PINE PSYCHOANALYTIC CENTER, INC. NEWSLETTER

P.O. Box 920762, Needham, MA 02492 Volume 22, No. 1, Fall 2010

EDITOR'S NOTE:

Whereas the spring *Newsletter* was formally devoted to reflections on PINE today, this issue has been more organically centered on the natural evolutions that emerge in all communities: advancements, retirements, growth, and loss. These events weren't organized; they just happened. We are honored to be able to devote these pages to a thoughtful account of these happenings.

At my invitation, Stephen Kerzner has reported on the experiences of a PINE study group on pedagogy that has been meeting for five years under the guidance of Bob Gardner, one of PINE's esteemed founding members. As he describes, this group returned to the original vision that drove PINE's establishment as a training institute thirty years ago, in the interest of exploring new ways of fulfilling and refining those long-standing ideals. The recommendations in Dr. Kerzner's report offer food for thought for us all, as learners and as teachers. In recognition of Carl Brotman's retirement from PINE last March, nine members of our community contributed a kaleidoscopic array of reflections on the quiet presence that Carl has had over his many years and many roles at PINE. This *Newsletter* also memorializes the passing of a luminary in our field, Dr. William Meissner. We are pleased to be able to share memories from people who knew him well and can convey the depth of his impact as a clinician, colleague, mentor, friend, and mischief-maker. We are also fortunate to include tributes to the scope, significance, and creativity of his published work.

Evocative reports from previous scientific meetings add to this newsletter's contents. To better prepare for recruiting reporters for upcoming meetings, this time I issued the invitation to myself, both to remind myself of the amount of work demanded, and to reassure myself of the enormous rewards that are paid by close engagement with the written transcript of an engaging conversation. My report of the rich discussion around Dr. Bonnie Litowitz's paper—on the fate of language in contemporary practice of the talking cure—proved deeply educational for me. I hope it will convey, even to those who couldn't attend the meeting, an appreciation for the sophisticated and topical discussion that day afforded. Alongside the report, we

Continued on page 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

share a fascinating interview with Dr. Litowitz, addressing her personal path and her interdisciplinary vantage-point on our field, conducted by Dr. Donna Mathias. Finally, we include Ms. Deborah Shilkoff's thought-provoking report of a scientific meeting that explored the role of love in the clinical encounter, based on the presentation by Dr. Lora Heims Tessman.

We are also delighted to report on personal developments at PINE. Dr. Stephen Kerzner acceded to my request for his reflections on the path that led him to his recent appointment as Training and Supervising Analyst at PINE, sharing his story quite openly. Dr. Deborah Offner also accepted my invitation to share something of what brings her to be our newest candidate at PINE.

All of us at PINE were shocked this summer by the sudden departure from our community of a highly regarded and beloved leader, at PINE and far beyond. It's hard to think of a topic in these pages that doesn't feel different in light of Henry F. Smith's resignation from PINE in June. But it's also hard to know just yet how to think or talk about the complex range of repercussions that this will have on us, as individuals, and as a group. The facts we do know are shocking enough: Dr. Smith suddenly resigned all of his professional affiliations within the American Psychoanalytic Association, and retired his medical license. This itself raises all kinds of questions within our profession about ethics, community, professional conduct, institutional structure, relationship, and much more. We began to undertake a serious conversation about our responses at a community meeting in late July. But of course, there's much more to say. These pages are open to all for personal and professional reactions to this loss. We hope that in *Newsletters* to come, there will be ways of exploring the dynamics, threads, and threats that accompany our attempt to make sense of this abandonment by one of our community's highly esteemed leaders.

TIME AND SPACE FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

ADVENTURES OF THE PINE STUDY GROUP ON PSYCHOANALYTIC PEDAGOGY

Stephen Kerzner, M.D.

We envision an adventure of ideas. PINE will bring together a few candidates and a few teachers in the professional closeness and lively atmosphere of a workshop.

Candidates and teachers will explore critically the basic observations, methods and theories of psychoanalysis. We shall share candidly differences already held and differences that will arise in sustained study and discussion. In short PINE will be devoted to shared curiosity and search.

The curriculum of PINE will be flexible. It will be attuned to the needs of individual candidates and teachers. We shall strive for a good mixture of organized seminars and seminars that follow more spontaneously the immediate interests of the participants. Seminars will be augmented by tutorials and by special projects. The developmental point of view and developmental data will receive particular stress in each aspect of the program…

The full faculty will explore scientific and teaching challenges and will advance a program of faculty study groups. We shall develop a faculty with a ferment of academic spirit and the activities reflective of that spirit. (Excerpted from PINE Credo 1974)

In May, 2005, the PINE Curriculum Committee proposed a PINE Faculty Forum on pedagogy. Dr. Bob Gardner, one of the founders of PINE and author of an inspiring book, *On Trying to Teach*, agreed to facilitate a discussion about the nature and quality of teaching at PINE. To frame the discussion for this forum, Dr. Julia Matthews, chair of the Curriculum Committee, asked, "How can [we] balance the process of inquiry and the actual ideas so that candidates may find personal understandings of the material? Can the seminar model a psychoanalytic space of shared discovery?" Rather than provide answers, Dr. Gardner invited the faculty to reflect upon Dr. Matthew's questions and on the interplay of what we teach and how we teach. He urged us to form study groups to address our teaching and learning at PINE.

The first PINE Study Group on Pedagogy formed in September, 2005. Eight faculty members

joined the group, including Nina Avedon, Bob Gardner, Maida Greenberg, Axel Hoffer, Neal Kass, Stephen Kerzner, Ava Bry Penman and Graham Spruiell. We have been meeting for two hours over lunch approximately every other month except summers since September, 2005.

We began without an agenda. In Dr. Bob Gardner's words, we gave ourselves "as much time and space as possible to discover what we as a group really want to do and how we propose to do it." Bob's simple recommendation to provide time and space to establish a process was a familiar concept to us as psychoanalysts. It proved vital to our group process. I have also come to recognize its applicability to the psychoanalytic classroom. In our third year, Axel Hoffer expressed it best: "I love this group. It has got me thinking about things I haven't thought about before. The question is how to package what we've done to share with others. That feels daunting because it is an associative group." By sharing what we have learned in our study group on pedagogy and how it has improved our teaching, I hope to inspire others at PINE and in the broader psychoanalytic community to reflect on their own experiences of teaching and being taught. Perhaps this article will also encourage others to form study groups on pedagogy, as Bob Gardner recommended in 2005.

Our group spent a lot of time talking about the challenges and frustrations of teaching at PINE and about our own mixed teaching experiences. In the first years, we took turns presenting our current and on-going teaching experiences as if they were continuous case presentations. These seminar case presentations proved invaluable. The group not only helped in problem-solving difficult class dynamics, but also enhanced the teaching and learning experience both for our students and ourselves. As Neal Kass aptly stated, "We play with our (teaching) process as a group in terms of how we get into trouble and how we avoid it."

One common teaching issue that emerged from these presentations involved how we encourage class discussion. Would it be best to start a class with open-ended questions or to offer a guided tour of the readings? How should one respond when a class falls silent? We had all had experiences where the class did not gel, and the instructors felt they had to do the heavy lifting. We wondered if the students' apparent passivity signified our own failure to invite participation in the classroom. We considered ways to create a learning space that encourages participation and interaction. Some of us felt that the instructor(s) should take the lead and offer what they find salient in the material. Others felt that a more open-ended discussion would enliven the class, promoting active and engaged discussion.

More recently, our group read an excellent 2008 paper by Dawn Skorzcewski on psychoanalytic pedagogy, "Analyst as Teacher/ Teacher as Analyst: A Confusion of Tongues?" (*JAPA* 56:367-389). This paper provided helpful conceptualizations that related principles of academic pedagogy to the teaching of psychoanalysis. One recommendation involved presenting scaffolding questions that help guide students in increments toward a synthesis of the material. Dr. Skorzcewski credited Vygotsky (1978) for this pedagogical concept. Rather than asking students to provide an integrated summary of the assigned reading at the outset, a teacher might invite students to look for specific points in the text. As these points are highlighted, a scaffold will be created that will lead students step-wise to a fuller integration of the central concepts to be conveyed in the class.

Our discussions of specific seminars and their dynamics as well as the art of pedagogy led naturally to broader considerations of the kind of psychoanalytic institute PINE is and can become. We began to discuss the PINE curriculum. Concerns were raised about the emphasis on the classical Freudian model, the challenges of teaching child development and the question of teaching solo vs. duo. Some of us challenged the traditional PINE emphasis on teaching Freud first. Others felt that psychoanalytic study must be framed in an historical context, and that we should retain "what PINE is known for." Ultimately, the group reached a consensus that the curriculum needs more balance, with an integration of the classic and the contemporary that emphasizes the controversies.

In anticipation of a redesign of the child development curriculum at PINE, we considered the historic unpopularity of the development courses and how to improve them. The group identified the apparent resistance of adult analytic candidates to the study of child development, as well as the bias of adult analysts

Continued on page 4

against child analysis as a "step child." The group suggested that presentations of adult clinical material from a developmental perspective be incorporated into the development curriculum, and also that an adult and child analyst might co-teach the courses. The assignment of fiction and films to illustrate developmental issues was also proposed.

Much of the teaching at PINE has been shared between two instructors. The group addressed the pros and cons of this model. For some instructors, solo teaching allows for the development of one's own ideas and teaching style. For others, co-teaching offers the opportunity for interaction, feedback and support. Contrasting points of view of co-teachers may also enrich and deepen understanding of the material. Teaching styles may conflict, but can also complement each other. We examined some courses that members of our group co-taught and how differences of opinion, style and approach were negotiated. Often, one instructor wanted to be more didactic while the other was more comfortable allowing the students to run with a question. When problems in the dynamics of the class arise, co-teachers may have different responses. One instructor might respond to an argumentative or digressive student by setting limits and holding to the frame of a seminar, while the other instructor might want to let the dynamic in the class play out. We all agreed that on-going dialogue between the instructors is imperative for effective co-teaching.

Our study group has pondered how to balance the urgency to teach content versus the recognition that learning is a non-linear, dynamic process. Graham Spruiell pointed out that there has been a dialectic tension throughout the history of human thought between "experience," as in the affective, here and now relationship between teachers and students, and the conveying of the "idea," as in the content of the lesson prepared. He prepared a remarkable presentation, tracing the history of Western thought from the Delphic oracle through modern day philosophy.

Unfortunately, the idea of taking notes on our discussions did not occur to us until we had been meeting for a few years. However, some pearls survive:

1. Plan a syllabus of readings that are both doable and interesting. Select articles with contrasting points of view to encourage creative and critical thinking.

2. Assess the level of students at the beginning to get a sense of their clinical experience. Invite students to give feedback as the course progresses to make sure they are comfortable with the process and feel they are learning.

3. Encourage students to participate actively to ensure a mutual learning process. Monitor the freedom and spontaneity of discussion and the affective tone of the class. Put ourselves "in the student's shoes."

4. Approach the class as a shared process of learning together, "teaching up," as opposed to telling the students the way it is, "teaching down." "Teaching up" also involves pursuing the complexity and imaginative potential of basic questions, as opposed to simplifying and codifying the material.

5. Engage the class with excitement for the subject, but allow time for them to process and to synthesize the ideas discussed. Controversy and conflict may challenge authority but also empower openness, curiosity and interactive learning.

6. Teaching must balance the need for structure and content with a positive experiential learning process.

7. Co-teaching requires on-going dialogue between the teachers to provide mutual feedback and support, avoid misunderstandings and coordinate individual styles.

8. Writing should be an integral part of the curriculum as it encourages students to clarify their understanding of each seminar and to relate it to their clinical work. In addition, writing skills are important for the exchange of ideas with psychoanalytic colleagues.

In conclusion, I offer Bob Gardner's response to an earlier draft of this article. His comments capture the essence of what our group has discovered together.

We as teachers should try to teach maybes and not teach musts… We should try to encourage our students not to rush to decide what aspects of what they are learning (theory and technique) is what will serve them best… We teachers need to keep examining the ways in which and the reasons why we depart from this and other of our ideals and impose our personal preferences for the doctrinaire and the anti-doctrinaire.

ON CARL BROTMAN'S RETIREMENT FROM PINE

Carl Brotman was the first candidate at PINE, the first graduate of PINE, and the first among our ranks to be appointed training and supervising analyst. As role models go, our community couldn't have dreamt up a better one.

Carl gave himself generously to PINE. A beloved teacher, Carl taught a broad array of classes, including a new class every year for his first fifteen years on the faculty. His teaching balanced lucid thought and dedication to his convictions with an openness to exploration. In case conferences he shared process notes alongside his students. As a co-teacher with many colleagues, he was a wonderful mentor and friend. As an admissions interviewer to many who are now members of our community, it's not that he made applicants feel heard, recognized, and taken seriously, but rather that he gave himself to the conversation in a way that achieved just that. Most universally, Carl Brotman was treasured, by his patients, his supervisees, and his colleagues. Carl says that all he ever wanted was to be a good clinician. We all know just how challenging that is, and we are lucky to have Carl as an inspiration in that regard.

It would be lovely to say that Carl Brotman reflected the culture and values of PINE; it would be reassuring to claim Carl's style as a reflection of what it is to be a psychoanalyst. But it's more accurate to say that Carl gave to PINE and to psychoanalysis a model for a way of being with others that we can only hope to embody ourselves and to teach to others. For that, we cannot thank him enough.

Below are the personal reflections and roasts of many people from our community.

***

Carl has a rare combination of attributes that contribute to his extraordinary clinical skills. He is at the same time canny, astute, sophisticated, intuitive, and all of this is combined with a kind of—what to call it?—an openness, an exposed-nerve sensitivity to others and to the world. Further, Carl's generosity of spirit made it so easy for many of us to turn to him. For PINE, Carl has always been a trusted friend, a role model, a mentor, but, most of all, a first-class mensch. And, as you know, friends, role models, mentors, and mensches are an endangered species.

Despite our protests, Carl has had the good sense to go while he is at the top of his game. In this respect, Carl is still serving as a mentor, role model, and mensch. So thank you, Carl, for all that you've given us; it's a debt that we can only repay by aspiring to be as generous and decent as you have been.

Al Margulies

Reflections on Carl Brotman upon His Retirement: The Curve of Wisdom

Carl and I trained together on Service I at the Massachusetts Mental Health Center starting almost forty years ago. It was true bedlam there. The service was often well over census, with patients sleeping on mattresses in the hallways and others in seclusion and restraints. There was a lot to learn in this trial by fire.

On the ward Carl handled stress extremely well. He seemed to know what to do, and he could acknowledge what he didn't yet know. With colleagues and patients, he conducted himself in a warm and friendly way that was collaborative and not rivalrous. His manner was a rare and valued asset amidst a bright and competitive bunch of 24 first-year psychiatry residents. He even came back to Service I as a Chief Resident!

All that was before his precocious psychoanalytic accomplishments. He has always been (and still is) ahead of the pack professionally and personally.

Able to speak directly and with clarity, he has a characteristic thoughtfulness, insightfulness, practicality, and ability to express pleasure. What has always impressed me is not only his grasp of situations but also his ability to express the truth in a straight forward, matter-of-fact way. He knows how to ask the right questions and quickly gets to the feel-

Continued on page 6

ing truth. Given his precocity, it now is no surprise that he has decided to devote himself to the art and science of fishing—well ahead of his peers. (Space permits only an allusion to the parallels between angling and psychoanalysis. Suffice it to say that we are still angling for fish set out by Freud [Rechardt, 1985].) He also is ahead of the curve in being able to enjoy relaxation and use the wisdom he has acquired.

Best wishes, Carl!

Michael Good

***

Carl represents what is best in psychoanalysis. He is smart, warm, humane and a superb clinician and teacher. He knows a vast amount of psychoanalytic theory and knows how to use it in the clinical situation in conjunction with his keen instincts and insights into the secrets of the human mind and heart. He is hardworking and intense about his involvement in psychoanalysis, but able to stand back and see the irony in it all.

I was blessed to have Carl as a teacher throughout my training at PINE. Along with Myrna Weiss, he taught the pre-clinical year seminar; the next year he taught me "Freud's Cases" along with Marty Miller. These seminars were a wonderful introduction to psychoanalysis and set the tone for my entire training. He was the supervisor for my third control and, as such, dragged me over the finish line to graduation. I was honored to be the first candidate at PINE to teach before graduation and Carl was my co-teacher. We co-taught many seminars after that and we rode the crests and troughs together. As co-teachers we were Mutt and Jeff, Good-Guy/Bad-Guy, Yin and Yang and every other possible combination, but we always respected each other's difference and had a great time together.

Carl was the best of PINE. He has left an enormous and defining legacy. I am very grateful to be his colleague and friend.

David Diamond

***

A Shared History

Approximately twenty years ago, Ivers Bever, Julia Matthews and I (referred to as the mature candidate trio, for whatever that meant) were accepted as PINE candidates to pursue our analytic training. We learned that Carl Brotman, who had graduated from PINE at a very young age, was the first graduate to be appointed (I almost said anointed) to TA status. He and Elissa Arons were our assigned instructors who introduced us to Freud's writings on dreams. We enjoyed the readings and the lively, interesting discussions that ensued. At the end of the semester we thought it might be fun to continue the course for another semester. To our surprise and pleasure, Carl and Elissa agreed to teach the course for the full year.

The following year we drove to Carl's office in Lincoln to take a course on Resistance that he and David Diamond co-taught. I will say no more other than that finding my way in the dark, during those miserable, cold, snowy, rainy, wintry nights, helped me experientially to fully understand the meaning of resistance. The driving was a Herculean endeavor. However, I did not succumb to my strong desire to curl up in a chair in the comfort of my home, read the articles on resistance, and call it a tutorial. I managed to get to class on time. I should add that only at the end of that seminar did I learn that David lives only a few blocks away from my home, and that we might have been able to carpool.

On a more serious note, I would like to say, "Carl, you were a thoughtful, devoted teacher. You were committed to your work and to your students. Our classes were interesting, playful and stimulating. You created an accepting, respectful atmosphere for the exploration of ideas. I treasure those years with much fondness."

The best of wishes to you and your family on your retirement.

Maida Greenberg

***

Carl was the first person I met at PINE (he interviewed me for admission). I recall feeling instantly comfortable and 'at home' in his presence, as though he were a longstanding confidant and friend. His quiet interest, sincerity, intelligence, and obvious integrity impressed me enormously and was an important factor in my decision to come to PINE. During my years of training, Carl was an unfailing and generous source of support, encouragement, and counsel. He taught me with respect for my ideas and concern for my learning; he chaired committees with grace and wisdom; he always spoke with humility yet conveyed authority. Carl represents for me the best of PINE's

values and commitments. I hope he knows how much his quiet and thoughtful presence is missed. I wish him health and opportunity in his retirement.

Julia Matthews

***

Carl was my first interviewer when I applied to PINE. I don't remember much of my two meetings with him, but the experience of those meetings stayed with me. Unlike two of the BPSI interviews I had had, Carl never "wowed" me with deep interpretations that seemed spot-on but also jarring. In fact, I didn't leave there holding on to a particular *this* or *that* that Carl had said. Rather, I left feeling—the only word I can find is—moved. Or maybe it's even simpler: I left feeling. In no way had Carl intruded on my story of what brought me to apply to PINE, but somehow telling that story to him left me deeply affected. I don't know how we could conceptualize or identify what Carl did in those meetings. I do know that for Carl, it was intrinsic to him, not something he put on for show, and that as special as that encounter remains for me, it was something he gave generously to many people, within our community and far beyond it, on a daily, even hourly, basis.

Thank you, Carl.

Sally Ackerman

In Honor of Carl Brotman

Carl Brotman is a gifted psychoanalyst. While retired from the consulting room, he retains the understanding of human nature that caused so many of us to seek him out. (In the new spirit of transparency, I confess that Carl, having begun as my advisor in 1986, has generously agreed to retain this role for life – no Emeritus allowed for this one, nor refusal.)

The task of describing Carl is not a simple one; but in my opinion, recognizing how and why he has had such a powerful impact on PINE is important. These reflections are intended to capture some essential aspects of his person: first, Carl is the real thing. Essentially a private man, he has never been anything but genuine. (I think he may be incapable of artifice.) He has a lively curiosity about life, be it nature, history including travel, art, music, or children. He is a great and loyal friend, and masterful in his sense of humor.

A serious scholar, a man of keen intelligence and unusual creativity, Carl has always valued learning from others' ideas and points of view. Skillfully and tactfully, he has aided many candidates in developing the confidence to enunciate their own points of view. Carl's physical persona, his athletic skills and the twinkle in his eye give little hint that underneath is a unique mix of rabbinical respect for and appreciation of life's joys, along with a Zen master's knowledge that life brings with it tragedy and anguish as well. With great compassion born of empathy, he has accompanied many as they discover these truths.
Carl's belief in the power and effectiveness of the psychoanalytic process supported and bolstered so many of us as we struggled to find our own. It remains our legacy and our responsibility to now impart his wisdom to others.

For Carl:

"I know you are no stranger
down the crooked rainbow
trails,

From dancing cliff-edged shattered sills of slandered-shackled jails,

But the melodies draft from below as the walls are being scaled,

Yes, all of this and more, my friend, your song shall not be failed."

(from "Thirsty Boots", by Eric Anderson)

Susan Rosbrow-Reich

***

This is the poem I read as a "roast" for Carl:

For Carl I have written this ode:
He's decided to lighten his load.
To Truro he will go,
Where life is more slow.
He'll take along his club
But aye, here's the rub.
There'll be no more PINE—
How can he be fine?
Of what will he have to complain?
Oh well, PINE's loss is Sally's gain.

I also pointed out that Carl was the first graduate of PINE and he was the first TA at PINE to have been educated at PINE. I suggested that his precocity might have contributed to his early retirement. So he is the first TA graduate of PINE to retire.

Marty Miller

Continued on page 8

I had the pleasure of hosting a retirement party for Carl this past May. What stood out most to me about that evening was how grateful everyone was to share with Carl how much they care about him, have learned from him, value him, and will miss him. So many people thanked me for hosting the party. For me it was a gift, a chance to say thank you and to wish Carl happiness and new adventures in his retirement years. He certainly earned it.

Diane Pearlman

IN MEMORIAM: WILLIAM W. MEISSNER, S.J., M.D.

Bill Meissner joined PINE late in life. He was already ill and unable to participate actively in its activities and programs. His continuous writing of clarifying and scholarly papers was his contribution to all of us.

Who was this man, William Walter Meissner? He was born in Buffalo, New York and was proud of it. His father was a physician. He attended Canisius College in his native Buffalo and after graduation decided to follow his teachers and become a Jesuit. He had already received a scholarship to go to Harvard Medical School, but opted to join the rigorous training he needed to become a Jesuit. Several years later, he returned to Harvard and received his medical degree in 1967. He became a psychoanalytic candidate at the Boston Psychoanalytic Institute when he was still a medical student and graduated in 1971. Immediately upon graduation, he became a member of the Institute's faculty. From that moment on, Bill started writing papers on psychoanalysis until the actual moment of his death. He had still many papers in his mind when his illness overcame him. He had finished a book that is to be published posthumously.

I met Bill in Vienna, in the summer of 1971. My classmates at BPSI—Jerry Sashin and Richard Fox, together with his wife Ruth, and myself—decided to attend the first International IPA Congress in Vienna after Freud's departure from the city. Soon, we were joined by a large and full-of-fun man from Boston who was also from BPSI. We spent time together and got to know only a bit about him. He seemed to us sort of a mystery man. It was upon our return to Boston that we learned that he was not only a psychoanalyst, but also a Jesuit. That was the beginning of a life-long friendship for all of us. Richard and Ruth Fox moved to California the following year. Jerry and I graduated from BPSI in 1974.

A couple of years later, Jerry and I decided to form a small study group to learn more about psychoanalysis. We invited Bill and Dan Buie to join us. We met once a month and presented very detailed clinical material to each other. Our first theoretical focus was the understanding of affect. Jerry was involved in creating a mathematical model about the emergence of affect, based on chaos theory. Our discussions were very rich and colored by our commitment to understanding the material in depth without having to prove anything. We just wanted to learn and to take the time to ponder and explore the issues in all their complexity. Those meetings were truly most precious. Bill, obviously more knowledgeable than the three of us together, never tried to impose his views. He was one more in the group and entered all discussions on equal footing. His comments always helped us to sharpen our views, but none of us was shy in challenging him when we did not agree. We learned and evolved in our learning and began to change the focus of our inquiry, moving now in the direction of understanding aggression—its affective and motivational components—while progressively realizing that we could no longer conceive of it as a drive. Then, in 1990, the unexpected happened: Jerry became gravely ill and died in six months at the age of 49. We were affected to the core. It was very hard to resume our meetings. Finally, Bill took the lead and helped Dan and me return to our work. We decided to write a book about aggression, but to take the time we needed do it well. We passionately discussed every theoretical and clinical aspect, always using clinical material to understand theoretical issues. Finally, in 2004 Brunner-Routledge published our book, *The Dynamics of Human Aggression. Theoretical Foundations, Clinical Applications.*

Bill was a solid and loyal friend. One could rely on him and on his generosity. One could also count on his infallible sense of humor. He had jokes for everything and loved to tell them. He also had a mischievous disposition, seeing the comical side of the most serious of things. To be with him meant being ready to be playful, while also being profoundly committed to the task at hand.

His many and significant contributions to psychoanalysis will remain a source of significant learning for the new generations of psychoanalysts and for the scholars of psychoanalytic theory in the future.

I will miss him very much: his sharp mind, his jokes, his playful disposition, and his solid and generous friendship.

Ana-Maria Rizzuto, M.D.

Meissner Tribute

William Meissner's prodigious contributions to the structure of psychoanalytic theory put him in a class by himself among contemporary psychoanalytic authors. Most salient is the breadth and perspicacity of his integrative work. In his numerous explorations of extant conceptual ambiguities and persisting lacunae in psychoanalysis, relevant theoretical, clinical and empirical background studies for his research frequently cover a vast literature not only within the field but from cognate disciplines as well, geared toward a systematic and more consensual psychoanalytic science.

Exemplifying these highly integrative contributions is his comprehensive study of the meaning of the self. He refined his conceptual research on the self-system over many years, coincident with the upsurge in thinking within the field about the role of the self within psychoanalytic theory. He formulated a multi-dimensional meaning of the self compatible with other recent accounts, but unlike other approaches, his did not emphasize one aspect of the self while minimizing others. Rather, Meissner elaborated the complex conditions of development for each of its inextricably interacting dimensions (self-as-agent, self-as-subject, self-as-object, self-as-relational, self-as-social) to increase the explanatory range of the psychoanalytic theory of the self and its progressive (nonlinear) development. The model includes a supraordinate concept of the self-as-person that is always inherently embodied (the body-self). It has been updated recently with special attention to how an integrated psychoanalytic theory of the personal self may help advance theory of therapeutic action.

I find his psychoeconomic emendations in psychoanalytic theory to be particularly valuable. Meissner elucidates a distinction between quantitative considerations as an essential component of a meaningful psychoanalytic theory, and the avoidable language of energetics that concretized quantitative principles in the classic model. He additionally recognizes that a notion of energy is required theoretically, though its role as 'power source' can be reduced from a central theoretical position to indicating only the generic potential for action and function that is inherent in psychic structures and capacities. Along these lines, his collaborative revision of the theory of aggression (with Rizzuto, Sashin and Buie) importantly corrects the confounding factor of agency (causality) inherent in the classical motivational concept of aggressive drive energy. Aggression is reformulated as a biologically based capacity and resource of the organism that is called into play as a secondary motive to help overcome obstacles in the service of various needs and wants. The motive of overcoming obstacles interfering with the completion of an intended action serves as a common denominator of all aggressive actions, apart from any affective concomitants.

It's an honor to participate in this memorial tribute to Dr. William Meissner.

Alan J. Barnett, Ph.D.
Editor, *The Psychoanalytic Review*

Tribute to Bill Meissner

It saddened me deeply to hear of Bill Meissner's death. He was one of my favorite contributors to the interdisciplinary journal I edited for more than twenty-five years, *Psychoanalysis and Contemporary Thought*. As far as I was concerned, his contributions were always first rate. In my eyes, he wore the mantle of outstanding psychoanalytic systematizers such as Otto Fenichel, David Rapaport, and Edward Glover, the names that most readily come to mind. As you can tell from the book endorsement I wrote for one of his numerous works, this one entitled *Freud and Psychoanalysis*, I was a great fan of his and for some

Continued on page 10

years used his book as a text in my graduate course at NYU:

> From Dr. Meissner's indefatigable pen we now have the perfect textbook on psychoanalysis! Ideal for the serious student—whether in psychiatry, psychology or social work—who wants a comprehensive, systematic and authoritative grounding in Freud and psychoanalytic thought from its origin to contemporary theory and practice. Only someone with Dr. Meissner's years of experience and deep grasp of the complex theoretical and clinical issues could write with such a direct and readily accessible style. His superb text ought to be recommended reading for students in the field for years to come.

I knew him only slightly from my brief encounters at some of the annual "Rapaport-Klein" meetings in June at Austen Riggs in Stockbridge, MA, when he would arrive in his informal, jaunty, rubber-soled sneakers, which I somehow recall him always wearing. On a personal level, I was consistently impressed with his earnestness and his obvious but unassuming Jesuit scholarship. In his outstanding series of articles that we published over the years, the editorial board and I were always most impressed by his remarkable productivity, as well as his genuine aspirations to modify our received classical psychoanalytic theory in light of advances in our metapsychological understanding of a number of key concepts, such as ego, self, narcissism, etc.

All I can say is I mourn his passing. He was a giant in our field, a unique and thoughtful scholar in areas of psychoanalysis thattended to be totally neglected—such as the relevance of ethics and religious values. I will miss his voice.

May he rest in peace...
Leo Goldberger

An Memoriam:
William Meissner

Bill Meissner was my Training Analyst. I had never met him before he interviewed me for admission to BPSI, but had heard plenty about him. I looked forward to meeting him, but was quite anxious at the same time. After a few minutes of listening and a few comments on the mark from him, he calmed me down and I told him my story. He had a few free hours and I needed an analyst. We subsequently set up our meeting times.

Several days before we were to begin he called and asked if we could change one of our hours. He was quite grateful that I immediately managed to change my schedule. I was surprised by this because I didn't have much of a schedule in those days and he no doubt did. I brought this up with him years later and he was curious why I would think my time wasn't as important as anyone else's.

He had the uncommon quality of having a very common touch. He was so ordinary that occasionally I questioned if he was all he was cracked up to be. He listened. I wondered why he didn't use fancy psychoanalytic terms. He finally used the "N" word (narcissism) after I used it first. He never once said anything that hurt me unless it was necessary to help me.

I had a significant early loss in my life and was sensitive to separation and he knew about this. He was never late except for one time when almost the whole hour had passed. His secretary and I were worried. He showed up and I think was surprised that I was still waiting for him. He invited me in and told me of his car troubles, the tow truck, traffic, and his inability to call. No cell phones in those days. We surely analyzed my fantasies about where he was and what might have happened, but on that day he knew what I needed and gave it to me. It might be said that he favored the alliance, but from my perspective he favored his patient.

At the end of each session he would open the door and stand there for me to pass. We would look each other in the eye. Eye to eye, man to man. Not infrequently there were tears in my eyes and sometimes there were tears in his. We were together in our analytic endeavor. There was plenty of sadness, but we laughed also. Not because he made a joke and was showing off, but because the situation was ridiculously ironic or fully worthy of laughter. He was not afraid to laugh, was not afraid to smile, was not afraid to be spontaneous, and apparently not afraid to cry.

I had read much of what he had written by the time I terminated with him. It was never discussed. I offered my opinion and he listened. When I was a resident I came across a clever paper he had written on memory before I had the slightest idea who he was or that I would ever meet him. He never acknowledged he wrote it. He listened to what I had to say about it.

He practiced what he preached in his writing.
It was our last day. My inclination to give him a gift had been thoroughly analyzed and I arrived empty handed. I did ask him who his analyst was and he laughed and replied that I would probably just be disappointed if I knew. I could find out who his analyst was in five minutes and still don't know twenty years later. This was my final exam for him and he passed. What was important was that he was my analyst up to our last day and I am very grateful. He was the most profound teacher I have ever had and yet, he never deliberately taught me anything. Whatever help I have been able to give to people in the years since I met him, he has played a part in most of it.

Some of you have lost your analysts to death and others not. I was profoundly sad when I heard of his death and still am from time to time. I had not met with him for a number of years, but miss him as if I had talked to him the day before he died. Maybe I meet with him every day in that he so much influences how I sit with people. I don't know how he thinks about psychoanalytic theory or his ideas personally from him, but I am sure about a few things. He was a very good and decent man, worthy of unrestricted trust, dedicated and sincere, wise and kind, and very helpful to me. I will always miss him.

David L. Stagner, M.D.
Supervising and Training Psychoanalyst
Minnesota Psychoanalytic Provisional Institute

Adjunct Professor of Adult and Child Psychiatry
University of Minnesota

"Big Bill with a Beard"
In Appreciation of a Friendship

We first met Bill Meissner in Vienna in the summer of 1971. Ruth and I had traveled with my analytic seminar colleagues, Ana-Maria Rizzuto and Jerry Sashin, to the meetings of the International Psychoanalytical Association. Anna Freud's return to Vienna for the first time since the Freud family had escaped Austria made the IPA Congress especially exciting for the three of us, who had just completed our first year. Each evening, we were joined by a large, fun-loving fellow from Boston, Bill Meissner, for our explorations into the Imperial City.

Over that seven-day period, we closed more cafés and beer gardens than any other candidates, with the possible exception of the French. Night after night, Ruth, Bill and I managed to consume liters of Vienna's finest malt beverages before closing hour.

Ruth and I remained puzzled by this man who was so much fun, but who didn't reveal much about himself. The fact that he never mentioned a wife or girlfriend led us to speculate whether he might be rebounding from an unhappy marriage or love affair. It was only after we were back in Boston and were invited to celebrate his pronouncement of his Final Vows at the Jesuit Residence House in Cambridge that we learned Bill was a Jesuit priest. As a graduate of a Jesuit high school and college, I should have recognized Bill's enthusiasm for eating and drinking as not "analytic" but Jesuit. After all it was the Jesuits who had taught me to drink!
After my second seminar year, Ruth and I emigrated to California where our first child, Richard Jr. was born. In spite of the distance, we were able to maintain our bi-coastal friendship. We spent most Augusts on Cape Cod where Bill was a frequent guest, pitching horseshoes, playing croquet or talking on the beach. Over the years, Bill developed a special attachment to our independent-minded young son. He seemed to enjoy Rich's antics and his ability to get under our skins. Ruth and I came to suspect that Rich was an embodiment of Bill's own childhood memories of himself. Rich dubbed him "Big Bill with a Beard," a name that stuck with our family.

Bill became an annual visitor to California where, as program chairman, I hosted his visits to the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society and Institute. Drawing from his book, *The Crisis of Authority in the Church*, we worked on an analytic model of authority based on observations on my adolescent unit at UC Irvine. Unfortunately this work was never published.

Bill's annual visits became an opportunity for trips to the Napa Valley and other California locations. During these stays, Bill had a way of encouraging Rich's exasperating tendencies and their relationship thrived. On the occasion of his graduation from junior high, Bill presented Rich with what appeared to be a college medallion necktie. When Ruth and I asked Rich what the letters "MCP" stood for, he and

Continued on page 12

Bill proudly chorused "Male Chauvinist Pig."

In more recent times our contacts with Bill became less frequent and we regretted the loss of those very special occasions when Bill was like a member of our family.

We remember him with great affection and will miss him terribly.

❖ ❖ ❖

"THE FATE OF LANGUAGE IN PSYCHOANALYSIS AND ITS IMPACT ON AMERICAN VIEWS OF THE EARLIEST RELATIONSHIP: FROM DYAD TO DIALOGUE"

OPEN SCIENTIFIC MEETING, MARCH 20, 2010

Presenter: **Bonnie Litowitz, Ph.D.**
Discussants: **Stephen Rosenbloom, Ph.D.**
Jeanine Vivona, Ph.D.
Moderator: **Ana-Maria Rizzuto, M.D.**
Reporter: **Sarah Ackerman, Ph.D.**

On March 20, 2010, members of the PINE community convened for the Jerome I. Sashin Annual Memorial Lecture, presented by Dr. Bonnie Litowitz, with discussions from Dr. Stephen Rosenbloom and Dr. Jeanine Vivona. Dr. Ana-Maria Rizzuto, the moderator of this panel, began by connecting the day's theme to the man in whose honor this meeting was dedicated. Jerry Sashin was a mathematician, as well as an analyst. His work drew from other disciplines in order to apprehend "components of affect tolerance, the capacity to fantasize, the state of the inner container… and the capacity to tolerate affect." Had he been able to continue this work, he would have explored language and the capacity to express affect through words. However, Dr. Sashin's rich intellectual interests were left unfulfilled; he died at the age of 49 in 1990. As Dr. Rizzuto put it, this panel's exploration of the role of language aspires to clarify "the function of language in analysis as our modest way of honoring his person and his contribution to PINE."

Dr. Rizzuto proceeded, in her characteristic manner, to brilliantly crystallize the paradoxes surrounding speech, and our use of it as analysts, as an introduction to the riddles with which Dr. Litowitz, Dr. Rosenbloom, and Dr. Vivona would be tangling. Dr. Rizzuto began with a quote from *The Question of Lay Analysis*, in which Freud describes that in an analyst's treatment of a patient, "'nothing happens between them [the analyst and patient] except that they talk to each other.'" Nothing but talk transpires, and yet, that talk amounts to a powerful, transmutative treatment. Dr. Rizzuto noted that these days, many analysts look beyond the talk to other aspects of the clinical encounter that they hold central, such as the relationship, the containing function of the analyst, or enactments, and yet "the fact remains that all these analysts do is nothing but talk with their patients." Dr. Rizzuto closed her introduction with a series of penetrating questions about how this particular "nothing but talking" can generate so much, questions about the manner of speaking, the psychic impact of voice tone, melody and style, and most pressingly, "what is in the exchange of spoken words that prompts the analysand, like a modern Scheherazade, to return day after day to tell his or her story to another, the mysterious analyst sitting behind the couch?" Dr. Rizzuto briefly engaged with these questions by pointing to our unique relationship to questions about speech. Unlike academic discourse, which separates language from its user,

> We analysts have a great privilege. We participate in the living language, the exchanges with people who are alive even if they don't feel well about themselves. It is our task, paradoxically enough, to help them understand what they are saying to themselves and to us and to make them aware of what is there to be

said that they cannot put into words. The act of the analyst goes beyond prose or rather, penetrates the depths of prose spoken by the analysand and with the analysand to open the words' exchange and reveal the depths of the inner life from which they sprung. The richness of such life exceeds all words yet there is only one way to access the private world of another being, to listen to the words she has to say to us … To speak prose is easy and automatic, to practice psychoanalysis in order to use words to help analysands to uncover and change their psychic suffering requires an arduous and never-ending task of learning how to speak, truly speak, with another human being.

Dr. Bonnie Litowitz, who received a doctorate in linguistics before bringing her knowledge of the complexity of speech into analytic practice, began by introducing the questions that she hoped to pursue. First, she inquired about the way in which contemporary analysts, primarily in the United States, seem to be "turning away from language," in their interest in the behavioral aspects of the analytic relationship, such as enactments and the real relationship. Dr. Litowitz's second question was partly a response to her first one: what effect has been had by the focus in America on academic developmental research on dyadic interactions had on psychoanalysis? Just as Dr. Rizzuto warned of the dangers of studying language apart from its use in spoken conversation, Dr. Litowitz wanted to consider a number of dangerous sequelae for measuring "relationships," with a focus on observable behavioral interactions from laboratory research. Finally, Dr. Litowitz promised to explore a possible alternative to the view of the early relationship: what if we were to "redefine the earliest relationships in terms of communication exchanges and dialogue instead of a dyad? And what are the consequences of each position for clinical relationships?"

Before engaging with these questions, Dr. Litowitz clarified her own perspective on the relationship of language to the work of psychoanalysis. She claimed that whether or not we explicitly attend to it, language is critically relevant to any psychoanalytic theory of mind or of treatment; psychoanalysis remains the talking cure. She added that questions of relationship have been of interest from the moment that Freud introduced the concept of transference. Even if our goal is to understand the analytic relationship, we need to understand how relationships are established in the earliest communicative exchanges. Within communicative exchanges, Dr. Litowitz attends to vocalizations, intonation patterns, the melody of speech, gestures, pointing, posture, and visual line of regard. From Dr. Litowitz's linguistic and psychoanalytic perspective,

> The infant is born into a language and culture that precedes and defines him and with which he is in constant communication, mediated by his caregivers. The specifics of what a relationship is emerge out of those mediational contexts. They appear in our patients' unconscious fantasies and they reappear in our therapeutic exchanges with them… Behaviors are all mediated, by that I mean that they are not naturally occurring. They emerge only from specific socio-cultural practices, and are therefore expressed in forms with shared significance. My focus is on the consequent entanglements of the participants in the exchanges, the I and the you, the speaker and the listener, and the inherent difficulty in determining a unique source of agency and intentionality. *My claim is that we need to understand the nature of mediated communications to reestablish an intrapsychic dimension to the concept of relationship that is lost when relationship is reduced to behavioral patterns.*

As Dr. Litowitz turned our attention to academic research and its proclivity for a linear, sequential model of human development, we were treated to a succinct summary of the evolution from structuralism to post-structuralism in the last century, and Freud's dual role in that evolution. Dr. Litowitz drew out the emphasis on structural stages that emerged in the U.S. partly in concert with Freudian tradition. Theorists like Freud, Anna Freud, Spitz, Mahler, and Erikson, in step with the intellectual movement of structuralism, developed stage-theories of development, in which each stage had a characteristic structural organization. Individuals were understood as proceeding from stage to stage, and stages were understood as partially

Continued on page 14

defining for the individual. Dr. Litowitz described some of the critiques of these structural models. These theories confuse what makes sense for a model with what happens in the individual. The expectation that a person achieve the aptitudes considered emblematic of a particular stage may interfere with our appreciation of that person's actual development. Further, stage theories have been known to conflate temporality with causality; see, for example, the longstanding false belief that infants have to be able to crawl in order to be able to walk. These theories also lead us to view aberrations of the expected stage-related behavior as regressions, because the subject is viewed through the theoretical framework of her appointed stage. While we can see how such theory evolved from Freudian notions of development, in concert with the prevailing structuralist *Weltanschauung*, it isn't hard to appreciate how *un*-psychoanalytic such a mindset is for the practice of psychoanalysis. Freud's work, as read by Ricouer and Derrida, for example, was also instrumental in the development of post-structuralism, in which all the concepts we hold as separate, like stages, or individuals, are understood as inter-related and, to use Dr. Litowitz's word, entangled. Selves are conflicted, multi-faceted, and chameleon-like in their responsiveness to environmental influences—we can't separate the self from the environment that shapes and interprets it. Scientific knowledge, too, is shaped by its context. But while post-structural concepts were in part born out Freud's revolutionary re-conception of the man as the progeny of the child, post-structuralism has not been fully or evenly re-integrated into psychoanalytic theory.

With the move to a post-structuralist model, the meta-narratives informed by stage theories have been rejected. The focus has shifted to a more individualized characterization of shifting states or phases in the context of complex systems. However, Dr. Litowitz contends, in spite of this shift, much of our theory is still informed by a structuralist meta-narrative surrounding the emphasis on the Oedipal stage, and the concurrent conflation of the pre-Oedipal stage with its various presumed hallmarks. One of the central markers of the shift between these stages is the theory of the infant's ascension into the capacity to speak. Dr. Litowitz shared this quote by Daniel Stern to epitomize the bifurcation inherent in this developmental perspective:

> Infants' initial interpersonal knowledge is mainly unshareable, amodal, instance-specific, and attuned to nonverbal behaviors in which no one channel of communication has privileged status with regard to accountability or ownership. Language changes all that. With its emergence, infants become estranged from direct contact with their own personal experience. Language forces a space between interpersonal experience as lived and as represented. And it is exactly across this space that the connections and associations that constitute neurotic behavior may form… Finally, with the advent of language and symbolic thinking, children now have the tools to distort and transcend reality… Prior to this linguistic ability, infants are confined to reflect the impress of reality. They can now transcend that, for good or ill (1985; 182).

Dr. Litowitz noted the meta-narrative underlying this model, in which language radically alters the infant's experience. While many now use Stern's work to challenge the earlier psychoanalytic view of the infant as un-related, Litowitz drew out an assumption that remains in Stern's model: the infant may seek out relationship, but the immediacy of the first communicative exchanges between infant and caregiver are overlooked. Stern's infant is born without language. There is a kind of idealization of the infant's unmediated presence in the world, before symbolic thought and speech have come to interrupt the lived experience.

With this reference to Stern's model of infant development, Dr. Litowitz turned our attention to her second question, "the very nature of infant observation research, which privileges seeing over listening" and draws its inferences from frame by frame observations of video-taped interactions. Aside from this bias toward the visually observable aspects of infants' experiences, Dr. Litowitz addressed some methodological confusion present in this research. The behavioral evidence found in systematic research on infants is looked for in analyst-patient interactions, and when found, it is assumed to mean what it meant in the laboratory. "In other words, the clinic reproduces the nursery,

with treatment and observational research replicating each other (cf, Tronick, 2003)." Dr. Litowitz emphasized that while empirical research depends on a third-person observer to separate the experimenter from the subject, in a clinical setting, this is impossible to achieve.

> Thus we are caught not only in the 'hermeneutic circle' (as often described); we are engaged in a 'double hermeneutic,' interpreting others who are simultaneously interpreting us. As philosophers like Paul Ricouer and Jurgen Habermas understood, psychoanalysis makes yet a further contribution to the double hermeneutic: an insistence on the opacity of the interpreters to themselves and to each other. We really don't see all that clearly into ourselves or into them.

One example that Dr. Litowitz provided to highlight the problematic methodology in infant research is the work on the attachment paradigm, which has become for many, "the key dyadic point of psychic structuration—a sort of 'pre-oedipal Oedipus'—in that how one navigates attachment both reflects past and predicts future self-other interactions." In infant research, observable conditions are established to measure behavioral responses of infants to parting with their mothers. Since most of the research is conducted on children under two, language plays little role in the interactions that are considered to be most central. (In adult attachment research, which is used to retrospectively establish what the child's attachment style was, verbal data is the medium.) The results from this research are understood as normative and universal, with little attention to the specifics of context and contingency. Dr. Litowitz was able to highlight how un-psychoanalytic such conclusions are.

> For example, the mother-child research posits two persons (a *dyad*) engaged in contingent responding. That behavioral pattern is then generalized to all dyadic interactions, including treatment. It is always problematic to import such findings, generated across individuals at different ages, to any unique individual engaged with a particular therapist in an entirely different context (Tronick, 2003). But it is especially questionable for psychoanalysis, in which there is no observational place to stand that is outside its first and second-person *dialogue* (Litowitz, 2007). The entanglement of the first ('I', self, subject) and second ('you', other, object) persons, as revealed through psychoanalysis, is radically different from the unproblematic use of similar concepts by academic discourse or conversation analysis, for whom dialogue is treated not unlike other dyadic behaviors—as a series of contingent responses.

Dr. Litowitz contrasted two influential books that summarize infant research with respect to affect regulation as a means of highlighting crucial differences in conceptualization of the pre-Oedipal development. In Allan Schore's (1944) book, the circularity of research and theory was highlighted; chapters alternate between summaries of the results of observational infant-parent research and research on brain functioning, which also relies on the visual, through imaging techniques. "Aural-oral development" and communicative exchanges never enter into the field of study. Further, the findings from attachment research are seen as predictive of diagnosis and treatment of attachment disorders, with no recognition of the circularity of thinking.

In contrast, Peter Fonagy, et al., employ their concept of "mentalization" to theorize about how affective states and sense of self are mediated by one's own, and others', thought. This focus on mediation draws in an emphasis on language and linguistic processes. The caregiver treats the infant as someone with a mind. As Litowitz quoted from the text, "The caregiver approaches the crying infant with a question in her mind: 'Do you want your nappy changed?' 'Do you need a cuddle?'" (Fonagy et al., 2002, 53).

Finally, Dr. Litowitz honed in on the heart of her presentation, the question of what an alternative view of early development might present were we to take communicational exchanges into account. Our shared understanding is that human babies are born in a highly dependent state, and unlike other animals, their motor abilities are slow to develop. This drives the primacy of attachment capacities in the infant, whose survival depends on the attentive care of others. The two primary means of exchange between the

Continued on page 16

infant and her world are through sight and sound, and of these two, hearing is active even before birth. The uterus is sound permeable, and, Dr. Litowitz noted, research shows that week-old infants can distinguish their mother-tongue-to-be from other languages. The body of research on language capacity in very young infants strongly indicates that infants are born with "with perceptual-cognitive systems for analyzing speech sounds." The evolutionary explanation for the primacy of auditory function over visual functioning in newborns is that hearing affords a capacity to perceive potential threats at a greater distance, in a dark or cluttered visual field, and even behind barriers.

Dr. Litowitz brought into focus the highly unusual nature of the aural-oral system. "Consider that the speaker is also always her own listener, no matter to whom her speech is addressed…. From birth there is an entanglement between the one vocalizing and the one who hears the vocalizations, between oneself *for* another and oneself *as* another (Ricouer, 1992). This entanglement, where I and you can mean oneself or the other and we can refer to ourselves, separating our speaking from our selves, is what gives rise to the endless complexity of transference and counter-transference. Language also, as Dr. Litowitz pointed out, uniquely provides "the degrees of semiotic freedom" to enable "our capacity to travel through time, even into the future, and to create the counterfactual—traits that define us as human beings and are critical to psychoanalytic work." These complex aspects of language underscore its unique role in human life—they are foundational to the possibility for unconscious fantasies, reflection, and imagination.

Dr. Litowitz reminded us of the research on the linguistic and sociocultural practices surrounding child rearing. Caretakers' speech is attuned and adapted toward its comprehensibility by infants, and this promotes the infant's attachment by creating "meaningful patterns of attention, comfort, approval and prohibition." Infants hear the "motherese" words, but also the melody and tone. They learn to prune out the non-linguistic noise. Along with acquiring affect regulation from his "conversation" with his mother, a baby develops a mediational means of understanding the particularities of specific relationships. For Stern, this knowledge grows out of the infant's actions and observations; for Litowitz, it emerges from the infant's internalization of a relationship with a mother with her own mind, fully engaged with thoughts, feelings, and expectations about her child that result from her own personal history and her place in the world.

From Dr. Litowitz's perspective, even the earliest relationships are seen as communicational exchanges shaped by the sociocultural environment along with the contents of both members' minds. Litowitz read from an earlier paper:

> Although in this view the infant is equally active and competent at extracting information from its environment, it does so always as part of a dyad with a mediating adult. The adult 'mediates'—that is, intercedes between the infant and the world… But the infant-adult dyad is doubly mediational since the adult's inner world that is brought to the infant has been (and continues to be) constructed in a specific cultural context, embodied by its semiotic systems. The adult's inner world includes conscious and unconscious fantasies, belief systems, theories about infancy, gender, class, food, play and so forth. (Litowitz, 2005, 253)

Before babies understand what words mean, they understand language as a means to express desires and get things done. Language begins as speech acts, but Dr. Litowitz emphasized hidden complexities that are not revealed in much of the work on this topic. For Dr. Litowitz, because of the ambiguity and entanglement of the "I" and the "you" in all conversation, some of the power dynamics addressed by speech act theorists is over-simplified. Closer contextual observations of speech's performative function hones in on the "self-in-the-context-with-specific-other distinctions" in which language is highly tailored to the particularities of the person to whom it is addressed, and the response of the one spoken to will undoubtedly be in part shaped by the expectations conveyed by the speaker. A question, "Do you want your nappy changed?" frames an expectation that dirty nappies need to be changed and that their dirtiness is a reason to be upset. Dr. Litowitz pointed out that ultimately, even with a mundane question of this kind,

> it is never completely clear

> whose desire is being expressed. Neither the mother nor the baby can be certain what the other is communicating but 'the one who knows language' (Sullivan's phrase for the adult caregiver, 1953) uses her knowledge to establish a 'temporarily shared reality' (Rommetveit, 1974) on which the baby can comment with its available vocabulary… The baby now has a culturally validated concept to attach to its stage, but also an ambiguity of whence the concept-state connection arose: did it come from her or from me; is it what I want or what she wants?

This emphasis on Dr. Litowitz's part represents a profound departure from the traditional structuralist perspective that prevails in psychoanalysis, where selves, egos, or subjectivity are seen as unifiable entities, even if conflicted, or potentially dissociative, or split. Consider Dr. Litowitz's words:

> A self-with-other-in-the-world is neither "guilty man" nor "tragic man" (Kohut, 1977) but rather more like a character in a Dostoevsky novel or a Chekov short story whose thoughts as interior monologues are saturated with dialogues (Morson & Emerson, 1990). Thus, this entangled self's subjectivity is always already intersubjective and his agency always uncertain. Freud already revealed that our sense of self-mastery is an illusion. Post-Freud we find that a self, existing apart from others, is also an illusion. The further task for psychoanalysis is to attempt to describe the nature of self-object entanglements, and toward that end, we must better understand the relationships among our conflated concepts of self, subjectivity and agency.

However, although Dr. Litowitz was focusing in on vast new problems to be theorized in our conceptualization of our patients, and our work, she made clear that the method by which our understandings can be advanced is at the ready, through attention to speech practices and the contextual and sociocultural environment in which they occur. Dr. Litowitz did illustrate the entanglement of the analyst and the analysand with three brief clinical vignettes.

With this illuminating presentation to work with, our discussants, Dr. Steven Rosenbloom and Dr. Jeanine Vivona, had a broad array of topics and directions to pursue. Dr. Rosenbloom, a training and supervising analyst from the Quebec English Branch of the Canadian Institute of Psychoanalysis in Montreal, chose to focus on the sociocultural influences on American psychoanalysis and analytic theory in general, and questions about clinical implications. Citing a paper by his co-discussant, Jeanine Vivona, Dr. Rosenbloom reflected on the way in which our clinical and theoretical concepts act as "metaphors," to reflect what analysts think they are doing through their clinical conversation with patients. Dr. Rosenbloom highlighted many ways in which the metaphorical quality of our theories has broken down, taking on a fixed, reductive quality with "a misleading air of certainty to it." Particularly in the research on pre-verbal infants, this is a dangerous situation to be in, as infants can't correct the assumptions we place on them in the way that analysands can. Dr. Rosenbloom concurred with Dr. Litowitz that the blatant omission of "the complex verbal communications between mother and infant" by researchers such as Stern misses important opportunities for conceptualizing infantile experience.

Dr. Rosenbloom went on to flag the many helpful concepts surrounding language development that Dr. Litowitz identified for our use. He noted that her attention to language development in the context of the caretaker's speech, implicit and explicit expectations, and affect, along with the bodily ranges of expression and communication, "allow for an interaction between verbal and nonverbal developmental functions, which would not be conceived as mutually exclusive and fixed in nature."

Dr. Rosenbloom used these observations of Dr. Litowitz's paper to highlight that this presentation reaches far beyond questions about language development in children. "In addition, this paper deals with the question of how theories are created in psychoanalysis, the nature of the data used to validate them, and less explicitly, the effects of their creation on clinical practice." Along with raising questions about the specifics of our theories of pre-Oedipal infants, Dr. Litowitz is questioning the structural foundation of these theories as well as the circular process of entanglement

Continued on page 18

between theory and its evidence.

Dr. Rosenbloom closed his discussion with a question about the broader clinical implications of Dr. Litowitz's work. He wondered whether Dr. Litowitz is suggesting that analysts are missing data to inform an understanding of the "complex mediation process played by parents in early language development," or whether that data is right there to be found in the clinical encounter, and we aren't making use of it.

Dr. Vivona's presentation resonated with many of the themes that the day's discussion had already addressed, but stood out as a remarkable synthesis and clarification of the central themes and questions. As a psychology professor who studies the role of language in psychoanalysis at the College of New Jersey, Dr. Vivona shared many of Dr. Litowitz's convictions about the diminishing attention to talk in the practice of "the talking cure." Dr. Vivona considered Dr. Litowitz's observation that Freud considered language to be the "clear glass through which the real psychic landscape can be seen" in the context of her attention to the interpersonal and sociocultural entanglements endemic in our speech. Dr. Vivona suggested that within the American analytic tradition that Dr. Litowitz had described, as illustrated by Stern or Schore, "behavior has replaced language as the presumed clear glass, as though behavior is immune to the inevitable foundational entanglements of self and other." Dr. Litowitz, Vivona suggested, is turning our attention to the nature of clear glass: it may look transparent, but it is present and reflective, as well as revealing. "Self *and* other, speaker *and* listener, are reflected in the image shown to us by language; we don't see one without the other." Whereas theorists like Stern mistrust language, Dr. Litowitz underscores its special abilities, which give it the power to be therapeutic. Dr. Vivona drew out the surprising conclusion that Freud and Stern both "got it wrong and in the same way." They both missed the role of mediation in human interaction, imagining that we can understand another person wholly, either through interpreting their words or viewing their behavior.

Dr. Vivona went on to elaborate her alignment with the surprising blindness that infant researchers have had with regard to the verbal aspects of mothers' interactions with their babies. Dr. Vivona described some of the research evidence about the infant's linguistic capacities that has gone largely unrecognized by psychoanalytic theorists. The many specific results were illuminating and built toward the inevitable conclusion that infants in their first year of life, before uttering a word, already understand their world through the semantic categories of their native tongue. As Dr. Vivona put it, "The effects of language and thinking are bidirectional: verbal labels influence the formation of mental concepts and the presence of concepts supports the learning of words." Thus, Dr. Vivona endorsed Dr. Litowitz's critique of the mythological pre-verbal infant, living in pure experience without the intrusion of language to separate her from her sensory life. Dr. Vivona went on to wonder, though, about the implications.

> To state this boldly and even provocatively, this may imply that no form of self-experience is profoundly or unequivocally beyond the reach of language and, therefore, that there is little need for special therapeutic approaches to access modes of thought that are essentially nonverbal. Perhaps there is no period of development that can be accurately conceptualized as preverbal.

Dr. Vivona turned her attention to the second major theme of Dr. Litowitz's talk, the post-structuralist view of the self as inherently intersubjective, "constituted by dialogue," entangled the relationship. She began by synthesizing her understanding of Dr. Litowitz's position, namely that "the self involves a kind of double intersubjectivity, or maybe an intersubjective version of object relations, in which the other is within the self because the subjectivity perceived in the other (correctly or incorrectly) imbues the subjectivity of the self." Dr. Vivona underscored that Dr. Litowitz is not simply making a plea to return to a focus on the intrapsychic in lieu of all the attention that observable behavioral interactions are getting, but rather, that she is inviting us to redefine the intrapsychic based on a new understanding of the self as "self-in-relation-to-the world." This idea raised many questions for Dr. Vivona and, as with Dr. Rosenbloom's discussion, turned her attention in large part to the broader clinical implications. Although Dr. Litowitz's ideas were quite persuasive, it is clear that they invite a radical re-thinking of the nature of the self, the role of language, the implications for understanding clinical dialogue, and the

core constructs, like transference or defense, that guide our thinking.

A very energetic conversation ensued, with many questions resonating with the clinical questions emerging in the discussions. One interesting theme was the idea of 'intentionality,' the motivation, desire, or emotion behind the words. Dr. Rizzuto reminded us of a time when mothers followed the advice of Dr. Spock, even if it wasn't concordant with their own intuitions or history. Intentionality is something we need to attend to as analysts, too. With so many contradictory metaphors, or theories, or research findings to draw upon, so many clear glasses to look through, we can be confused about our role with our patients.

As can be seen, the discussants and the audience were very much entangled in the richness and depth of Dr. Litowitz's presentation. It was refreshing to end with more questions to pursue.

References

Fonagy, P., Gergely, G., Jurist, E. & Target, M. (2002). *Affect Regulation, Mentalization, and the Development of the Self.* New York: Other Press.

Litowitz, B. (2005). The origins of ethics: deontic modality. *International Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies,* 2(#3):249-259.

Schore, A. (1994). *Affect Regulation and the Origin of the Self.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Stern, D.N. (1985).

INTERVIEW OF BONNIE LITOWITZ, PH.D.

Donna Mathias, M.D.

On Sunday, March 21, Dr. Bonnie Litowitz sat down with Dr. Donna Mathias to reflect on her career trajectory and the way in which her interests evolved from pursuing a doctorate in linguistics, to ultimately practicing as a psychoanalyst. Included in this conversation are many reflections on the state of our discipline and Dr. Litowitz's urgent commitment to bridging the gap between academia and analytic practice.

How did you come to make the leap from linguistics to psychoanalysis?

It wasn't as big a leap as it might appear. I started out as a classicist in college and was very interested in different languages, especially differences in meaning or semantics. While I was at Barnard I took a linguistic anthropology course at Columbia. What I took from that course was how language affects the mind, so I started to get interested in anthropology. You know how every semester one wants to be something else? I wanted to look at language and culture and how they affect perception, cognition, emotion, and such. However, I was scared of going into the field. I started to read about what happens in the field—something about needing to eat grubs for their fat content to help metabolize B vitamins. Not what I classify as a food! As a child I never even went to camp! I worried how I would manage my anxieties in this course of study.

Then life entered in. I met my husband, got married, and had children. During that time, Chomsky appeared and he was saying one didn't have to go into the field to study language because one can't learn about its structure from informants; the deep structure of language is unconscious. When I got into linguistics, I became interested in semantics and I wrote my dissertation on the semantic structure of dreams.

While I was working on my dissertation, George Pollock was Director of the Chicago Institute. He was open and interested in research and academics and wanted to bring academics into psychoanalysis. He ran the institute as a sort of benign dictator and he allowed me to take courses on the dream and metapsychology. At that point, it was not the clinical I was interested in but the ideas, such as the effects of language during sleep on dream formation. I was then offered an academic job at Northwestern but always maintained my interest in psychoanalysis, although at that point I couldn't bring those interests into the work I needed to do for tenure. I worked with children

Continued on page 20

in the course of my job, training people to work with children with specific language and learning disorders.

I left the University when I was offered a position as the Dean of the Erickson Institute. It was a great opportunity to do some things I wanted to do but couldn't at a large university. The Erickson Institute was dynamically oriented. Anna Freud and Erik Erikson were on its Board. We studied children from zero to three and offered Master's degrees in teaching and trained people to create intervention programs for young children and their families. They wanted me to develop a PhD program and start research projects, which I did and really enjoyed. However, I left the position because most of my time ended up being spent in fund-raising. Nobody wants to give money to women and children! Corporations like Xerox and IBM don't understand why they should invest in children under three! I went back to Northwestern but increasingly became interested in clinical work. I did research at Rush Medical School and then got training under the CORST program. It all felt like an organic progression.

How does your interest in child language acquisition shape your theory and practice of psychoanalysis with adults?

I fell into studying children in a way; that was the job I was offered at Northwestern and I became fascinated with it. One of the most influential people for me was Vygotsky, especially his theory of microgenesis. He viewed children as a laboratory: if we study them, we can have input and clearly see development as it occurs. For that reason alone I think everyone should take a development course—as a laboratory to see how interventions can change the mind. Also, I just really liked working with and studying children. I find their spontaneity very enjoyable.

What analyst has had the most influence on your work?

Freud. I go back to Freud all the time. Not so much that in his work is where the wisdom is. There have been many important additions since Freud, such as thinking about the object in object relations, but what I like most is his spirit of honesty and trying something new when he had used his best educated guess but failed. That is, a psychoanalytic attitude, rather than sacred psychoanalytic knowledge. For me, *Studies in Hysteria* is a great text. I work with residents who often have a great deal of trouble transitioning from medicine to psychiatry. They are used to alleviating symptoms and doing something. It's hard to give them a different notion of symptoms. I say, 'Freud was just like you. He didn't have a clue about what to do and these ladies were leading him on a merry chase. He said, wait a second, something has to change in my approach to these symptoms.' It was his openness and willingness to fail and change that makes his work great.

Other analysts who have had an influence on me are Winnicott, Loewald, and George Klein. Klein was part of the group with Rappaport. Rappaport was a fascinating man. He collected very interesting people around him. People like Kohut and Klein sensed there was something else—the self, a need for mastery, which foreshadowed a broader view of motivational systems. It is not just sex and aggression. Klein asks interesting questions and struggles to answer them in interesting ways; he pulls theory in to meet clinical intuition. For me it isn't whether the answer is right or wrong. It's whether the question is clinically relevant and the struggle to answer it is interesting.

In some of your papers, you highlight feminist themes. Could you reflect on how feminism has impacted your understanding of the theory and practice of psychoanalysis?

This was the hardest question for me [*in pre-reading the questions*]. I absolutely consider myself a feminist, but I consider myself a traditional person too. I have three children; I have eight grandchildren; I love to knit, cook, all those traditional things. How it influences me is that I can be a feminist and be traditional. I believe women should have options. Nobody should dictate to them how to have a life. I think that impacts how I work with men as well—a sense of freedom. They should not be confined to what they have been told they have to be, either. It gives me a sense of how many ways there are to live a life. It comes out of feminism in terms of its focus on potential and what one can do.

What are your thoughts about what would be gained by bridging the gap between academia and clinical psychoanalysis?

This is a topic close to my heart. Boy, everything would be gained. Our isolation from academia has been a huge mistake that we are

still struggling to correct. Trying to make the connection is very hard. The CORST program came into being to train academics to come into psychoanalysis, but our entrance into academia has not been easy.

I am in favor of such outreach. It is a struggle to understand the different traditions. The academics are not clinically trained, and they view clinicians as trained but not educated. There are prejudices on both sides, put in place to preserve self-worth. Jonathan Lear has been trying to bridge the gap at the University of Chicago, and Robert Paul and Steve Levy are attempting innovative programs at Emory. It makes me sad that it is so difficult because it would be a benefit to everybody.

A lot of the focus of my writing has been about this topic. We shouldn't just go to academia and take certain things and add it on to our work. Nor should we expect them to take what we do on face value. There *must* be a dialogue with full appreciation of the data that each discipline brings and an understanding that different data come from observations of different kinds. We have a unique laboratory that can contribute the intrapsychic aspects of interpersonal relationships. Academic researchers don't find our data because their research is not set up to see it. Different databases need not compete or conflict; they should enrich each other.

How do you feel psychoanalysis is evolving?

I have no idea where it's evolving, but I'm delighted if it is evolving! I think periodically, when I go to meetings, I'm fearful that it's not. Like in any evolution, the ecological niche changes and you either adapt or you die out. Our ecological niche has changed and we will either adapt or we'll die out. I am pleased whenever I feel that we are not stagnating.

❖ ❖ ❖

BLIND LOVE, KNOWING LOVE – WITH NOTES ON IDEALIZATION AND THE ANALYSAND'S LOVE

OPEN SCIENTIFIC MEETING, MARCH 21, 2009

Presenter: **Lora Heims Tessman, Ph.D.**
Discussants: **Simona Grabel, Ph.D. and Axel Hoffer, M.D.**
Moderator: **Laurie Raymond, M.D.**
Reporter: **Deborah Shilkoff, LICSW**

Do different forms of erotic loving have different functions and consequences for the individual? This is one of the questions that Lora Heims Tessman posed in her PINE Open Scientific presentation: "Blind Love, Knowing Love," on Saturday, March 21, 2009 at Cambridge Hospital's Macht Auditorium. Acknowledging that "erotic loving, in our lives and our consulting rooms, is astoundingly diverse," she compares two varieties of erotic love: "blind love" and "knowing love." Both can be experienced as powerfully transformative: she noted that "unlearning old patterns of anticipations is crucial for new ways of loving to come about. This is a crux for change in therapy or analysis as well."

Dr. Tessman tells us "when love is 'blind,' based in compelling illusions about the beloved, it fulfills different needs than when it proceeds to deepening knowledge about that person." Illusion is necessary and has "lifelong importance in creativity, play and imagination." Illusions are "persistent footprints of individual fantasy life, revealing as a Rorschach" and emerging "as a precious part of the private love play of intimate couples." However, "if illusions subvert the desire to know, then recognition of the actuality of the Other is held at bay. Proceeding to 'knowing love' may be stymied by unconscious convictions about the dangers of loving, resulting in separation dread, with defensive disavowal of ambivalence, and need to control emotional distance by controlling the beloved." Dr. Tessman contrasts illusion with idealization of the other, "part of the passionate excitement about the actual, rather than illusionary qualities of the person who is beloved."

Continued on page 22

Within analytic process, Tessman tells us, "deepening knowledge is sought while erotic love must be contained." She believes that, "whatever transpires in the state of erotic desire for the analyst is most deeply interiorized, becoming indelibly imprinted into psychic life. Concurrently, desire is a state unequaled in creating vulnerability to the analyst's communications, as they signify the analyst's affective response and self-regulation in the presence of the analysand's love, sexual arousal, or both." Turmoil accompanies the analysand's struggle to accept the analyst's separate libidinal subjectivity without feeling catastrophically rebuffed. The analysand's desire for affective knowledge of the analyst's psychic life is not primarily defensive (although it may also serve that function). Like love, Tessman claims, "such 'knowing' fosters maximal freedom for imaginative interweaving of the subjectively created and the known other. When erotic love has been experienced as transmutative, feelings of love for the analyst, not attributable to transference, may linger past termination." Tessman illustrated her ideas with examples from literature as well as dream material from an analysand.

As a poignant end to her talk, Dr. Tessman notes the change of attitude in Freud toward lingering love after loss. Freud originally praised decathexis when a beloved is gone, because, "Reality testing has shown that the loved object no longer exists, and it proceeds to demand that all libido shall be withdrawn from its attachments to that object." But, after Freud's daughter Sophie and his grandchild Heinele died, he saw that, although acute sorrow runs its course, it will also remain, never finding a substitute for what has been lost. Freud says, "We know that the acute sorrow we feel after such a loss will run its course, but also that we will remain inconsolable, and will never find a substitute. No matter what may come to take its place, even should it fill that place completely, it yet remains something else. And that is how it should be. It is the only way of perpetuating a love that we do not want to abandon."

Dr. Simona Grabel began her discussion of Dr. Tessman's paper by wondering about the developmental continuum of love, assuming "knowing love" to be the more mature. However, do blind and knowing love co-exist? Can't one turn into the other? Dr. Grabel tells us that Freud (1915 "On Transference Love") characterizes transference love as being in "a special position." Alive in the transference, this love "consists of new editions of old traits and… repeats infantile reactions. But this is the essential character of every state of being in love." Freud reminds us that "in the first place it is provoked by the analytic situation; secondly, it is greatly intensified by the resistance, which dominates the situation; and thirdly, it is lacking, to a high degree a regard for reality, is less sensible, less concerned about consequences and more blind in its valuation of the loved person, than we are prepared to admit in the case of normal love. We should not forget, however, that these departures from the norm constitute precisely what is essential about being in love."

Dr. Grabel points out that all psychoanalyses are "filled with both dread and longing, with narcissism and object love." Dr. Grabel relates the fate of "the new editions of old traits" in the transference of one patient at the end of analysis: "How can Dr. Tessman's delineation of blind love/knowing love shed light on the tortured ambivalence of one person?" This patient had felt loved unconditionally, but blindly, in an empty way, while growing up. She was ambivalent about knowing and being known by the analyst, to have "real engagement" in life, which the patient also craved. To be blindly loved "for no reason," to be the object of another's "blind love" could bring about a feeling of being annihilated--unseen and nonexistent, except as existing for the other person."

Winnicott (1969, "The Use of an Object," IJP: 50: 711-716) differentiated the capacities of "object-relating" from "object usage," which Dr. Grabel likened to the dichotomy of blind vs. knowing love. In the earlier of the capacities, object-relating, "projective mechanisms and identifications have been operating, and …something of the subject is found in the object." This, Dr. Grabel tells us, is Freud's stage of narcissism. In Winnicott's words, "When I speak of the use of an object, however, I take object-relating for granted, and add new features that involve the nature and the behavior of the object. For instance, the object, if it is to be used, must necessarily be real in the sense of being part of shared reality, not a bundle of projections." To Winnicott, use of the object requires being part of a shared reality; as it is in knowing love. It involves "a capacity to use objects" and to live in reality. In development, this involves "the subject's perception of the object as an external phenomenon, not

as a projective entity, in fact recognition of it as an entity in its own right." Dr. Grabel's patient was ambivalent about being seen clearly. The patient idealized love objects so as not to allow them to feel destructive. Being known was "both intensely desired and feared." In the transference, the patient "went back and forth ambivalently from 'knowing' to 'blind' love."

In Anna Karenina, Tolstoy describes Levin as suddenly experiencing "blind love" to assuage his own doubts about marriage: "Happiness consists only in loving and desiring; in wishing her wishes and in thinking her thoughts, which means having no freedom whatever, it is happiness." This does not sustain Levin. He fears that Kitty only loves him blindly. He asks her why she loves him. She replies that "she loved him because she thoroughly understood him, and that she knew what he must love and that all he loved, all of it, was good. And that seemed perfectly clear to him."

Dr. Grabel concludes, as in Tolstoy, "love is a mixture of blindness and sight." These aspects can occur simultaneously, or sequentially in the same person. Both Levin and Dr. Grabel's patient found it threatening to be loved blindly. Dr. Grabel's patient also found it "threatening to be known as loving and in need of love." This was the essence of the patient's analysis.

Dr. Hoffer's discussion focused on the question: "Does the analyst love the analysand?" Is there a "special analytic love?" If so, what is the nature of the analyst's love? Dr. Hoffer recognizes that we all want to be seen and understood but, quoting Dr. Lawrence Friedman, he notes: "…understanding seems a rather bloodless sort of love and, as we have seen, analysts now and then bravely ventured to put some juice into it." "Is love the same as understanding?" Dr. Hoffer wonders. Is there passion and is that different from passion that one might feel in seeing a movie or reading a book? Is the analyst detached? He points out that a detached analyst would eventually not be tolerated by the analysand. There must be engagement, involvement and, yes, even passion in the relationship.

The analytic relationship has often been compared to a parental one, as elaborated by Loewald. There is great value in the analyst's seeing the potential of the analysand which is freeing and growth-promoting, not self-serving and restrictive. While this comparison has validity, it contains the danger of the analysand feeling parentified, which is implicitly infantilizing. Dr. Hoffer emphasized the importance of the analyst's undivided attention to the analysand. Full attention is an important ingredient of love and feeling loved. How often does the analyst give four or five hours a week of undivided attention to his or her spouse…even on vacation?

A feeling of non-judgmental acceptance by the analyst is essential. Training in psychoanalysis helps the candidate approach the ideal expressed in the quotation from the Greek dramatist, Terence: "I am a man; I consider nothing that is human alien to me." That acceptance allows the analysand to bring his or her vulnerability into the relationship. This promotes the unique intimacy of the analytic relationship. The blind love that can occur is the result of the fundamental asymmetry of the relationship. The analyst can feel that intimacy without risking his or her own vulnerability, as is the case in an ordinary love relationship. The intimacy created by the analyst's caring attention can make the analyst feel like a soul-mate. For the analyst, it provides a "safe" kind of intimacy that can be so rewarding that it feels "addictive." Maybe that's why analysts tend not to retire.

Indeed, Freud, in a letter to Jung (1906) said "…the cure is effected by love."

THE ROAD TO TRAINING AND SUPERVISING ANALYST

Stephen Kerzner, M.D.

My journey to TA has been long but satisfying. I hope that my story may inspire others on the PINE Faculty to also pursue TA appointment. I view psychoanalysis as a pathway to creativity and liberation for analyst and patient alike. Contained by a frame and boundaries, psychoanalysis promotes a sense of boundlessness, timelessness and infinite possibilities.

My psychoanalytic career began in the late 1970's after medical school. As a pediatric resident in the neonatal intensive care unit (NICU), I took care of one-pound babies that my gung-ho attending neonatologist insisted on trying to save. Enormous resources and efforts were poured into the care for extremely premature babies whose tiny limbs were pierced by arterial lines and whose feet became pincushions for monitoring blood. I became concerned not only for the uncertain future of these babies, but for their helpless and terrified parents who stood vigil daily. I also worried for the siblings who sat in the waiting room or at home, because they could not come into the NICU. I began communicating with the families and interacting with the siblings. I answered questions and provided a listening ear. It turned out I had a positive impact on some of the families. The medical and nursing staff took notice and established a family support component in the NICU. Some of the staff suggested that I consider pursuing child psychiatry, given my ability to talk with parents and children. I felt both an emotional and an intellectual pull to psychiatric training because of the expanded possibilities for promoting growth and healing.

The following year, I started an adult psychiatry residency at Tufts, followed by a child psychiatry residency at Cambridge Hospital. My psychiatric training emphasized psychodynamic principles, and most of my supervisors were psychoanalysts. I learned to diagnose and to make psychodynamic formulations and treatment plans. When I finished training, I thought I knew what I was doing as a therapist and had great therapeutic zeal and enthusiasm. However, I soon discovered that I had little idea how to help people change their repetitive patterns. In spite of my best intentions, reaching and helping people surmount resistance required more than diagnostic acumen, warmth and empathy. As I sat with patients in once or twice weekly therapy sessions, I tried to apply some of the strategies that I had been taught, especially working with the transference. Sometimes I recognized the transference and interpreted it, and my patients felt recognized and understood. However, more often, I encountered impasses. After five years in full time practice, I found myself demoralized and dissatisfied with my work. I decided to apply for psychoanalytic training and found my way to PINE in the fall of 1987.

Training at PINE was inspiring, stimulating and enriching both professionally and personally. I overlapped adult and child analytic training. My two adult analytic supervisors, Drs. Robert Pyles and Sheldon Roth, and my first child analytic supervisor, Dr. Marty Miller, provided generous and invaluable supervision. They encouraged and supported my work and career. My training analysis was also helpful, but it was interrupted when my analyst retired. Although I was unable to find an adult male control case, PINE allowed me to graduate from adult training with a child male control case in January, 1994. I completed classes in child and adolescent analysis in 1998, but it took time to develop child analytic cases. I graduated from the combined BPSI/PINE Child and Adolescent Analytic Program in the spring of 2004.

I started a man in analysis in 2002 and obtained certification in adult psychoanalysis in January, 2005. At this point, I decided to pursue a second analysis in order to address unresolved issues from my interrupted first analysis. The following year, I was encouraged by the PINE TA Committee to apply for appointment as a TA. Hoping to increase my immersion in

both the practice and teaching of psychoanalysis, I agreed to apply. However, my first application for training and supervising analyst was turned down by the PINE TA Committee. The rejection by my own institute's TA's was painful, but the work of my on-going second analysis helped me. I determined to continue to expand my involvement at PINE and to increase my teaching commitment. In addition to multiple committee and study group memberships and my role as an advisor, I taught elective seminars on Donald Winnicott, Andre Green and Melanie Klein, and several development courses. I also revamped the development curriculum at PINE. Last year, I co-taught an advanced seminar on therapeutic action and plan to co-teach another advanced seminar this fall on relational perspectives.

The PINE TA Committee invited me to reapply for TA appointment in the spring of 2009 and asked me to meet with Dr. Jane Kite to go over my cases and write ups. Jane helped me to prepare for the arduous and challenging interview process that followed with three training analyst interviewers from other institutes. I was pleased to have my work validated and to finally be appointed as a TA this past January. While the future role of the TA is uncertain, I welcome the opportunity to promote psychoanalytic thought and practice and look forward to my continued involvement with PINE in my new role. I would be pleased to talk with PINE faculty interested in learning more about the application process for training and supervising analyst appointment.

❖ ❖ ❖

NEW CANDIDATE - DEBORAH OFFNER, PH.D.

Situated in front of the largest tabletop in Peet's Coffee, I had spread out the papers, calculator, and laptop computer I would need to complete my tax return. Though early September (I was filing on extension), it was 95 degrees outside; the air-conditioned cafe was teeming with refugees from the stifling heat. A girl approached me, reached for the chair across the table, and boldly asked whether she might sit down.

I began to push aside some of my belongings.

"Oh, that's okay. You don't need to move anything. I'm just reading."

She settled in across from me with her book (and a highlighter) in her lap. Glancing up from my latte moments later, I couldn't help but notice the title. Angela Davis: *Women, Race & class.*

"Oh, that's a great book."

"Yeah."

"I read that in college—that was a long time ago of course…. Are you in college?"

"Yes… I go to Hampshire."

"So what class is that book for?"

"It's not. I've been reading only Angela Davis all summer."

As I returned to computing the proportion of cleaning and landscaping expenses I could deduct for my home office, I thought, "THAT is why I am going to PINE."

College was a transformative experience for me. There for the first time I was immersed in philosophy, sociology, and women's studies in the very way that makes one want to devote a summer to reading everything that a revered theorist or author has written. In my introductory psychology class, I was fascinated by *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Though we were assigned the entire original text, it was presented more as historical artifact than clinical theory. Our textbook glibly informed us that psychoanalysis was a therapy about, and of, the past. American behaviorism and cognitive therapy were the empirically validated, "here and now" methods by which psychological symptoms could be

Continued on page 26

relieved and optimal functioning restored. In addition, Freud was widely regarded by both faculty and students as misogynist—his theories and treatment potential tools of social repression. Not a ringing endorsement.

Perhaps a year later, the break-up of a cherished relationship landed me in the office of a psychoanalytically oriented psychiatrist. Around the same time, I unaccountably came into possession of Janet Malcolm's *Psychoanalysis: The Impossible Profession*. While I identified more with Janet Malcolm than with her middle-aged male psychoanalyst subject, I found the theoretical principles and clinical phenomena they discussed endlessly compelling. During my junior year abroad, I discovered that the theory and practice of psychoanalysis were in fact flourishing across the pond. As a social science student at the London School of Economics, I studied psychoanalysis and social theory with a professor who had himself been analyzed by Anna Freud until her death several years before. I also pored through the writings of Winnicott, Fairbairn and Guntrip at the University of London Library.

Upon my return to Wesleyan University, I found a way to continue the exploration, albeit outside the psychology department. Elizabeth Young-Breuhl was teaching a seminar on psychoanalysis and feminist theory while writing a biography of Anna Freud and training as a lay analyst. It appeared that there were in fact feminist psychoanalysts! This new reality, along with a professor that let us call her by her first name, expected us to grade ourselves, and wore jeans to class—therein lay hope, and inspiration.

I chose Boston University's Clinical Psychology program for its psychoanalytic orientation and proximity to the college counseling centers and community mental health clinics in which I wished to train. I divided my time roughly equally between child, adolescent and adult treatment in both outpatient and inpatient settings. Since completing my Ph.D., I have maintained a psychotherapy practice. My current office is located in my home in Newton Centre, where I live with my husband and 7-year-old daughter. I have spent virtually all of my professional time outside of private practice in educational settings: first as an undergraduate teacher, then as a college counselor, and currently as the psychologist at the Commonwealth School, an independent high school in Back Bay.

In my private practice, I have been engaged in intensive long-term psychotherapy with adolescents and adults for a number of years, enabled by unfailing support of wise, patient and kind psychoanalyst supervisors and a personal psychoanalyst. Witnessing my patients' transformations through psychoanalytically oriented intervention has inspired me to formalize my training and deepen my practice. At Commonwealth School, I am continually reminded of the exponential intellectual and personal growth that can occur in adolescence, if the stars are aligned and the right mentors in place to guide. I know I can't really go back to being that girl in the coffee shop—but I've decided it's time to try.

❖ ❖ ❖

ANNOUNCEMENT

We are pleased to announce that Susan Rosbrow-Reich, Ph.D. was approved as Training and Supervising Analyst by the Board on Professional Standards of the American Psychoanalytic Association.

UPCOMING PROGRAMS

Title:
Reflections on Heinz Kohut's Last Presentation, *On Empathy*, 1981
Its impact on my Journey in how we Listen
Presenter:
Evelyne A. Schwaber, M.D.
Discussants:
Robin Gomulin, Psy.D. and Paul Ornstein, M.D.
Date:
October 23, 2010
Location/Time:
Macht Auditorium, The Cambridge Hospital, 1:30-4:30 p.m.

POSTPONED

Title:
The Power of Perversion
Presenter:
Jack Novick, Ph.D. and Kerry Kelly Novick
Date:
November 13, 2010
Location/Time:
Macht Auditorium, The Cambridge Hospital, 1:30-4:30 p.m.

Title:
Falling out of the World: The Shock of the Unspeakable,
the Strangeness of Everyday Life--and Afterwards
Presenter:
Alfred Margulies, M.D.
Date:
December 11, 2010
Location/Time:
Macht Auditorium, The Cambridge Hospital, 1:30-4:30 p.m.

Title:
The Workable Here and Now and The Why of There and Then
Presenter:
Fred Busch, Ph.D.
Date:
January 29, 2011
Location/Time:
Macht Auditorium, The Cambridge Hospital, 1:30-4:30 p.m.

Presenters:
Jane V. Kite, Ph.D. and Humphrey Morris, M.D.
Date:
April 23, 2011
Location/Time:
Macht Auditorium, The Cambridge Hospital, 1:30-4:30 p.m.

PINE PSYCHOANALYTIC CENTER, INC.

P.O. Box 920762, Needham, MA 02492

NEWSLETTER

PINE Newsletter
Published by the
PINE Psychoanalytic Center, Inc.

Editor: Sarah Ackerman, Ph.D.
Managing Editor: Alice J. Rapkin
Editorial Board: Ayelet Barkai, M.D.
Kimberlyn Leary, Ph.D.
Printer: PrintCentre