoot himself and we seemingly lose consciousness with him, the screen melting into confused frozen images, only to awaken to a “reality” in which he has seemingly survived. But in his survival, he has shot off his nose and had it replaced with a more beak-like nose, subtly blending him with the Birdman of his fantasy life. We see him, left alone in his hospital room, opening the window and stepping out, not to be seen by us again. As the film ends, his daughter reenters the room, looks out the window, first glancing down—we half expect a look of horror on her face, but no—she finally glances upward and smiles, suggesting that she sees her father hovering above, with all the power of the Birdman. Ultimately, the film gives us a delusional fantasy as the only alternative in the face of a mother whose approving gaze can only be won through self-annihilation.

Potentially, this may be the ultimate romantic ideal, but it is not the only option. Tabitha, the cold, imperious theater critic, may be a representation of the mother, but she is also a representation of the Approval Complex, the need to win the love and admiration of those who are perceived to be authority figures.

Editor’s Note: This article is an elaboration of one of the themes from a paper by the author on Birdman that was published in the Spring 2015 issue of the PANY Bulletin.

Competence

Continued from page 13

Rather than saying, “I hate these aspects of myself, or these are really difficult, frightening aspects of my own experience,” it’s easier for many people, perhaps most people, to experience those not as aspects of oneself, but aspects of the other, and then to hate the other. Othering, in this sense, would seem to be inherent in the human condition. It describes this process where people rid themselves of the things about themselves they can’t tolerate, by projecting them onto others, or attributing them to others, and even by inducing them in others, and then hating or destroying them in those others. The psychoanalytic project aspires to help people be curious about and, perhaps, to recognize what they are doing in the process of othering, and to help them see they are using people for internal security in ways that have external, invariably destructive consequences.

When it comes to the problem of prejudice, psychoanalysis offers a more profound remedy than trying to teach people not to be prejudiced or to watch what they say. Because psychoanalysis is interested in understanding what would make one person hate another and is inherently interested in creating contained opportunities for dialogue. Psychoanalysis aspires to help people to become more aware of the ways ignorance is self-protective and that prejudice involves using people to manage dreaded internal experience.

Psychoanalytically, it is axiomatic that both ignorance and its self-perpetuating variants such as prejudice and paranoia reside in all people. When we work to analyze transferences we are working toward the dismantling of such defensively held ignorance. In this regard, transferences can be understood as prejudices acquired early in life, as ways of surviving the anxieties stemming from the problems of dependency.
and relatedness. Accordingly, the goal when addressing prejudice is to discover blindesses and defensive biases, how they may have been established and perpetuate themselves, not erase them or cover them with more desirable or socially acceptable thoughts and manners of speaking.

Psychoanalysts look at otherness and how that otherness profoundly alters the interaction people have with each other. Whether conceived of in terms of identifications, intrusions or multiplicities of self, contemporary psychoanalysts understand the importance of context, looking at unconscious fantasy from the inside and considering the relational and broader social context from which fantasy may arise.

Critical theory, queer theory, hermeneutics, field theory—each of these has been incorporated by contemporary psychoanalytic thinkers and creates a richer and more complex analytic perspective for approaching racism, discrimination and the many forms of othering. We cannot simply assert that racial discrimination involves the projection of unwanted, unconscious aspects of self onto the other. We now propose that racism represents a failure of curiosity, an intolerance of ambiguity and complexity.

In contemporary psychoanalytic thought, in which the boundaries of self and other are understood as being constantly in flux and never fully clear or known, traditional categories of self and other are pushed to their limits. When you start considering things like the existence of more than two sexes, or multiple selves, or that the sense of continuity and cohesion each person normally possesses might be an illusion that dissociatively obscures annihilatory dread, then you open the door to dissembling the constructs of race, culture and other determinate categories and their validity. Psychoanalysts now are more likely to practice in a manner that acknowledges what the analyst doesn’t know is as important as what the psychoanalyst does know.

In relational and social constructivist thought, there is an emphasis on not knowing, and the psychoanalyst’s capacity for, or tolerance of, not knowing. This becomes a crucial aspect of the psychoanalyst’s role, one that has direct application to breaking down the categories that serve to perpetuate the defensive, discriminatory operations of othering: the ability to not know and to hold a position of not knowing for the analytic dyad, even when the analyst inevitably seeks to flee from the anxieties associated with such not knowing. The psychoanalytic endeavor aspires to avoid jumping to conclusions, even when they seem quite compelling and even when they would seem to resolve, or at least help to avoid, anxieties in the participants.

Finally, a psychoanalytic approach offers a unique tool for addressing the universal problem encountered when people try to talk to each other across the borders of race, culture and discrimination, as they try to articulate their experience of both difference and commonality.

I am multiracial, with a black father whose ancestors were African-American, Native American and Western European, and a white, Jewish mother whose ancestors were from Russia and Poland. I consider myself to be both black and white, and, also, not simply either.
RACE AND RACISM IN PSYCHOANALYTIC THOUGHT

Ghosts in Our Nursery
Continued from page 18

Did the unexamined racism of how people of color were viewed and othered, even by analysts, silently stifle our development as a field?

Many African-Americans entering the field encountered prejudice. The contention that minority groups were not “analyzable,” had grown out of Clarence Obendorf’s 1954 caution against inter-racial analysis since the divergent cultural difference, he argued, made it untenable. Altman, in 1995, challenged this classical attitude that analytic treatments could not be used with minority groups and, in 2006, pointed out “the blind spot in the field of psychoanalysis to racism in the U.S.” due to “its troubled history of exclusion and in-group domination.” The prejudices expressed earlier in TAP 50/4 by Richard Reichbart’s colleague, who doubted that African-Americans had the abstract thinking capacity conducive to psychoanalytic training, is equaled only by Veronica Abney’s (2011) recounting how a colleague informed her, when he began his analysis, he was told that since he was African-American he did not have an unconscious. In Salman Akhtar’s The African-American Experience, Dionne Powell (2012) similarly confirmed that “Early psychoanalytic writers were circumspect as to whether African-Americans, due to their history of trauma, and white analysts’ unexamined fears, prejudices, and behaviors, could effectively be brought into treatment.”

Schools of social work in the 1990s integrated social and cultural factors into clinical psychodynamic work while mainstream psychoanalytic institutes lagged in realizing the need for diversity teaching in training programs and the need to integrate the influence of class, ethnicity and race. (Elaine Pinderhughes 1989; Michael Moskowitz 1996; Altman 2005 and 2006). Our theoretical understanding of race and transference deepened with the publication of Dorothy Holmes’s 1992 paper, “Race and Transference in Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy,” and later Kimberlyn Leary’s 1997 “Race in the Psychoanalytic Space,” both representing new psychoanalytic perspectives on working with race as a container in the transference with greater nuance.

Holmes demonstrated that transference can be racialized (1992), that race and class provide unique “points of engagement” to further analytic understanding (1999), and that integrating the psychodynamic conceptualization of othering, deepens our clinical understanding along these lines (2015).

The British psychoanalyst, Farhad Dalal, in 2002, integrated and expanded on how understanding the dynamic processes of othering and racialization facilitate a deeper psychoanalytic conceptualization of racist thinking although both concepts had evolved into discourse on racism in the sociological literature (Simon Clarke 2003, Robert Miles and Malcolm Brown 1989). In short, Dalal (2002) postulates that, “more useful than the notion of racism is that of racialization—the process of manufacturing and utilizing the notion of race in any capacity,” an idea mirrored in the sociological literature by Miles (1989) who “prefers to use the term ‘racialization’ where social relations between people have been structured by the signification of ...[race such that]... race is a social construct at the center of the racialization process, and this becomes racism (ideologically) when there is a negative valuation.” These scholars challenge us to question our use of the terms “race” and “racism,” and suggest we refine our thinking and conceptualization as our conversations on race evolve.

Unlike early psychoanalytic formulations steeped mainly in Oedipal theory, modern conceptualizations integrate this new lexicon using the terms “racialization” (Dalal 2002, Miles and Brown 1989), and othering along with multilayered concepts including: intersectionality (Kemberle Crenshaw 1991), whiteness (Forrest Hamer 2013, Altman 2006a, Melanie Suchet 2004, 2006, Robin DiAngelo 2012, Janice Gump 2000), white privilege (James Baldwin 1993), racial melancholia (Anne Cheng 2001, David Eng and Shinhee Han 2000), hate and hating (Donald Moss 2001), being hated (Kathleen White 2002), race as an adaptive challenge (Leary 2012), intergenerational trauma (Kirkland Vaughans 2014, 2016, Maurice Apprey 2003, 2014), distinguishing racism from neuroticism in African-Americans (Cheryl Thompson 1987), anti-Semitism as contrasted with anti-black racism (Apprey 1996), relational perspectives (Altman 1996, Annie Lee Jones 2014, 2016), and the construct of dignity in a racist society (Holmes 2015). I cannot do justice in the space provided here to the recent rich extensions of theory in this regard, but I have tried to position for the reader this current TAP series, Conversations on Psychoanalysis and Race, in historical context.

At the outset, I had hoped I would find that psychoanalytic theory had explained the psychological forces underlying racist thinking, had developed a theoretical framework, had explained its developmental underpinnings, its evolution and intractability, and could serve as a foundation for social intervention and change. My sad conclusion is that racism, subtle and overt, has impeded the development of

Continued on page 29
psychoanalysis as a theory and as a field of practice forestalling our further understanding of race, racialization and racism.

Alas, the psychoanalytic world has not been immune to the racism deeply embedded in our culture and experience. Although the literature grows, more work is needed. Recent calls for attention to diversity in training and education in the American Psychoanalytic Association speak to our awareness of our neglect of these challenges. Institute curricula, training analyses and supervisions have not consistently addressed issues of race in clinical work. Many institutes have no required courses on race or diversity. Most lack study groups for faculty to improve supervisory teaching on this topic. This must change especially if we are to equip ourselves for Dorothy Holmes’s “fierce urgency of now,” and Anton Hart’s “radical openness.”

How do we apply psychoanalytic understanding and theorizing to the problems of racialization and racial hatred in the modern world? Current events remind us that this work is desperately needed. Are we ready for this challenge? Terrorist attacks last summer in Europe and the Middle East, police shootings and violence on American streets with the murders in Baton Rouge, Minneapolis and Dallas, and a presidential election drawing on racial division and exploiting perceived threats to white privilege remind us the ramifications of unanalyzed aggression, projection, hatred and violence can be devastating and make urgent the call for analytic voices in these conversations on race.

President Barack Obama once said, “Change will not come if we wait for some other person or some other time. We are the ones we’ve been waiting for. We are the change that we seek.” I hope this limited review has offered sufficient scaffolding for analytic scholars, teachers, supervisors and practitioners to build the conceptualizations and practices to make race a focus for disciplined interest and exploration. Ask yourself, how will you, as a psychoanalyst, now participate in this conversation on race?
Ideology
Continued from page 24

how early settlers were prepared to start kibbutzim with Marx in one fist and Freud in the other. Rolnik states clearly his view of psychoanalysis: “...a science of subjectivity...based on universal ... mechanisms... behind. differences and diversity....” That is, within psychoanalysis are both what is universally deeply human and what makes us different, including the small narcissistic differences or Erikson’s pseudospeciation.

Rolnik also ventures into the early application of psychoanalysis to literary criticism, mostly a matter of what Freud called pathobiography, “reading” the author’s alleged complexes from his work. While popular, it also raised hackles. Hayim Nahman Bialik thought fully zinged back: “(psychoanalysis’s) fundamental purpose...(is to) cure the psyche....few possess...ability to enter... a writer’s secrets, only those of great talent and transcendent purpose....”

Bialik, leaves the door ajar, but only for a select few to venture into literary dissection.

And S.Y.Agnon, that Nobel Prize winner who read his acceptance speech in Hebrew in Oslo, sent his wife to Eitingon for treatment. Rolnik reviews how carefully at least one of Agnon’s novels hews to Freud’s Dora case.

In his last chapter, Rolnik takes up the challenge to inquire how the political and cultural milieu affects both psychoanalytic theory and technique. Much of his book persuasively recounts how the pre-state analysts were affected by the circumstances of this raw land, “a land that eats its inhabitants” in the words of one of the spies sent by Moses to survey Canaan, and also how the early settlers were influenced by psychoanalysis.

In Zionist/psychoanalytic early history, there was tension between Zionism and diaspora, like that between true and false identity. There was also the Shoah’s shadow, which fostered a greater emphasis on corrective emotional experience, recovering from trauma. The psychoanalytic price of this shift—from Freud’s emphasis on the father/law to mother(land)/fusion, the shift from primary aggression to secondary responses to traumata, from taking responsibility for the maintenance of one’s symptomatic inner life to finding the causes lying in the faults of others—has been to deemphasize reflecting on how one maintains one’s misery to how one can achieve a therapeutic experience to overcome the failings of others.

In his brief account of contemporary Israel, his argument may falter. He makes two observations that need not be causally related. First, he notes the impact of the Shoah, the chronic Arab-Israeli conflict, at least since the 1929 Arab riots, and the Israeli occupation of the West Bank. He suggests this affects how analysts think and practice. Then, he notes there has been a shift at least among younger analysts to the role of actual trauma, to an emphasis on the “maternal order...whose romanticism and mysticism smack somewhat of late 19th-century German neo-romanticism and Gnosticism. The latter, in turn, is associated with greater interest in “primitive mental states” and a view of the individual as “passive... mostly reactive to his environment and therefore hardly accountable to his interiority and his mind.” This sounds like Kohut’s distinction between Guilty and Tragic Man. This is also ironic in two ways. First, this view of humankind is diametrically opposite to the Zionist construct of building a New Man. Second, it undermines Freud’s emphasis on learning how we contribute to continuing our own miseries even after we have left our parental homes.

But, Rolnik’s description of greater interest in primitive mental states and associated deemphasis of infantile sexuality and primary aggression, and taking responsibility for one’s inner life, sounds like what we see in the United States and possibly in other institutes. Nevertheless, his attempt to connect this to the sociocultural context of Israel (Shoah/wars/occupation) will hopefully be the subject for a future work.

What Rolnik tries to do is rich and valid. If only we had more such scholarly attempts to study the evolution of psychoanalytic thinking in various societies. Bobby Paul’s address to the IPA on culture and psychoanalysis is a sophisticated initial approach to this kind of study. Donald Kirsner’s work in Unfree Associations is another, as is Arnie Richards’s presentation on the undercurrent of Communism in early psychoanalytic members and how this affected their ideas.

That Eran Rolnik wrote this one book is enough to be proud about. If we are fortunate, he will write more. Buy it. Read it.
Training and Supervising Analyst Appointments Announced
By the Board on Professional Standards
January 18, 2017
2017 National Meeting, New York

Training and Supervising Analysts
Stephanie Brody, Psy.D.
Boston Psychoanalytic Society and Institute
Nancy Debbink, M.D.
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October 31, 2016

Jerome D. Oremland, M.D.
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September 16, 2016

George S. Evseeff, M.D.
February 11, 2016

Thomas Lynch, M.D.
October 11, 2016

David L. Rackow, M.D.
July 21, 2016

Samuel Wagonfeld, M.D.
January 24, 2017

Ralph Gardener, M.D.
June 28, 2016

John T. Maltzberger, M.D.
October 5, 2016

Irwin C. Rosen, Ph.D.
December 7, 2016

Roy M. Whitman, M.D.
October 12, 2016

Geoffrey B. Heron, M.D.
August 20, 2016

Thomas Mintz, M.D.
July 15, 2016

Henry L. Ruehr, M.D.
August 1, 2016

Lee Willer, M.D.
October 28, 2016

Deanna Holtzman, Ph.D.
August 24, 2016

Kenneth M. Newman, M.D.
July 7, 2016

Clarence G. Schulz, M.D.
November 25, 2016

Edwin C. Wood, M.D.
June 20, 2016
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