

The Analytic Observer

The Newsletter of The Chicago Psychoanalytic Society www.3b.com/cps Summer/Fall 2008

REMEMBERING MARIAN TOLPIN

Marian Tolpin died in her home on June 10, 2008 at the age of 82. By any measure, she was a distinguished psychoanalyst. She was an esteemed clinician, a dynamic teacher, an important writer, and a much-loved colleague, both to us here in Chicago and to many others in our country-and beyond the seas. She had been an active member of the Institute faculty for over 40 years where she had been a supervising and training analyst. Marian, with her late husband Paul, were in the original group of analysts around Heinz Kohut in the 60's when he developed the ideas that later became Self Psychology, and she became one of its most illustrious proponents. She was ever the animated and voluble teacher and presenter. In any scientific meeting she happened to attend, she could be relied on to get up at the end of the presentation to make a comment. Most often, in recent years, it related to some unappreciated aspect of the patient's healthy strivings, which she called the "forward edge". We analysts write about who we are, and Marian was the forward edge. She saw the potential for growth in her patients, her students, her colleagues and her friends. Marian was a much esteemed role model and mentor to many of the women in our field. They admired and emulated her, and she fostered their professional and personal growth in deep and lasting ways. What a paradox! Here was a woman who had lived 82 full and active years, and we all



feel an aching loss—as if she were taken from us prematurely. She is mourned and missed by all of us, and we extend our sympathies to her son and daughter, Jim and Maria.

To honor Marian's memory, as proposed by the Tolpin family, the Institute has established the Marian D. Tolpin M.D. Memorial Seminar. This event will be part of the Institute's series of Saturday Morning Panels held each year to discuss important clinical issues from a variety of viewpoints. Given Marian's interests, the seminar bearing her name will focus, when appropriate, on a topic related to Self Psychology.

If you would like to make a contribution in support of this event, please send your checks to the Institute's address listed below. ***Donations (payable to the Institute) are tax deductible, and the Tolpin family has graciously offered to match all gifts made for this purpose.***

Abridged from David Terman's eulogy
at the Memorial for Marian Tolpin,
Peggy Notebaert Museum, July 20, 2008.
For the full eulogy, please visit
www.chicagoanalysis.org

The Institute for Psychoanalysis
122 S. Michigan Ave., Suite 1300
Chicago, IL 60603
ATTN: Marian Tolpin Fund

IPA News:

Conversation with Kate Schechter about the upcoming IPA Congress

IPA International Congress

Psychoanalytic Practice: Convergences and Divergences

Hyatt McCormick Place, Chicago

July 29-August 1, 2009

Our own Kate Schechter, an advanced candidate at the Chicago Institute, is one of the four members of the Program Committee for the 46th IPA Congress. The Congress, held every two years, will be held in Chicago July 29-August 1, 2009. The Program Committee consists of one representative from each of three regions (North America, Latin America, and Europe) as well as a representative from the International Psychoanalytical Studies Organization (IPSO), which is the international candidates organization. Committee members for the Chicago Congress are Abel Fainstein from Buenos Aires, chairman; Glen Gabbard from the USA; Mónica de Armesto from Buenos Aires (ex officio); Liliane Abensour from Paris; and Kate Schechter from IPSO. As the IPSO delegate, Kate represents candidates world-wide.

In a recent conversation, Kate described the wonderful camaraderie and exchange of ideas among committee members. It has been a great experience for her to work with this group, which is at the heart of the IPA and international psychoanalysis. Members of the group have welcomed her as a fully equal member of the committee. Abel Fainstein, as chairperson, wanted the congress to have a clinical focus. Everyone on the committee is excited that the spotlight is on clinical material and practice issues rather than on theoretical papers. What happens in the consulting room will be front and center in the program. Many of the panels will consist of one person giving clinical material to be followed by people from different regions, schools, and cultures of psychoanalysis giving their diverse perspectives on the clinical issues raised. The committee is working hard to balance all of the panels with members from each region, insuring that the Congress will be a real forum for cross-cultural dialogue.

It is exciting to have the most important meeting in the international psychoanalytic world right here in Chicago. The Congress will be a great opportunity for us to learn about psychoanalysis in the rest of the world. Kate has just returned from a recent meeting of the Program Committee in Buenos Aires, where she was excited to learn more about the Argentinean schools of psychoanalysis. She shared with me the interesting fact that Buenos Aires has more psychoanalysts per capita than anywhere else.

The Congress is expecting a very large turnout of analysts from the USA. In fact, APsA has cancelled its 2009 spring meeting to encourage everyone to attend the IPA Congress instead. The LAC (Local Arrangements Committee), headed by Jorge Schneider, has been busy organizing events, activities, transportation, and other logistics to welcome the attendees and to make Chicago accessible for their enjoyment. For information about the Congress, hotel accommodations, and optional activities that are available, please check out the website: www.ipa.org.uk. Everyone in the field who would like to attend is welcome; categories for attendance include IPA members, non-members, candidates, and students.

A second exciting event that is separate from but adjoined to the IPA Congress will be the 20th IPSO Congress, which will be held on the day preceding the IPA Congress, (July 28), with several panels running concurrently with the IPA Congress as well. All of the panels in the IPSO Congress feature candidates presenting their own work. The IPSO Congress will also include supervision sessions, "Meet the Author" and "Meet the Analyst" sessions, all great opportunities for candidates to present their work to senior analysts from other regions, as well as to learn from each other about the different analytic training traditions. All candidates are encouraged to submit an abstract for a paper. For information, check out the IPSO website at www.ipsocandidates.org (there is also an IPSO link on the IPA website).

In addition to being on the IPA Congress Program Committee, Kate serves as the North American Vice President for the IPSO Executive Committee (IPSO is organized so that the presidency rotates among the three geographic regions, with a vice president from each region). One of the events that is eagerly anticipated by regular attendees of IPA meetings is the famous IPSO party, which is widely known for its emphasis on international music, good food, lots of dancing, and much fun. Jeffrey Seiden, the Chicago Institute's Candidate representative on the LAC committee, is also the chair of the Candidate LAC for IPSO. He and his committee are planning a slew of wonderful activities for candidates, including the IPSO party, an IPSO lunch, and lots of other fun Chicago outings.

Check out the IPA and IPSO websites for additional information about both organizations, as well as specifics about attending the Congresses. Information about program choices, costs, and cultural offerings is available.

Our New Graduates

The Institute for Psychoanalysis held its graduation on Friday evening, June 16, and had the largest turn-out in the Institute's history.

Ten students graduated from the Adult Psychotherapy Program: Kelly Berkheimer, PsyD, Bernadette Gaffney, LCSW, Allison Lerman, PhD, Katie Magrino, MA, Teri Murphy, MA, Jenny Philipson, LCSW, Angela Razon, PsyD, Bradley Sears, MA, Lisa Siegel, MD, Mark Virshbo, LCSW. Seven psychoanalytic candidates graduated from the core program: Thomas Byrne, MD, Eleanor Feinberg, PhD, Candace Fleischmann, LCSW, Basil Jackson, MD, Joshua Kellman, MD, Jane McCormack, PhD, and Erica Schmidt, LCSW. Thomas Byrne graduated from the Child Analytic program as well. We asked the psychoanalytic graduates to tell us about themselves and about their training at the Institute.

Tom Byrne graduated from both the child and the adult psychoanalytic programs. His certificate in child analysis was number 63 in the history of the Institute. Tom is a child and adult psychiatrist whose practice is in Oak Brook. He described the past seven years as extremely challenging and rewarding, as he attempted to balance family, work, and school. Tom has four children (all of whom attended graduation). While he regrets not having time for many of the "extra" social events, he is glad he was able to do this training now. He hopes to join the faculty and continue being involved in recruiting future candidates to the Institute. His best moments at the Institute came in the two colloquia, which he found to be a great way to learn. He really appreciated the thoughtfulness of the faculty in asking questions that allowed him to carry his own thinking further. Classes, supervision, and his own personal analysis have been invaluable and contributed to his becoming a more confident physician and analyst.

Eleanor Feinberg traveled to the Institute from the Champaign Urbana area, where she has been active in bringing psychoanalytic ideas. She and several others recently founded a new organization there called the Contemporary Psychoanalysis Interest Association. Her Ph.D. is in counseling psychology. Eleanor plans to continue doing committee work at the Institute, and so will continue to come to Chicago on Thursdays and Fridays. She will be opening a practice here on Fridays in September.

Candace Fleischmann is pleased that she can add "psychoanalyst" to social worker in describing her profession. High points of her training were meeting wonderful new friends among candidates and faculty, her experience of being able to present case material to visiting scholars, and having the opportunity to delve into new ideas. She anticipates that "doing the work of analysis and

consolidating the theory with practice" will keep her busy in the near future. Candace hopes to continue as an active member of the Institute community.

Josh Kellman is an adult, child, and adolescent psychiatrist. His goal was always to become an analyst, and he entered analytic training soon after the completion of his psychiatric training. Being at the Institute "allowed me to become the analyst I wanted to be." Josh especially valued the "intense intellectual sharing with classmates over many years." Being able to present his cases to other classes was "always a mind-expanding experience." He added that, "As with all of us, my personal analysis was an extremely influential part of my training." He will continue his private practice along with teaching and supervising in the child and adolescent psychiatry department at the University of Chicago, and would like to become a faculty member at the Institute.

Jane McCormack is the first person to graduate from the Institute's core program on the basis of a terminated child case. This required the faculty to establish a special set of evaluations that focused on the quality of her work with adults. She practices as a psychologist in the Loop and in Winnetka. Jane said there were many high points to her training, but "the most stunning experience was to sense (early in her first year) that analytic training would entirely change the way I listened to and understood my patients." She felt that each Friday, returning to her office from classes, she could notice incremental advances in this process. Jane hopes to continue being involved in clinical writing, presenting, supervising, and teaching, which she developed an interest in while at the Institute. "Certification is on the horizon."

Erika Schmidt began at the Institute as a research candidate, moving into both child and adult analytic training programs. She is an adult and child social worker, with a practice in the Loop. Erika described the high points of training as "those small moments, usually a clinical moment, when things came together and really made sense." These are the integrative moments, "when the reading, discussion, clinical experience, supervision, teaching, and listening to patients and colleagues" all contributed to a sense of wonder about the analytic process. Analytic training has broadened and deepened all of her clinical work, leading to an interest in applied psychoanalysis. To a question about her future plans, she replied, "The future is now." Erika will be the Director of Clinical Services for Children at the Institute, where she will help develop the new clinic for children and adolescents as well as coordinating ongoing clinical projects that serve children and adolescents within the Institute. She has also become the Archivist for the Institute, and will continue her writing on the work of Franz Alexander and the history of child psychoanalysis.

Thoughts on the Group Self of Psychoanalysis

In the last months of her life Marian Tolpin had become embroiled in a controversy that was quintessentially Marian. She had written an opinion piece to the newsletter of the International Psychoanalytic Association that made a forceful case against the institution of the Training Analyst. It was rejected by the officers of the International in an unprecedented interference with editorial autonomy. The regional editor resigned in protest. The stated grounds for rejecting the article were specious: it wasn't scholarly. The real motivation was political: this is a very hot issue in the hierarchy of the American and the International. With the help of one of our colleagues, Bonnie Litowitz, Marian was able to get it published online.

The following Op Ed piece was posted on The International Psychoanalytic website on Saturday, April 26th, 2008.

Marian Tolpin, the eminent analyst from Chicago, has asked us to publish her commentary on the training analyst and we have agreed. She explains clearly, articulately, and persuasively why the training analyst title should be retired. The International Psychoanalytic Blog is pleased to share her thoughts with the world because it stands for freedom of expression. The Executive Board of the International Psychoanalytic Association would not permit its publication. The blog welcomes comments on this important and timely article.

Jane S. Hall, Op Ed Editor

Marian Tolpin, M.D. Thoughts on the Group Self of Psychoanalysis, in light of the controversy over Training Analyst status

There is currently a great deal of debate taking place in psychoanalytic training centers, around the world and here in the United States, concerning whether there should be a separate category of graduate psychoanalysts designated as specially qualified to analyze future psychoanalysts. Among those who do believe that there needs to be such a category, further debate has raged on what that special qualification might entail and on the particulars of how (when, by whom) it should be established and evaluated.

In what follows below I reflect on my own experiences in regard to this category and on the lengthy history of the Training Analysis question as a disruptive force in institutional psychoanalysis. As I consider why this fractious issue, which has caused so much dissension in our profession, remains perpetually unresolved, I conclude that the Training Analysis serves a Group Self cohesive function. As such, it joins a list of other myths that

have served that function in the past; myths that were clung to but ultimately had to be relinquished in the face of contradictory evidence.

1. The myth of the "special" analyst:

First, in the interest of full disclosure, let me state that I have been a training and supervising analyst since 1975, which means that I underwent an analysis with an analyst who had been designated as "special" and, after further evaluation, was designated as equally fit to treat and train others who wished to ascend to my position. I have enjoyed my status as a training analyst. It has not made me a better analyst, but it is better to be a "have" than a "have not", and it has enhanced my career.

I see the training analyst controversy as a symptom of the vulnerability of the Group Self of psychoanalysis. When that Group Self is threatened and vulnerable from, for example, charges that psychoanalysis is an "inexact science" or from patients who do not get better, there is a propensity to rally around a special analyst (Freud) or a self-anointed institutional group of specially designated analysts (the Board of Professional Standards - BOPS), even in the face of contradictory evidence.

The current insistence that BOPS knows what is 'right' in terms of training and analysis continues Freud's tradition of always tenaciously insisting that he was right (until he was ready to change his theory). For example, Freud was "right" about his seduction hypothesis, until forced to acknowledge he was wrong. Or he was "right" that Dora (1905) had a vengeful father transference to him, abruptly ending her treatment to revenge herself against him (as she wished to revenge herself against her father) and wanting to continue treatment with him in order to exact even more revenge. Thus, he was "right" to refuse her further treatment. Likewise, Freud insisted he was "right" about the Wolfman's passive anality or the ubiquitous female castration complex as constituting absolute psychic "bedrock", and about the "psychic inertia" responsible for interminable analyses (1937).

Our current example of 'special-analyst-who-knows' is BOPS who "knows best" and is "right" to insist that it is the ultimate arbiter of psychoanalytic standards, and that only it is preeminently qualified to uphold the standards that it sets. That is, BOPS maintains that graduates of its own-approved institutes require its committee's oversight and imprimatur; graduation is simply not sufficient qualification for either certification or training analyst status, for which certification has been designated (by BOPS) as the "right" first step.

Thoughts on the Group Self of Psychoanalysis (continued)

This method of control over all aspects of training, including controlling the flow of future analysts designated as equally special, has a long history in our field and touches on my own personal history, as well. Some forty years ago, the Piers' report, commissioned by then-president of the American Psychoanalytic Association Samuel Ritvo, concluded that certification and training analyst appointment seriously weakened the field. The report was critical of one group's-BOPS-arrogating to itself the functions of overseeing both institutes and appointments in accord with what they think is analysis. At the time of my training, I also opposed and questioned this position. After I graduated, Leo Loomie, then-BOPS chair, threatened to expose the Chicago Institute if I, and a group of my peers, persisted in questioning the necessity for post-graduation certification by BOPS. Loomie wrote that he would reveal that Chicago Institute's then-Director Gerhart Piers and then-Dean Joan Fleming had "admitted in writing to him" that they had allowed some "compassionate graduations". However, since the 1940s, the decreasing number of new analysts, with one-third of our membership past seventy (myself included), vindicates the predictions of the Piers report: BOPS oversight was, and would continue to be, an important contributing factor in weakening American psychoanalysis.

2. Two examples of past psychoanalytic Group Self myths:

There are other myths that have been used by psychoanalysts to maintain a cohesive Group Self. Here I will mention only two from the past: The "Poor Breuer" myth and the "Eager Band of Followers" myth. The Poor Breuer myth began with Freud (1914) and was further elaborated by Ernest Jones (1953) in his account of Josef Breuer's weakness, panic and flight from his patient Anna O. (Bertha Pappenheim). Freud's original account of Breuer's treatment of Anna O. served his own purpose to rationalize and buttress his insistence that sexuality is the cause of neurosis. The story was that Breuer showed "distaste" for sexuality and (later) "repudiated" Freud's view of the sexual etiology of neurosis. He claimed that an "untoward event" concerning his patient's transference in "its crudely sexual form" led Breuer to "break off all further investigation".

This retrospective "reconstruction" by Freud of what happened was uncritically accepted by his followers as the truth. It was then further elaborated, taking on mythic proportions, in Jones' account, as follows. In a panic, Breuer fled from Anna O.'s "hysterical" labor, and rushed to Venice on a second honeymoon to appease his wife who was jealous of his patient. There, he impregnated her with a baby girl who would much later commit suicide in New York. However, the truth is that there was neither a flight or a Venetian honeymoon, nor a child conceived there; nor was there a suicide in New York. Hirschmuller's biography (*The Life and Work of Josef Breuer*, 1989) provides indisputable documentation in the form of Breuer's correspondence showing that he attempted to hospitalize Bertha Pappenheim after he unknowingly caused her morphine addiction; that, as was his custom, he vacationed near Vienna; that his daughter was born

during Anna O's treatment; and that she died in Vienna after taking poison to avoid arrest by the Gestapo. Yet, the myth of Poor Breuer, contrasting his panic and flight when faced with the "untoward event" of his patient's "crude sexuality" with Freud's steadfast insistence on the etiological bedrock of sexuality, took many generations to loosen its grip on Freud's "Eager Band of Followers".

In 1931 Freud was certain that his theory of girls' "rock bottom" penis envy and castration complex was right. He lauded his "eager band of followers...[who] closed ranks" to demonstrate their agreement. When all of his followers did not join his "eager band" Freud resorted to his authority and disparaged the dissenters. Karen Horney and Melanie Klein, for example, must be "wrong", their objections would have required him to change his mind and revise his entire timetable of normal development and the indisputable position of the Oedipus complex as the chief motivating force for neurosis. So Freud deemed that their objections must arise from "feminist views". Similarly, it must be Fenichel's and Jones' "feminist views" that led them to dispute Freud's theory of the nuclear female castration complex.

The legacy of Freud's insistence that he must be "right" persists as "eager bands of followers" still "close ranks" around their favorite theorist and his/her claim that one theory alone is the "pure gold" of analysis, that others' are mere "alloys." The same recourse to authority and disparagement is used to dispel valid disagreements, to dismiss controversial ideas or contradictory clinical evidence, and to exclude dissenters from the special group. When I was in training, Ralph Greenson (1967) designated Melanie Klein's theory as a "deviant" school, and David Rapaport (unpublished lectures in the 1960s) referred to Klein's "id mythology". Recently, Hanna Segal declared that British Independent analysts did not do "real" analysis. And so, the tradition-to know what is right and to disparage those who question or disagree-continues as the myth of upholding standards.

3. The myth of upholding standards-continued weakening of psychoanalysis:

In his study (2000), "Unfree Associations: Inside Psychoanalytic Institutes", Douglas Kirsner squarely blames the training analyst institution for the continuing weakening of our field. (He does not neglect sociological factors promoting a decrease in analytic patients and in analysts' prestige.) Kirsner's intensive study of four American Psychoanalytic Association institutes is summed up as follows:

Since there is scant agreement [among analysts] about anything in detail [theory], how can analytic 'standards' be other than a myth? Outside of anointment what can be the meaning of 'qualification' in psychoanalysis? Where qualification is not based on an agreed body of knowledge, disintegration products abound, leaving the way open for the role of power plays, anointment, cultism, and personality. There is here a folie a deux. Mystification serves the.... emotional needs of everyone in the system.... for a putative certainty that can establish a qualification as real...

Thoughts on the Group Self of Psychoanalysis (continued)

mystification...inspires some collusion on the part of candidates... the way this atmosphere of anointment has persisted has been through the training analysis and the appointment of those who have the right to train. These issues have always been at the heart of analytic disputes (2000, pp. 238-9).

Kirsner contributes a cogent and alarming view of psychoanalytic

culture from his 'outsider's' perspective. From my 'insider's' perspective I have attempted to make the same case: it is time to end the training analyst institution. If not now, when? If not us, who?

Marian Tolpin, M.D.
Training and Supervising Analyst
Chicago Institute for Psychoanalysis
122 South Michigan Avenue, 14th floor

CHICAGO PSYCHOANALYTIC SOCIETY PROGRAMS 2008-2009

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| September 23, 2008 | “Marian Tolpin: Psychoanalyst, Teacher, Writer, Supervisor & Colleague”
Presenters: James W. Anderson, Ph.D., Ernest S. Wolf, M.D. & Kate Schechter, M.S.W. |
| October 28, 2008 | Neal Spira, M.D. “An Analyst's Dilemma: The Longing for Transcendent Authority”
Discussant: Thetis Cromie, Ph.D. |
| November 25, 2008 | Steven Levy, M.D. “Psychoanalytic Education: Then and Now”
Discussant: Bonnie Litowitz, Ph.D. |
| January 27, 2009 | Martha C. Nussbaum, Ph.D. “Compassion: Human and Animal”
Discussant: TBA |
| February 12, 2009** | Steven Stern, Ph.D. “Session Frequency and the Definition of Psychoanalysis”
Discussant: Salee Jenkins, Ph.D. |
| February 28, 2009 | Saturday all-day conference: “Psychoanalysis and Philosophy”
Keynote Speakers: Jonathan Lear, Ph.D. & Eric L. Santner, Ph.D.
(Further information to follow) |
| March 24, 2009 | Khroush Dini, M.D. “Video Game Play and Addiction”
Discussant: Jeffrey Roth, M.D. |
| April 11, 2009* | Kerry Kelly Novick and Jack Novick, Ph.D. “The Pre-Termination Phase of Psychoanalysis” |
| May 5, 2009** | Kimberlyn Leary, Ph.D. “Racing for the Top: Psychoanalytic Reflections on Leadership And Race”
Discussant: TBA |
| June 23, 2009 | Robert M. Galatzer-Levy, M.D. - Presidential Address:
“Psychoanalysis: 10 Questions for the 21st Century” |

Meetings take place in Room 5006, National Louis University, 122 South Michigan Avenue, 4th Tuesday of the month, 7:30-9 p.m.

*This meeting will take place on a Saturday afternoon

** N.B.: 2nd Tuesday, instead of 4th

*** N.B.: 1st Tuesday instead of 4th

The Analytic Observer is published by the Chicago Psychoanalytic Society

Please send news items, announcements, or comments to:

Linda Marino, PhD, Editor

Holly Johnston, PhD, Associate Editor

122 S. Michigan Avenue, 13th floor, Chicago, IL 60603

lmarinophd@comcast.net

hollyjohn@ameritech.net

COUNCILOR'S REPORT

Neal Spira, M.D.

There is a revolution in progress in the way APsaA is governed. The Executive Council (composed of representatives from each society) has recognized that it is in fact the Board of Directors of the organization. The Council has oversight responsibility for all of our association's activities, which include the certification and accreditation functions of our Board of Professional Standards (composed of representatives from our Institutes).

This transformation has been accompanied by several major concerns. These include the following: 1) that the Council, due to its size, would not be able to function as a Board of Directors; 2) that the Council would be dominated by those who interpreted "oversight" of BOPS as "demolition;" and 3) that the organization would not be able to survive the power shift without fracturing into two separate entities.

This background is necessary to appreciate the main event at the June Meeting of Apsa's Executive Council, a discussion of two bylaw amendments that you have been asked to vote on before we convene in New York City next January. The first amendment, referred to as "Institute's Choice" (formerly known as "local option"), prohibits the Board of Professional Standards from requiring certification as a criterion for training analyst appointment. The second amendment simply eliminates the bylaw requiring certification for TA's, supervising analysts, and BOPS members themselves.

Similar propositions, right? Oh--I forgot to mention that the first amendment was brought to the floor by a petition of members. The second amendment was proposed by the Board of Professional Standards. Consequently, there was a passionate debate that bounced back and forth between: 1) the position of some Executive Council members that BOPS was responding to the "Institute Choice" initiative by coming up with an 11th hour alternative designed to split the membership, in order to siphon votes away from the 2/3 majority necessary to pass "Institute Choice," and thereby maintain its own rigid authority; and 2) the position of the BOPS chairs that "Institute Choice" was in fact a no-confidence vote regarding BOPS, and that it was intended to undermine their authority (hence, use of language like "prohibit"). BOPS maintained that its new proposal was a concerned response to the needs of our Institutes, and denied any strategic political motivations of its own. I proposed that as a Board we find a way to give BOPS a time-limited chance to demonstrate sufficient flexibility, and return to Institute Choice if they did not. However, this "middle" position was felt to be logistically impossible, as Institute Choice was automatically coming up for a membership vote due to its method of initiation (i.e., member petition). Despite the objections of several members, the Executive Council

voted in favor of sending both amendments to the general membership. As you may recall, a 2/3 majority is necessary for a bylaw change.

So what does this all mean? It seems to me that, regardless of motivation, BOPS has come up with a reasonable proposal that carries with it an implicit pledge to be accommodating to the needs of the Institutes, potential training analysts, and potential analytic candidates who do not want to be pressured into leaving productive analyses. How they will follow through is another matter, and I hesitate to make a prediction. But I do think that this is a choice between good and better, and an indication of forward movement in the organization. My advice is that those who vote for Institute Choice vote additionally for the BOPS amendment, to increase our chances of not having a stalemate should Institute Choice not garner enough votes.

In the conflict-free sphere, there were some additional notable items:

- 1) The fiscal year for APsaA has been changed to September through August, to allow the executive council time to review the budget beforehand instead of after the fact, as has been the case since the Winter Meetings were moved to January;
- 2) The council endorsed the formation of a new multidisciplinary affiliate organization to promote psychoanalytic scholarship under the ApsaA umbrella. This project has great potential for attracting creative thinkers, generating new ideas, and demonstrating our commitment to critical inquiry. A committee will present a concrete proposal in January;
- 3) The treasurer reported that this year we had our first deficit since 2003; while our income has actually increased, expenses have increased more, and we need to pursue new income sources;
- 4) Due to a history of declining attendance and significant financial losses, the future of the June meeting is in question. Specific recommendations were made regarding attendance and financial benchmarks that must be met if these meetings are to continue beyond the next two years. It was also recommended that we meet in cities like San Francisco, Washington or Chicago in order to capture large enough numbers.

Finally, the report of the Task Force on Externalization was deferred until the next meeting, which gives us time to reflect on why it is that in our daily work we try to help patients move from externalization to internalization, while as an organization we seek solutions in the opposite direction. Clearly, APsaA provides a great living laboratory for the exploration of Kleinian and Oedipal dynamics as well as Narcissism. And a great civics lesson, to boot.

NEWS OF MEMBERS SUMMER 2008

Christine C. Kieffer, Ph.D. had a paper accepted for publication, "On Siblings: Mutual Regulation and Mutual Recognition" in the 2008 volume (on Child Analysis) of *The Annual of Psychoanalysis*. Dr. Kieffer also presented "A Ship Made of Paper: From Dissociation to Engagement to Empathy" at the 2008 International Association for Relational Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy (IARPP) in Baltimore on May 31. Dr. Kieffer also served as discussant for a paper given by James Herzog at the "New Perspectives on Parenting" conference at the Institute for Psychoanalysis on April 5.

Jerome Weiner, MD participated in a roundtable discussion on "Emotion and Invention in Architecture" at the Philoctetes Center at the New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute on June 14, 2008. A video of the event is available on the website www.Philoctetes.org.

The Child Analytic Forum, consisting now of 27 child analyst members, has met continuously once a month for dinner and a scientific/clinical discussion since it was established in March of 1988. It celebrated its twentieth anniversary with cake and champagne at the end of the dinner.

The Chicago Psychoanalytic Society
122 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60603

